

Modern Bible Translations Unmasked

Dr. Russell R. Standish

Evangelist/Revivalist

Dr. Colin D. Standish

President, Hartland College

Copyright © 1993 by R. R. Standish and C. D. Standish
All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America

ISBN 0-923309-13-6

1 A Brief History of Bible Manuscripts and Translations

2 The Noblest Monument of English Prose

3 Testimony of a Modern Revision

4 Two Greek New Testaments

5 Corrupted Manuscript

6 An Inspired Translation?

7 The Case of the Missing Greek

8 Westcott and Hort

9 The Manuscripts

10 The Roman Catholic Attitude Toward Scripture

11 Burning Bibles and Saints

12 The Jesuits and the Versions

13 Emperor Constantine

14 Roman Catholic Elation

15 The Fourth and the Twentieth Centuries

16 Profitable Prophets

17 Subtle Catholicism

18 A Crucial Text

19 The Destruction of the Doctrine of Antichrist

20 Defaming Scripture

21 The Youth Factor

22 Archaic Words

23 The Bible Societies

24 The Trinitarian Bible Society

25 The Dead Sea Scrolls

26 The Missing Comma

27 The Revised Standard Version and Islam

28 The Defense of Modern Translations

29 The Revised Version

30 A Mutilated New Testament

31 The Milieu of the Revised Standard Version

32 The New Revised Standard Version

- 33 The New English Bible
- 34 The Revised English Bible
- 35 The New Jerusalem Bible
- 36 The Amplified New Testament
- 37 The New World Bible
- 38 Paraphrases of Scripture
- 39 Phillips' New Testament
- 40 The Best Modern Version

Appendices

- A Entire Verses Omitted from Most Modern Versions of Scripture
- B Portions of 178 Verses Omitted from Most Modern Translations
- C The Translators of the Authorized Version
- D Relevance Gone Berserk
- E God's Word Made a Joke

Chapter 1

A Brief History of Bible Manuscripts and Translations

The twenty-seven books of the New Testament were written in the second half of the first century after Christ. Not one of the original writings is preserved. However, early Christians carefully preserved copies of these sacred writings, taking the greatest care to eliminate copyist errors. Syria became the center of such copying endeavors.

Nevertheless, within a century of the writing of the New Testament canon, serious alterations were made, especially by scribes in the city of Alexandria in Egypt. These men were motivated by a desire to support their Gnostic errors, which included the view that Christ was not a member of the Godhead. Once scribes tampered with Scripture they became increasingly careless in their copying techniques, introducing numerous mistakes. However, the scribes of Syria did not deviate from their meticulous copying methods.

From these two copyist perspectives, two quite different streams of Greek manuscripts emerged. The Eastern stream, which became centered on Syria and Constantinople, remained true to the original writings of the apostles, while the Western stream, centered on Alexandria and Rome, was markedly flawed by both deliberate and careless alterations.

Early in the fourth century, Emperor Constantine commissioned Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, to prepare fifty copies of the New Testament. Eusebius chose to copy the flawed Western manuscripts. His decision was influenced by his admiration of Origen, who himself was a corrupter of Holy Writ.

It is thought that two of Eusebius' copies survive in the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Vaticanus. These copies contain many errors, and during the sixth and the seventh centuries at least ten different scribes attempted to make corrections to bring them somewhat closer to the valid Eastern manuscripts. Despite this effort, deliberate and careless errors remained in great numbers.

Knowledge of the errors did not prevent Jerome from using these faulty manuscripts as a basis for his Latin version of the Bible. His translation became the official Scripture of the Roman Catholic Church and is known as the Latin Vulgate. Disregarding all evidence to the contrary, the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century proclaimed the Latin Vulgate to be free from error.

But despite the great influence of the Papacy, true Christians were not deceived. Believers such as the Waldenses and the Gallic church of France and the Celtic church of Britain refused such perversion of God's Word and used only those translations arising from the Eastern stream. This practice was also true of God's churches in Ethiopia, Persia, India, and China.

When the Turks conquered Constantinople and destroyed the Byzantine Empire in 1453, men escaped to the West bringing priceless biblical and secular manuscripts with them. These manuscripts enlightened the dense darkness of the Middle Ages, a darkness directly attributable to Roman Catholic domination. The revelations of these manuscripts opened minds to learning and also to the pure, precious Word of God. The Renaissance spread throughout Europe like a wildfire, and shortly the Reformation arose.

God's servants perceived that it was the Word of God in the language of the common people which opened minds to truth and dispelled the errors of the Papacy. As nation after nation threw off the shackles of Catholicism and embraced a pure faith based upon the inerrant Word of God, great fear gripped the leadership in Rome. The Council of Trent was called in 1545 to find a means to stem the advance of Protestantism.

Perceptively, the bishops gathered at the Council acknowledged that the free distribution of the Bible to all men would prove the death knell of the Roman Catholic Church. Wherever men and women read this precious Book, the errors of Catholicism were forsaken.

Gladly would these wily bishops have cast every Bible into a sea of flames as they had done in previous generations, but their coercive power had disappeared from much of Europe. Thus more subtle means were required to reverse the great advance of scriptural truth. Some less farsighted bishops even suggested that the Roman Catholic Church, too, endorse the Bible as the sole source of faith. They reasoned that they might be able to wean men and women from Protestantism if they proclaimed such a view. But the Jesuits saw that such a stand, rather than serving to rescue the Catholic faith, would seal its doom. With the Archbishop of Reggio as their spokesman, the Jesuits totally overthrew this faulted tactic by pointing out that there was no scriptural basis for Sundaykeeping, and unless the church was prepared to return to Sabbathkeeping, they must uphold the authority of the tradition of the church above that of the Scriptures.

The Archbishop of Reggio's successful argument won a continued place for church tradition as the major source of Catholic doctrine, but it did not provide a solution to the advance of Protestantism and the supremacy of Scripture in the hearts of Protestants. The Jesuits thus devised a new strategy. While having little regard for the Bible, they nevertheless went to Douay and Rheims in France and translated the Bible into the English language using the Latin Vulgate as its basis, although resorting to the original languages in some areas.

The Jesuits were not bothered by the faultiness of their new translation; it furthered their aims. Their faith depended not upon God's Word, but rather upon church tradition. Accuracy was not vital to their

undertaking, and inaccuracies would assist them in their aim to weaken Protestant faith in God's Word. It is the corruption of God's Word which turns men and women to the authority of men and the church in place of the Bible.

For three centuries the design of the Jesuits met with scant success. Protestants were acutely aware of the perversions of the Western manuscripts and eschewed them. Men such as William Tyndale died at the stake rather than submit to a perverted Scripture. The Reformers of Europe united to bring before God's flock the precious truths of the pure Word of God. It was in this commitment of fidelity to God's Word that the King James Version of the Bible was undertaken by godly men.

But in the nineteenth century the Jesuits penetrated the Anglican Church in force. This infiltration led to the formation of what became known as the Oxford movement early in that century. This movement among young Anglican clerics upheld the re-introduction of Catholic practices such as the confession, the adoration of Mary, and the celebration of the Mass, into the Anglican Church.

When in the 1870s the archbishopric of Canterbury undertook a revision of the King James Version of the Bible, the revision committee's two most influential figures, Doctors Westcott and Hort, were greatly under the influence of the Oxford movement. They encouraged the translators to discard the pure Eastern manuscripts upon which the Protestant Reformation and its Bible were based and to revert to the perverted Western manuscripts, ever the ally of Catholicism.

Thus the Revised Version of 1881 transformed the nature of the English-language Scripture. This version, and the American Revised Version which followed twenty years later and which was equally faulted, did not initially have a profound influence in Protestantism, for the King James Version remained the standard Bible of these churches.

But the appearance of the Revised Standard Version of the Bible in the second half of the twentieth century, followed by a plethora of new translations, saw the scheme of the Jesuits finally implemented. Today most Protestants have discarded the trusted King James Version and now cheerfully use Bibles which are based upon Catholic manuscripts. All the best-known modern translations with the exception of the New King James Version (also known as the new Authorized Version) distort Scripture. These translations include the New International Version, the New English Bible, Today's English Version, Phillips' translation, and a host of others.

Is it any wonder that the Catholics openly rejoiced at the appearance of the Revised Version, proclaiming that its use would be the death knell of Protestantism? The use of these translations has seriously weakened the Protestant perception of the errors of Rome. Already the effects of the use of these translations, initially sponsored by theologians, are plain to see.

Chapter 2

The Noblest Monument of English Prose

It was not until the sixteenth century that the first English translation of the Scriptures from their original Greek and Hebrew was completed. It is true that John Wycliffe had, in the fourteenth century, translated the Bible into English from the Latin Vulgate. For this and other assaults on the excesses of

Rome, Wycliffe's bones were disinterred a decade after his death in 1384, and publicly burnt. He had written,

Cristen men and wymmen, olde and yonge, shuden studie fast in the Newe Testament, for it is of ful autorite, and opyn to understanding of simple men, as to the poyntis that be moost nedeful to salvacioun.¹

This astounding assertion had rocked the ecclesiastical foundations of England. It was a frontal challenge to the papal teaching that the priests alone could interpret and present scriptural truth. This erroneous view of Catholicism is one reflected by the growing demands of modern theologians to invest them with the right to determine truth when matters of doctrine are in dispute. The domination of the church by theologians has ever led to darkness, never light. Little wonder that Wycliffe was later hailed by devout Protestants as the Morning Star of the Reformation.

In November 1983 we had the privilege of worshipping in the country church of Lutterworth in Leicestershire, England. It was to this pastorate that John Wycliffe was banished when his influence in Oxford was more than the church hierarchy could tolerate. It was here that he died, and it was here that his bones were ceremonially burned. How fortunate we are that our God's actions are not subject to the whims and bigotry of man! In the stone church is preserved a copy of Wycliffe's great contribution to truth, his translation of Holy Writ.

But bold as Wycliffe's work was, and far-reaching as his efforts were—it was through contact with him that Reformation stirrings were witnessed as far away as Bohemia, culminating in the mighty witness of Huss and Jerome—Wycliffe was unable to introduce to his fellow citizens an uncorrupted translation of the New Testament.

The Latin Vulgate, from which Wycliffe translated his English version had been translated originally from these corrupted Greek manuscripts. William Tyndale in the sixteenth century had access to uncorrupted Greek and Hebrew manuscripts and it was from these that he prepared his English translation. The Roman Catholic prelates condemned Tyndale's work as a willful perversion of the New Testament. His Bible was consigned to the flames and he himself was burnt at the stake in 1536 for daring to utilize Greek manuscripts uncorrupted by deliberate alterations. So dear was the purity of God's Word to Tyndale that life itself was less precious. We do well to consider at what price the standard of purity of biblical manuscript was preserved.

Tyndale's work was not extinguished by the flames which consumed his body and his translations. It lives on today in its worthy successor, the King James Version of Scripture. Unfortunately, the tradition of the corrupted manuscripts was not stayed by the success of the English Reformation. It still survives in most modern translations. Indeed in 1986, sales of one of these versions, the New International Version, exceeded that of the King James Version for the first time.

The great majority of Christians selecting a modern version of Scripture do so, believing that they are simply obtaining an authentic Bible translated in the English language of today rather than that of the seventeenth century. They would be astounded to learn that the most popular modern versions have been translated from a different Greek manuscript from that used in the King James Version.² Few are aware that from the earliest times, two Greek manuscripts have competed for the right to be accepted as the original words written by the apostolic authors.

Many unsuspecting Christians accept the claim, that modern translations have a marked advantage over those of the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries since more recent discoveries have revealed many more manuscripts. In some cases these are more ancient copies of the Greek manuscripts. It is claimed that these enable a more accurate basis for the evaluation of both minor and major discrepancies among the various manuscripts. But all the Greek manuscripts bear unmistakable testimony of having arisen from one of two sources—one preserved by the Eastern Christian Church in Constantinople and Syria and the other by the church of the West, centered in Rome and Alexandria. Modern discoveries have not altered this fact. The merits of these competing claims demand evaluation, for it is never safe to tamper with Holy Writ. God did not choose in a careless fashion the message He inspired His servants to record. Every sentence was inspired by God. While it is true that these privileged authors of the canonical writings used their own words and distinctive styles in writing, nevertheless every concept expressed, every fact related, was deemed by God as information vital to our salvation. So holy were these words that the most terrible anathema was threatened against those who dare to tamper with the Scripture's content.

If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book. Revelation 22:18-19

The two competing Greek texts³ of Scripture are typified by the *Textus Receptus* (Eastern tradition) and the Codex Vaticanus (Western tradition). No translator since early Reformation times has chosen these two forms of the Greek Scripture in a vacuum. Each has made a deliberate decision to choose one or the other. The translators who were chosen to undertake this important task in the days of King James I of England were well aware of the two basic manuscripts. The *Textus Receptus* had a history extending back to the apostolic churches and reappearing at intervals down through the Christian era among enlightened believers. [It] was protected by the wisdom and scholarship of the pure church in her different phases; by such as the church in Pella in Palestine where Christians fled, when in A.D. 70 the Romans destroyed Jerusalem; by the Syrian Church of Antioch which produced eminent scholarship; by the Italic Church in northern Italy; also at the same time by the Gallic Church in southern France and the Celtic church in Great Britain; by the pre-Waldensian, the Waldensian, and the churches of the Reformation. Benjamin George Wilkinson, *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, p. 12, Washington, 1930.

This pedigree is impressive indeed, for all these churches strove for purity of faith in an age of rampant apostasy.

The competing stream is small by comparison, yet it seems that as in the Middle Ages, so at the end of time, it is poised to supersede the *Textus Receptus*. It is based upon two Greek manuscripts—The Codex Vaticanus, secreted in the Vatican Library for centuries, and the Codex Sinaiticus, discovered by a German theologian in the "waste-paper basket" of an ancient monastery at Sinai in 1844. One could rightly wonder if this discovery was not a satanic trump card reserved by the devil for the days of the preaching of the everlasting gospel. This corrupt form of the Greek manuscript has been represented in the Latin Vulgate, the 1582 Jesuit translation of Scripture into English (known as the Douay) and, since 1881, the vast majority of modern English translations.

Perhaps no man examined the evidence for the authenticity of the Greek text more carefully than John William Burgon, fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, vicar of St. Mary's, the University of Oxford Church, professor of Divinity at Oxford University and later dean of Chichester. This great nineteenth century Christian held a fervent love for Scripture. He spared no effort to examine the claims of the two versions. In Rome in 1860, he visited the Vatican Library specifically to study the Codex Vaticanus. In 1862 he travelled to Sinai and inspected the treasures of St. Catherine's Convent where the Codex Sinaiticus had been discovered. He also visited a large number of continental libraries, examining their ancient Greek manuscripts of the New Testament.

At the conclusion of these investigations, Professor Burgon declared:

I am utterly disinclined to believe, so grossly improbable does it seem—that at the end of 1800 years, 995 copies out of every thousand, I suppose, will prove untrustworthy, and that one, two, three, four, or five which remain, whose contents were till yesterday as good as unknown, will be found to have the secret of what the Holy Spirit originally inspired. I am utterly unable to believe, in short, that God's promise has so entirely failed, that at the end of 1800 years, much of the text of the Gospel had in point of fact to be picked by a German critic out of a waste paper basket in the convent of St. Catherine. David Otis Fuller, *True or False?*, p. 13, Grand Rapids International Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Some have upheld the antiquity of the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Vaticanus as evidence of their superiority over the manuscripts used in the translation during King James I's reign. Burgon adopted an alternative view. He saw many years of preservation as evidence of their unreliability since any valuable document, he believed, would have long since been destroyed by constant usage.

Burgon's references to the recentness of the knowledge of this Western stream should not be interpreted as evidence that it is of recent origin. It is simply a fact that these Greek manuscripts were unknown to the mass of scholars until the nineteenth century. But these manuscripts were soon found to be the basis for the perversions present in the long extant Latin Vulgate, so highly prized and promoted by the Roman Catholic Church.

That the Reformers, both English and Continental, eschewed this false set of biblical records, should not surprise us. The Eastern church had meticulously preserved the Word of God through numerous copyings, checking and rechecking each entry. Such care had not been demonstrated in the West where apostasy so rapidly overtook the purity of the faith that some sought to "improve" on the words of Holy Writ through means of alterations and deletions.

Eusebius, an early church father, admitted that in his day corrupted manuscripts were so prevalent that agreement between the copies was hopeless. B.G. Wilkinson, op. cit., p. 15

Men such as Justin Martyr in the second century of the Christian Era, together with Tatian, who espoused Gnosticism, had deliberately "corrected" Scripture. In the following century, Clement of Alexandria, a man who espoused many pagan concepts, took the process even further. Dean Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, p. 336

But men like Origen and his follower, Jerome, who was the editor of the Latin Vulgate, contributed most to the debasing of Holy Writ. The situation has been well summarized by Scrivener:

It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that the worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected, originated within a hundred years after it was composed; that Irenaeus (A.D. 150), and the African Fathers, and the whole Western, with a portion of the Syrian Church, used far inferior manuscripts to those employed by Stunica, or Erasmus, or Stephens thirteen centuries later, when moulding the *Textus Receptus* (Scrivener, *Introduction to New Testament Criticism*, 3rd Edition, p. 511, quoted in Wilkinson, op. cit., p. 18

The history of the recent change of thinking in Protestant circles is not clouded in mystery. It was successfully engineered by two prominent professors of Theology at Cambridge University: Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort. These men have been recognized as the most brilliant and erudite Bible scholars of the second half of the nineteenth century, but they were brilliantly wrong. They were in error, for they were not lovers of truth, but rather leaned toward the rising Anglo-Catholic tide in their church. We illustrate by citing a quotation from one of Professor Hort's letters.

I have been persuaded for many years, he wrote in a letter to Dr. Westcott dated October 17, 1865, that Mary-worship and Jesus-worship have very much in common in their causes and their results (quoted in D.O.Fuller, op. cit., p. 17).

With such Catholic sentiments in his heart, we need not experience surprise that this man, ignoring the hard-won gains of his spiritual forefathers in the Anglican Church, turned once more to the manuscripts so valued by Rome. Thus when in the 1870s both Westcott and Hort were included among those entrusted with a revision of the King James Version, they persuaded their fellow translators to exceed their commission. This commission had confined the work of the committee to alterations of expressions which the passage of time had rendered archaic. Many readers of the modern translations imagine that here the translators halted. But tragically, the Revised Version of 1881 was based upon, not the Greek of the *Textus Receptus*, but that of the corrupted Western manuscripts. What the consequences of this departure from their commission produced, we shall subsequently examine.

Some assume that in most instances there is such a small difference between the *Textus Receptus* and the Codex Vaticanus as to make all protests trivial. Such should study the evidence more closely. Philip Mauro, a diligent Greek scholar, has recorded no fewer than 7,578 verbal divergences in the gospels alone. These consist of the omission of 2,877 words, the addition of 536 words, the substitution of 935 words, the transposition of 2,098 words and the modification of 1,132 words (Philip Mauro, *Which Version? Authorized or Revised?*, quoted in D.O.Fuller, op. cit., p. 78). Such wholesale destruction of the original text, resultant upon both willful changes and carelessness in copying, indicates the magnitude of the problem.

The beauty of the King James Version English has never been matched. Even the translators of the Revised Standard Version were constrained to admit this fact. They quoted from the assessment of those involved in the 1881 revision. These men had stated that the King James Version was marked by its simplicity, its dignity, its power, its happy turns of expression . . . the music of its cadences, and the felicities of its rhythm. The Preface of the Revised Standard Version of Scripture

It is sometimes asserted that the English language reached its peak around the seventeenth century. This view is a matter of personal judgment, but it must be said that the works of William Shakespeare

and John Milton, contemporaries of the 1611 translation, offer evidence to support this opinion. One analysis of the superiority of seventeenth-century English to that of the present day concluded:

Each word was broad, simple and generic. That is to say, words were capable of containing in themselves different shades of meaning which were attached to that central thought. B.G.Wilkinson, op. cit., p. 74

Whatever the reason, few could rightly refute the claim that the language of the King James Version has not been equalled by later translators. It is indeed the noblest monument of English prose. How proper that the sacred Word of God should be thus expressed!

1 Christian men and women, old and young, should study diligently the New Testament, for it is of full authority, and open to the understanding of simple men, as to the points that are most needful for salvation.

2 Among these versions are the Revised Standard Version, the American Standard Version, the New International Version, Today's English Version, the Jerusalem Bible, and the New English Bible.

3 There is little dispute over the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. The Masoretic Text is almost universally accepted.

Chapter 3

Testimony of a Modern Revision

In 1982 the Revised Authorized Version (also known as the New King James Version) of the Bible was published. While being significantly superior to some of the other contemporary translations of the Bible, it also shares some of their errors. For example, in Hebrews 9:12, the Greek *ta hagia* is unjustifiably rendered "Most Holy Place" rather than "Holy Place" or "sanctuary."1 However, the preface to this modern translation offers unsolicited testimony to the unmatched quality of the original Authorized Version (also known as the King James Version) from rather unlikely sources, such as this quotation from the eminent Catholic scholar, Alexander Geddes, who in 1786 stated of the Authorized Version:

If accuracy and strictest attention to the letter of the text be supposed to constitute an excellent version, this is of all versions the most excellent (quoted in preface, *The Holy Bible—revised authorized version*, Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1982, p. iii).

The same preface quotes the English literary legend, George Bernard Shaw, certainly not a Christian in belief, as saying of the King James Bible:

The translation was extraordinarily well done because to the translators what they were translating was not merely a curious collection of ancient books written by different authors in different stages of culture, but the Word of God divinely revealed through His chosen and expressly inspired scribes. In this conviction they carried out their work with boundless reverence and care and achieved a beautifully artistic result. Ibid. p. iii

The preface adds some other valuable insights as to why no other subsequent English translation of the Bible has been able to match the veracity of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures. It affirms

that the period of the 1611 translation was far more aggressively devoted to classical learning than our present day. Ibid, p. ii

Perceptively the preface of the Revised Authorized Version points out:

1. The Authorized Version translators determined to avoid a translation that paraphrased or gave only an approximate rendering.
2. The translating scholars were almost as familiar with the original languages of the Bible as they were with English.
3. The translators had a reverence for the divine Author and His Word, which assured a translation in which only a principle of utmost accuracy could be accepted.
4. The Authorized Version translators, unlike most modern translators who frequently use the less precise dynamic equivalence when translating certain passages, used complete equivalence. The former often leads to paraphrasing which lacks the more literal rendition of the Authorized Version of Holy Scriptures. Ibid.

The preface to the Revised Authorized Version also offers confirmation that the translators of the Authorized Version believed in the sacred providences by which the manuscripts were preserved.

They firmly believed that they had been handed down a trustworthy record of the Word of God. Ibid.

The profound influence of the Authorized Version upon a wide range of life and culture in the English-speaking world is also noted in the Revised Authorized Version preface:

The precision of translation for which it is historically renowned, and its majesty of style have enabled that monumental version of the Word of God to become the mainspring of the religion, language and legal foundations of our civilization. Ibid.

The preface also acknowledges the deficiencies of the Sinaitic and the Vatican manuscripts, upon which most of the modern versions of the Scriptures depend.

The manuscript preferences cited in many contemporary translations of the New Testament are due to recent reliance on a relatively few manuscripts discovered in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Dependence on these manuscripts, especially two, the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, is due to the greater age of these documents. However, in spite of their age, many scholars have reason to doubt their faithfulness to the autographs, since they often disagree with one another, and show other signs of unreliability. . . .

On the other hand, the great majority of existing manuscripts are in substantial agreement. Even though some are late, and none are earlier than the fifth century, most of their readings are verified by ancient papyri, ancient versions, and quotations in the writings of the early church fathers. This large body of manuscripts is the source of the Greek text underlying the Authorized Version. It is the Greek text used by Greek-speaking churches for many centuries, presently known as the *Textus Receptus*, or *Received Text*, of the New Testament. Ibid.

Since the latter nineteenth century the theory has been held by some scholars that this traditional text of the New Testament had been officially edited by the fourth-century church. Recent studies have

caused significant changes in this view, and a growing number of scholars now regard the *Received Text* as far more reliable than previously thought. Ibid, p. vii

No translation is perfect. It may even be persuasively argued that no exact copies of the original autographs still exist. This concept has become the platform of debate for many who declare that therefore the precision of a translation is less important than its relevance to today's needs. This view has led to the deplorable situation where some "translations" have only scant resemblance to the sacred truth enshrined in the Scriptures. To those who cherish the sacred oracles of God, objective research confirms that the Authorized Version of the Bible is the most accurate and gives the most precise translation of any English Version yet produced. This reason alone is sufficient for it to be the primary Bible for all true Protestants.

1 This subject is thoroughly explained in C.D.Standish and R.R.Standish, *The Sacrificial Priest*, available from Hartland Publications, Box 1, Rapidan VA 22733 USA

Chapter 4

Two Greek New Testaments

Many theologians, seeking to calm the fears of church members, assert that there is only three percent of difference between the Greek manuscripts upon which the modern versions are based and those upon which the King James Version depends. Even if this estimate is correct, it means that the equivalent of 240 verses in the New Testament come under question. Very significant doctrinal changes could be accomplished by the perversion of such a large number of verses. Furthermore, should God's children countenance *any* departure from the inspired writings? While many theologians, as we have noted, emphasize that only three percent of Scripture is in question, nevertheless, they are most tenacious in their defence of the modern versions. Indeed, their defence of these versions appears to extend beyond the matter of ease of understanding. After all, theologians in many instances have studied Greek and/or Hebrew. They themselves should have no trouble with a few archaic English words. Yet it is evident that the majority discard the King James Version, preferring one of the modern versions based upon the Greek manuscripts which contain numerous omissions and other errors. We could be forgiven for suspecting a hidden agenda.

There have been, from the earliest period of the Christian era, two competing Greek manuscripts. Before a sincere Bible student selects a Bible translation for daily use, it is imperative that he first examine which one of these two incompatible Greek manuscripts he finds to be the one which represents the original writings of the New Testament apostles, and then discover which translations are based upon this accurate Greek manuscript. Clearly, a translation from a faulty Greek manuscript can in no wise bring pure truth to God's people.

The Greek manuscripts from which the King James Version of Scripture was translated, largely emanated from the Eastern Christian Church. When Constantinople, the headquarters of the Eastern Church, was overrun by the Ottoman Empire in 1453, many Greek scholars fled to the West, bringing with them priceless Greek manuscripts of Scripture. The Eastern Christian Church, particularly that located in Syria, had faithfully copied the manuscripts utilizing a technique similar to that used by the

Jews in copying the Old Testament. In this technique, words and letters were counted and manuscripts checked to minimize the possibility of copyist errors.

So dedicated were the translators of the King James Version that they desired only the very best manuscripts, and eschewed those which have been tampered with in the West. The sound manuscripts represent over ninety-five percent of all Greek manuscripts of the New Testament.

The second category of the Greek manuscripts, from which the vast majority of modern translations have been made, consists of those from the Western Christian Church which had its centers of learning in Alexandria and Rome. The two most famous of these manuscripts are the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus. Two significant Bibles have been translated from these Western manuscripts. The first was the Latin Vulgate translated in the fourth century, and the second was the Jesuit translation of Scripture in 1582 known as the Douay Version.

It is significant that churches which remain close to the truth of God always preferred Bibles based upon the Eastern manuscripts; while those who did not regard biblical authority as final, preferred the Western manuscripts. Thus the church in Pella in Palestine, where Christians fled after the fall of Jerusalem, the Syrian church of Antioch, the Italic church of Northern Italy, the Gallic of Southern France, the Celtic church of Great Britain, and the Waldensians all had the Eastern manuscripts as the basis for their Bibles. On the other hand, the Roman Catholic Church has always upheld the Western group of manuscripts. Such a situation should alert every loyal Christian to the need for a thorough examination of the Bible from which he is studying. Dr. Fuller has demonstrated the presence of the two contrasting categories of Greek manuscripts of the New Testament. Speaking of the production of the Douay translation, he states:

At the same time another group of scholars, bitterly hostile to the first group, were gathered at Rheims, France. There the Jesuits, assisted by Rome and backed by all the power of Spain, brought forth an English translation of the Vulgate. In its preface, they expressly declared that the Vulgate had been translated in 1300 into Italian and in 1400 into French, "the sooner to shake out of the deceived people's hands, the false heretical translations of a sect called Waldenses." This proves that Waldensian Versions existed in 1300 and 1400. So the Vulgate was Rome's corrupt Scriptures against the Received Text; but the Received Text the New Testament of the apostles, of the Waldenses, and of the Reformers. D.O.Fuller, *Which Bible?*, p. 209

That the Western Christian church corrupted Scriptures cannot be doubted. Speaking of the pure Italic faith, Allix testified:

They receive only, saith he, what is written in the Old and New Testaments. They say, that the popes of Rome, and other priests, have depraved the Scriptures by their doctrines and glosses. Allix, *Churches of Piedmont*, p. 288

There is sound historical evidence to support the fact that the New Testament was early corrupted in the Western Christian church. Eusebius reported that in his day there were many corrupted manuscripts. He asserted that those who were destroying the manuscripts were claiming to correct them. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book 3, Chapter 24, quoted in B.G.Wilkinson, *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, 15

Very soon the Gnostic heresy entered the Christian church. The proponents of this heresy taught that Christ was a created being. In the second century, Tatian wrote what he described to be a harmony of the gospels, termed the Diatessaron. This book claimed to have placed the four gospels into one book. However, it was so corrupted that eventually most churches destroyed the book. *Encyclopedias*, "Tatian" quoted in B.G.Wilkinson, op. cit., 16

In Alexandria in the third century, Clement refused to hand down Christian materials unmixed with the precepts of pagan philosophy. He freely quoted from corrupted manuscripts indicating that these were scriptural passages. Dean Burgon, *The Version Revised*, p. 366 quoted in B.G.Wilkinson, op. cit., 17

Origen also "corrected" Scripture. He stated:

The Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written. MacClintock and Strong, quoted in *ibid*.

It was Origen who taught Jerome, the editor of the Latin Vulgate translation of Scripture.

Because the Gnostics did not accept the divinity of Jesus Christ, we can see evidences of this doctrine in their corrupted New Testament manuscripts. Let us examine just one. One of the great affirmations of the divinity of Jesus Christ was stated in Paul's first epistle to Timothy:

And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh. 1 Timothy 3:16

Virtually every modern translation, following the Western manuscripts corrupted by the Gnostics, delete the word *God* and substitute the word *He* in its place, thus concealing this powerful witness to Christ's divinity. Let us examine three modern translations of this text as evidence.

Great indeed, we confess, is the mystery of our religion: He was manifested in the flesh. 1 Timothy 3:16, RSV

And great beyond all question is the mystery of our religion: He who was manifested in the body. 1 Timothy 3:16, NEB

Beyond all question, the mystery of godliness is great: He appeared in a body. 1 Timothy 3:16, NIV

That the English translators of the King James Version were not alone in adhering to the legitimate Eastern manuscripts may be seen from an examination of the translation of this text in a number of European languages:

Dieu a été manifeste en chair (1 Timothy 3:16, Osterwald's French Version)

Gott ist offenbaret im fleisch (1 Timothy 3:16, Luther's German translation)

Iddio e stato-manifestato in carne (1 Timothy 3:16, Diodati's Italian translation).

Deus se manifestou em carne (1 Timothy 3:16, Almeida's Portuguese translation).

Dios ha sido manifestado en carne (1 Timothy 3:16, Valera's Spanish translation).

William Tyndale had translated this passage in 1534 as

God was shewed in the fleisch (1 Timothy 3:16, Tyndale translation).

Clearly, the decision as to the stream of Greek manuscript in which to place one's faith is a vital one.

Chapter 5

Corrupted Manuscripts

One may inquire upon what evidence we base the assertion that the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus are corrupted manuscripts. Since much has made of the fact that each is a fourth-century document, whereas the earliest Greek manuscripts utilized in the construction of the *Textus Receptus* are dated a century later, many, impressed by the antiquity of the two Codices, are unaware that both are full of alterations of an obvious correctional character—"brought in by at least ten different revisers, some of them systematically spread over every page, others occasional, all limited to separate portions of the MS, many of these being contemporaneous with the first writer, but for the greater part belonging to the sixth or seventh century." Dr. Scrivener, quoted in David Otis Fuller, *True or False*, p. 75

Thus many of the corrections postdate the earliest manuscripts used in the *Textus Receptus* by one or two hundred years. The very fact that it required so many corrections is proof beyond dispute that it was regarded as impure. Indeed, the Codex Sinaiticus would have been even more corrupted had it not been for the thoroughgoing revision which Dr. Scrivener believed took place in the 6th or 7th century [in order] to conform to manuscripts in vogue at that time which were "far nearer to our modern *Textus Receptus*." Ibid.

Unlike scribes in the East, there is clear evidence that those scribes who undertook the copying resulting in the Codex Sinaiticus were utterly incompetent.

There is no attempt to end the word at the end of the line, for even words having only two letters as en, ek, are split in the middle, the last letter being carried over to the beginning of the next line, though there was ample room for it on the line preceding. Ibid., 76

Rank scribal carelessness can be seen in that the Codex Sinaiticus

must have been derived from one in which the lines were similarly divided, since the writer occasionally omits just the number of letters which would suffice to fill a line, and that to the utter ruin of the sense; as if his eye had heedlessly wandered to the line immediately below. Doctor Scrivener cited instances "where complete lines are omitted" and others "where the copiers pass in the middle of the line to the corresponding portion of the line below." Ibid., 76-77

It is clear that the scribes failed to reread the page, for they could not have failed to notice such omissions, and the destroyed sense of sentences. Dean Burgon pointed out:

In the Gospels alone, Codex B (Vatican) leaves out words or whole clauses no fewer than 1,491 times. It bears traces of careless transcription on every page. Codex Sinaiticus "abounds with errors of the eye and pen to the extent not indeed unparalleled, but happily rather unusual in documents of first-grade importance." On many occasions 10, 20, 30, 40 words are dropped through very carelessness. Letters and words, even whole sentences, are frequently written twice over, or begun and immediately cancelled; while that gross blunder, whereby a clause is omitted because it happens to end in the same words as the clause preceding, occurs no less than 115 times in the New Testament. Ibid., 77

It is little wonder that Dean Burgon exclaimed:

So manifest are the disfigurements jointly and exclusively exhibited by the two Codices (Vatican and Sinaitic) that instead of accepting them as two independent witnesses to the inspired original, we are constrained to regard them as little more than a single reproduction of one and the same scandalously corrupt and comparatively late copy. *Ibid.*, 74

Dean Burgon went on to point out:

In the Gospels alone, Codex Vaticanus differs from the Received Text in the following particulars: It omits at least 2,877 words; it adds 536 words; it substitutes 935 words; it transposes 2,098 words; and it modifies 1,132; making a total of 7,578 *verbal divergencies*. But the Sinaitic manuscript is *even worse* for its *total divergencies in the particulars stated above amount to nearly 9,000*. *Ibid.*, 78

It is little wonder than in considering these two fourth-century Codices and a similar one from Beza dated in the sixth century, Dean Burgon declared,

"... without a particle of hesitation, that they are three of the most scandalously corrupt copies extant"; that they "exhibit the most shamefully mutilated texts which are anyway to be met with"; that they "have become (by whatever process, for their history is wholly unknown) the depository of the largest amount of fabricated readings, ancient blunders and intentional perversion of truth, which are discernible in any known copies of the Word of God." *Ibid.*, 78

In view of the clear evidence that these manuscripts were copied by scribes who disregarded the elementary techniques of their art, it should not surprise us that the modern translations of Scripture based upon these manuscripts are greatly faulted. Bibles utilizing such carelessly recorded passages of Scripture should have no credibility in those areas where they differ from the *Textus Receptus*.

We must not overlook the fact, however, that such defective manuscripts amply support Rome's claim that the church is the sole source of doctrinal truth. If our Bible is corrupted, then men will have to seek elsewhere to find full truth.

Chapter 6

An Inspired Translation?

As boys we travelled by train more than 1000 miles each Christmas vacation (remember that is summertime in Australia), from our home city of Newcastle to the beautiful Barossa Valley of the state of South Australia. This valley was the ancestral home of our father, and was the home of hundreds of Reformed Lutheran Germans who emigrated to Australia between 1838 and 1850, fleeing persecution from the state Lutheran Church in Germany.

Our great-great-grandfather, Thomas Standish, migrated to Australia from Lancashire in England as a young man. On the boat, he met a young German lass and they married upon arrival in the new state. These Germans from the area of Germany known as Silesia (now part of Poland) had adhered to their primitive Lutheran faith despite the fact that the Prussian emperor adopted a course of persecution against them because they refused to accept his enforced form of State Lutheranism, which they judged to be apostate. Initially they sought refuge in the Ukraine, but their leader, Pastor Kruger, on a

visit to England met Sir William Angus, who had devised a scheme to settle the state of South Australia and what became its capital city, Adelaide. This, the only Australian State which did not commence as a convict settlement, was first settled by Europeans in 1836.

In spite of the fact that our father was a fourth-generation Australian, and despite the fact that he was of partial English ancestry, German was his primary language. Following the failure of the German community of the Barossa Valley to support the Australian war efforts in the First World War, the German schools run by the Lutheran Church were closed and all children of the Barossa Valley, including our father, were required to study in English-medium schools. In a single generation the inhabitants of that valley thus became Australians rather than Germans living in Australia.

We were always intrigued by this "little Germany." In our grandmother's home, we saw the primacy of the Martin Luther Bible. To fit our needs, the English King James Bible was dusted off for worship time during our visits. We still remember, however, the reverence with which our great-uncle Oscar held the Luther Bible. Occasionally, he would point to a passage, indicating his view that there was a deeper meaning in the German Bible as compared with the English translation. Clearly God spoke to him in German.

In the English-speaking world it is possible for us to forget that the Bible has been translated into hundreds of languages. Every one of these languages possesses words with slightly different shades of meaning—often unique to the cultural heritage of that language. It is not possible for one language to be translated into another language with perfect accuracy. Though the Hebrew scholars were among the finest in the world, nevertheless it is not difficult to detect the differences in expression in the Greek Septuagint translation of the pre-Christian era when compared with the original Hebrew. If anyone has doubts about translation difficulties, he should examine a Diaglot, which attempts to provide a word-by-word translation into English language from the Greek.

There are other considerations. Of all the 5,000 or so older manuscripts of the Greek New Testament, many are fragmentary or partial. Further, whenever there are significant portions of the New Testament, no two are precisely identical. D.A. Carson, *The King James Version Debate*, 18, Baker Book House, Michigan, 1979

It hardly needs emphasis that we have none of the original writings, and that even manuscripts of the Byzantine (Eastern) text have in many cases been altered from the original at least slightly, either by accidental error of the scribe or by deliberate change. However, almost always these errors can be identified by comparison with other copies, with early translations into other languages, and with reference to scriptural quotations of the early church fathers. It must be remembered that the leaders of Christianity in the East followed very strict rules of copying. Most errors are simple misspellings or omissions of words in one manuscript which are correct in the vast majority of others. Thus the *Textus Receptus*, for all practical purposes, represents the original writings.

We now examine the problem of whether any translation is divinely inspired. Obviously, if no manuscript in the original language is a perfect reproduction of the original writings, then it is impossible for any translation from these imperfect manuscripts to be perfect. Yet by comparing manuscript with manuscript and examining other ancient writings it is possible to discern the original writings with great accuracy.

Many textual critics greatly overstate the presence of errors in the Greek manuscripts. The lesson of the Hebrew manuscripts should not be lost. Textual critics had pontificated major copyists' errors in this text. But the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls put such guesswork to rest. God had preserved His Word. That He has just as miraculously preserved the New Testament cannot be doubted.

Some, however, have been so bold as to assert that the King James Version of the Scripture is a divinely inspired translation. Such a claim must be doubtful. Every evidence we have indicates that, though the King James Version is an excellent translation, it is not a perfect translation, which presumably is what an inspired translation would be. Yet we do not doubt the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the work of these translators, a guidance that could hardly be expected to guide men deliberately bent on falsifying God's Word.

Generally the exact-equivalence method of translation does not necessarily completely remove all bias in translation. For example, the Authorized Version, though giving many strong evidences of the doctrine of free will, nevertheless reflects the Calvinistic leanings of some of its translators with its heavy predestination emphasis in a number of New Testament passages. It is likely that the writings of the Dutch scholar Armenius, who died just about the time that the King James Version began to be translated, were known to the translators. It is possible that they were reacting against his free-will theology. Some have also felt that the King James Version reflects the pagan error of immediate life after death, with its emphasis on an everlasting burning hell. But, if these biases are present, they do not misdirect the Spirit-directed soul who is endeavoring to find the truth of the Bible by studying precept upon precept and comparing Scripture with Scripture. Overwhelmingly, the King James Version portrays a concept of free will through such texts as the following:

And if it seem evil unto you to serve the LORD, choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell: but as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD. Joshua 24:15

And Elijah came unto all the people, and said, How long halt ye between two opinions? If the LORD be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him. And the people answered him not a word. 1 Kings 18:21

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Matthew 23:37

Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Matthew 11:28

And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely. Revelation 22:17

The Lord is not slack concerning his promises, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. 2 Peter 3:9

Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. Hebrews 7:25

The King James Version portrays the sleep of death awaiting the resurrection through clearly translated texts:

For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Ecclesiastes 9:5

Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest. Ecclesiastes 9:10

For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me. Job 19:25-27

And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. Daniel 12:2

These things said he: and after that he saith unto them, Our friend Lazarus sleepeth; but I go, that I may awake him out of sleep. Then said his disciples, Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well. Howbeit Jesus spake of his death: but they thought that he had spoken of taking rest in sleep. Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead. John 11:11-14

But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. 1 Corinthians 15:20-23

Behold, I shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. 1 Corinthians 15:51-54

For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord. 1 Thessalonians 4:16-17

Dr. D.A. Carson, in his book *The King James Version Debate*, gives a wide range of ways by which errors crept into the manuscripts of the New Testament. Most of these errors are readily detected. For example, if a scribe accidentally left out a word, that word is attested to by many other manuscripts. Overwhelmingly, the words of the New Testament are sure, and where scholars are unsure, there is in most circumstances, high probability of the words of the original. Where there is vigorous debate, it is over issues that do not touch the central truths of the Bible. There is no reason to doubt the veracity of God's Word.

Problems arise, however, when translators seek to interpret Scripture according to their own biases. We can expect that as we come near the end of earth's history, this bias will increasingly be the object of Satan's efforts. The reason we uphold the King James Version of the Bible is not that it is an inspired or perfect translation. We recommend the King James Version not just because it is easier to memorize

or its language more sacred, or its cadence superior to modern translations. We recommend the King James Version as the primary Bible for both the individual and the church, simply because it is still the most accurate and reliable translation available in the English language. Whenever a more accurate, unbiased translation comes out in good quality, contemporary English, the authors will quickly join those who endorse its primary usage. We had hoped that the New King James Version would provide just that, but it does not measure up to the King James Version, and seriously erodes some precious truths of Scripture.

Chapter 8

Westcott and Hort

Bishop B.F. Westcott and Professor F.J.A. Hort were the most significant translators of the Revised Version, and since their theories of textual criticism continue to dominate the thinking of modern translators, we are at liberty to examine their personal convictions, for manifestly these have dictated their view of Scripture. That both men accepted gross apostasy is testified by their own writings.

Let us first refer to Dr. Hort. His attitude to the *Textus Receptus* is no secret. He himself wrote:

Think of that vile *Textus Receptus*. *Life of Hort*, vol. 1, 214, quoted in B.J. Wilkinson, *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, 168

With this attitude to the Greek text, in defense of which many true Christians were prepared to yield their lives, we need not be perplexed as to why Hort engineered the discarding of the *Textus Receptus* as the basis for the Revised Version and replaced it essentially with the Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus.

He did not accept as truth the very Book he led out in translating.

I am inclined to think that no such state as "Eden" (I mean the popular notion) ever existed, and that Adam's fall in no degree differed from the fall of each of his descendants, as Coleridge justly argues. Letter written by Hort to John Ellerton, recorded in *Life of Hort*, vol. 1, 78, quoted in *ibid.*, 157

How could the Holy Spirit enlighten a man who had such contempt for God's Word?

Once again we are not left to doubt why Hort possessed no faith in the veracity of the early chapters of the Pentateuch; he was a convinced evolutionist. In his letter to fellow translator and Anglican minister John Ellerton, he wrote:

But the book which has most engaged me is Darwin. Whatever may be thought of it, it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with. . . . My feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable. If so, it opens up a new period. Letter to John Ellerton, dated April 3, 1860, *Life of Hort*, vol. 1, 416, quoted in *ibid.*, 152

While we possess no evidence to support the suggestion that Dr. Hort was a Jesuit who had infiltrated the Anglican Church, one matter is certain: he could not have done a "better" work had he been one. That he was a Roman Catholic at heart is documented beyond dispute. The following five quotations from his own pen should convince the most skeptical.

I have been persuaded for many years that Mary-worship and "Jesus"-worship have very much in common in their causes and their results. Ibid.

I am very far from pretending to understand completely the oft-renewed vitality of Mariolatry. Ibid.

But this last error can hardly be expelled till Protestants unlearn the crazy horror of the idea of Priesthood. Ibid.

But you know I am a staunch sacerdotalist. Ibid.

I believe that Coleridge was quite right in saying that Christianity without a substantial church is vanity and disillusion; and I remember shocking you and Lightfoot not so long ago by expressing a belief that "Protestantism" is only parenthetical and temporary. Ibid., 155

It is proper to ask the rhetorical question, Could God use such a man, steeped in the pagan superstition of Roman Catholicism, to bring new light to the world concerning His Word?

Bishop Westcott, the Anglican Bishop of Durham, was no less of Catholic persuasion, as his own pen testifies.

After leaving the monastery, we shaped our course to a little oratory which we discovered on the summit of a neighboring hill. . . . Fortunately we found the door open. It is very small, with one kneeling-place; and behind a screen was a "Pieta" [a statue of the Virgin and the dead Christ] the size of life. . . . Had I been alone I could have knelt there for hours. Westcott wrote from France to his fiancée, 1847, *Life of Westcott*, vol 2, 50, quoted in Ibid.

I wish I could see to what forgotten truth Mariolatry bears witness. Westcott wrote to Archbishop Benson, November 17, 1865. Ibid.

He was just as condemnatory of the accuracy of the Word of God as was his colleague.

No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history. I could never understand how any one reading them with open eyes could think they did. Westcott wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury on Old Testament criticism, March 4, 1890. Ibid., 157

Thus the two translators, whose work in textual criticism has dominated almost all translations made in the last century, are seen to be "cupboard" Roman Catholics, men who deny the inerrancy of Scripture and subscribe to the theory of evolution. It is a record of belief that should utterly destroy confidence in their work.

That they introduced not only the Western text dear to the Roman Catholic Church, but that they concurred in the introduction of subtle Roman Catholic teaching,¹ should also surprise no one.

Further, their lack of belief in the Holy Book they chose to translate and their acceptance of the theory of evolution disqualify them as serious textual critics. Yet countless millions of Christians today are totally oblivious of these facts, and unwittingly study from Bibles whose translations have been influenced by the theories of these faithless men.

¹ See chapter 17 entitled *Subtle Catholicism*. <[BACK](#)>

Chapter 10

The Roman Catholic Attitude Toward Scripture

At the outset it must be made clear that Catholics are not "Bible Christians."

We do not profess faith in the Bible, but in Jesus Christ and His church, and its teachings. *Catholic Answers to "Bible Christians,"* 6

Thus the lines of distinction are drawn between Protestants and Roman Catholics. For Protestants, the Holy Scriptures are the only authoritative teachings of Jesus; the teachings of the church are valid only as they conform with the written Word.

Jesus Himself set us an example of the all-sufficiency of the Word. Upon the day of the resurrection, He joined Cleopas, one of His faithful followers, and another devout Christian on their journey to Emmaus. Both friends were utterly dejected as they discussed Jesus' execution two days earlier.

And he said unto them, What things? And they said unto him, Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people: and how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him. But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel. Luke 24:19-21

Jesus' response to their dismay is instructive to all Christians.

O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself. Luke 24:25-27

In the minds of many, Jesus' approach to the dilemma of the two friends seems curious, for it was only later as He sat at supper with them and blessed the food that their eyes were opened, and they knew him. Luke 24:31

Surely the most convincing evidence that Jesus could have offered of His resurrection was His appearance in person. But was it? In this episode, Jesus taught implicitly that our eyes are not always reliable witnesses of truth. The devil can deceive as he did when he brought "Samuel" before King Saul. Was that sound evidence of Samuel's immortality?

When we studied psychology at Avondale College under Dr. Gordon McDowell, he told us of attending the American Amateur Magicians' Championship. The winner's act was deceptively simple, yet none of the professional magicians, called upon to judge the event, could discern the trickery employed. The young man simply strolled onto the stage whistling. Then he suddenly shot up the thumb of his right hand, and a live canary sat happily upon it. He continued his whistling until each of his ten fingers, one by one, was found to have a canary perched upon it. The magician then produced a cage and placed all ten canaries in the small cage. They enthusiastically flew about in it like any such birds are bound to do. The magician continued his whistling holding the cage with its birds between his hands, in clear view of the audience. Suddenly he clapped his hands together and the cage and all ten birds disappeared before their eyes.

On the visual evidence, the birds had come from nowhere and with the cage had returned to the invisible realm. But was it so? Of course not. It was indeed a very clever trick, but the audience's eyes had deceived them.

Jesus well knew that our faith must be established on firmer evidence than our visual images. It was only after He had proved the authenticity of the crucifixion and the resurrection events from Scripture that Christ revealed Himself to these followers. It is little wonder that they were to testify:

Did not our hearts burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures? Luke 24:32

Peter correctly recognized that the testimony of the Word of God was far more certain than even the evidence of what his eyes had seen and his ears had heard.

For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount. We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts. 2 Peter 1:16-19

Roman Catholics have not altered their attitude toward Scripture. In 1954, the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus, a fiercely Roman Catholic organization, made the bold claim that the Bible does not believe itself to be inspired or to be the complete Word of God; and that there is only one place in the world where you can be sure to prove the Bible is true and that is through the Catholic Church, the Apostolic Church (stated in *Collier's Magazine*, September 17, 1954). Apparently, the Knights of Columbus are so ignorant of the words of the Bible that they are unaware that it does present powerful testimony of its own inspiration. It testifies:

All scripture is given by inspiration of God. 2 Timothy 3:16

Further, the Bible plainly indicates that it is the complete Word of God and that nothing else is required, for it warns:

If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. Revelation 22:18

Protestants, on the other hand, accept the biblical assurance that it is the work of the Holy Spirit to guide the worshiper in his discovery of the true meaning of God's Holy Word.

Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. John 16:13

Nowhere does Scripture delegate this right to the church. Any student of history can trace the dismal results of following the papal philosophy of biblical interpretation. In the days of Jesus, God's church claimed to be the sole interpreter of the Word. This view was implicit in the question posed concerning Jesus—

How knoweth this man letters, having never learned? John 7:15

In answer to this question Jesus enunciated the principle of individual Bible interpretation.

If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. John 7:17

When the leading light of the early Christian Church, the apostle Paul, explained his interpretation of Scripture to the believers in Berea, they refused to accept his words without confirming them by personal study. Rather than heaping condemnation upon them for following this procedure, it is recorded concerning the Bereans:

These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so. Acts 17:11

In both Old Testament and New Testament times, men were admonished to study God's Word for themselves.

For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope. Romans 15:4

Never did God place the interpretation of Scriptures in the province of the church. So sacred are the Scriptures that the Holy Spirit alone holds the key to their understanding. When the church has usurped this divine prerogative it has inevitably provided a fertile ground for the proclamation of damnable error. The Jewish Church perverted Sabbathkeeping by its dictates. It taught the law from a legalistic viewpoint which favored the church but removed from God's people the joy of their salvation.

So too the Roman Catholic Church, usurping God's authority, has interpreted Scripture to teach the infallibility of the pope, the immortality of the soul, the Immaculate Conception, the efficacy of the seven sacraments, confession of sins to men, idol worship, the veneration of the "saints," purgatory, limbo, infant baptism, penance, the Mass, and a whole host of associated heresies. Truly, the track record of ecclesiastical interpretation of Scripture is a poor one indeed.

In contrast, humble men of God, searching the Scriptures under the power of the Holy Ghost, founded the Reformation, the Methodist Revival, and the great Advent movement of the nineteenth century. None of these mighty reformatory movements which shook the world could have been based upon interpretations propounded by church authority, for such is not the province of the church. The duty of church leaders is to encourage private Bible study and prayer, to preach the Word, admonishing the flock to personally verify that which is spoken, to condemn sin, and to uplift Jesus as our Saviour. It is its duty to organize the proclamation of the three angels' messages to every corner of the earth.

This responsibility does not mean a loose organization consisting of men and women of great variations of belief. The Holy Spirit does not guide one into truth and others into various errors. The Holy Spirit is designated as the Spirit of Truth. He alone can guide into truth. Contrary to speculation, when each believer asserts his God-ordained right to discover Bible truth for himself, unity will prevail and the church will be vibrant. Deeper truths will be discovered and shared as each believer utilizes the power of divine insight freely available from the Holy Spirit. No course would more effectively

eliminate the spiritual stagnation of credalism than a church buoyant with members freely studying God's Word to discover more and more of God's plan for their lives.

Typical of the acquisition of truth which comes from personal Bible study under the guidance of the Holy Spirit is the faith of William Tracy, a former High Sheriff of the County of Gloucestershire in England. Tracy, a devout Roman Catholic, had nevertheless studied William Tyndale's translation of Scripture. Before his death in 1530, Tracy wrote in his will a profound view of the Bible truths he had found in Scripture, which were quite contrary to the multitudinous errors taught by his church. He had discovered justification by faith, the fallacy of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, the mediatorial ministry of Christ, and many other truths still condemned by Roman Catholics. In part his will read:

First and before all things, I commit myself to God and to His mercy, believing, without any doubt or mistrust that by His grace, and the merits of Jesus Christ, and by virtue of His passion and His resurrection, I have and shall have remission of all my sins, and resurrection of body and soul according as it is written, I believe that my Redeemer liveth, and that in the last day I shall rise out of the earth, and in my flesh shall see my Saviour: this my hope is laid up in my bosom. And touching the health of my soul, the faith that I have taken and rehearsed is sufficient (as I suppose) without any other man's works or merits. My ground of belief is, that there is but one God and one Mediator between God and man, which is Jesus Christ; so that I accept none in heaven or in earth to be mediator between me and God, but only Jesus Christ: and therefore will I bestow no part of my goods for that intent that any man should say or do to help my soul: for therein I trust only to the promises of Christ: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." As touching the burying of my body, it availeth me not whatsoever be done thereto; for . . . the funeral pomps are rather the solace of them that live, than the wealth and comfort of them that are dead. And touching the distribution of my temporal goods, my purpose is, by the grace of God, to bestow them to be accepted as the fruits of faith; so that I do not suppose that my merit shall be by the good bestowing of them, but my merit is the faith of Jesus Christ only, by whom such works are good . . . and ever we should consider that true saying, that a good work maketh not a good man, but a good man maketh a good work; for faith maketh a man both good and righteous; for a righteous man liveth by faith, and whatsoever springeth not of faith is sin. Witness mine own hand the tenth of October in the twenty-second year of the reign of King Henry the Eighth. Quoted in Merle D'Aubigné, *The Reformation in England*, vol. 2, 69-70

Perhaps this superb testimony of faith would be incomplete if we were not to record that like John Wycliffe's, William Tracy's bones were exhumed and burnt two years after his death on the order of the Roman Catholic primate of England. Such foolishness not only demonstrated Roman Catholic intolerance of truth, but also emphasized the paucity of Bible truth espoused by those who permitted the Church to guide their interpretation of Scripture.

Worse still, the Roman Catholic Church has ever upheld the corrupted manuscripts of the Bible and included seven non-canonical books in their bible. It has done so because

The Catholic Church has always encouraged the faithful to read the Bible, but at the same time she reserved and reserves the right to see that translations are in accordance with her tradition and her faith. *Catholic Answers to "Bible" Christians*, 7

Thus when Roman Catholic literature speaks well of the modern translations of Scripture, this fact alone should serve as a stern warning to those who wish to uphold these translations before God's people as the standard Word of God. The condemnation and rejection of the King James Version by the Roman Catholic Church serves as one of the most powerful testimonies of its validity.

Chapter 11

Burning Bibles and Saints

The use of Catholic translators in the production of modern ecumenical versions of scripture overlooks the abysmal record of the Papacy in relation to the Bible. The record is one of hatred toward God's Word and those who humbly choose to read it. Protestants with short memories will protest that it is quite unjust to judge the modern Papacy by the standards and actions of its medieval predecessors. It is asserted that times have changed, and thank God they have. But has Rome genuinely altered her attitude toward Scripture?

In recent years, the Emperor of Japan publicly apologized to South Korea for Japanese actions during their Korean occupation from 1910 to 1945; the governments of East Germany, Poland, and Hungary apologized publicly to Czechoslovakia for the part they played in putting down the Prague pro-democracy uprising of 1968; the U.S.S.R. apologized to Poland for massacres it undertook during the Second World War. But when has the Vatican publicly apologized for the burning of Bibles and the immolation of saintly people? Until it does, it ill behooves Protestants to assume that there is a genuine change of heart by the Roman Catholic Church to the Word of God.

In 1943, Pastor Christian Edwardson wrote the book *Facts of Faith*. His presentation is well documented and emphasizes the papal attitude toward the Scriptures. There follows an extract from his book, printed by the Southern Publishing Association:

Could it be thought possible that an all-wise Creator would bring so many millions of people into existence, as the inhabitants of this earth, and give them no information as to why they are here, or what His will is concerning them? No, that would be unreasonable. Just as surely as there is a judgment day coming, on which we all shall be called to account for our conduct, so surely He must have given us an infallible rule of life. But what is this "infallible rule"? The Roman Catholics say it is "the Church, with its traditions." But the church has changed so greatly since its origin that if the apostles could arise from the dead, they would not recognize it as the church they established. As for "tradition," it is like a story that grows and changes as it travels. No government would be satisfied with oral laws. In so important a matter as our eternal happiness we need a rule that is more stable and unchangeable, and this rule we have in God's infallible Word, the Bible.

The Bible is not the product of man's thought and planning.

For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. 2 Peter 1:21; compare Isaiah 55:8-9; 1 Corinthians 3:5.

Peter says: "The Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake," Acts 1:16, and David himself declares: "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me." 2 Samuel 23:2. Of Jeremiah we read, "Then the Lord put forth his hand, and touched my mouth." Jeremiah 1:9. Thus the whole Bible is God's word spoken through human

instrumentality, for "God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began," Acts 3:21, and His hand guided them while they wrote: "The Lord made me understand in writing by his hand upon me." 1 Chronicles 28:19

And so the prophets, after writing of Christ's coming, were "searching" their own writings to find out — what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. 1 Peter 1:11

We have now presented the testimony of the Bible itself to the fact that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God." **2 Timothy 3:16**. No consistent person can, therefore, receive one portion of it while he rejects another. Jesus says: "The scripture cannot be broken." **John 10:35**.

He, the Author of the Scriptures, displayed such implicit confidence in them, that even the devil did not dare to question their authority, when Christ faced him with the words: "It is written." **Matthew 4:4, 7, 10**. Yes, "devils also believe, and tremble," **James 2:19**, for they know the Bible is true, while critics today doubt and ridicule, see Jude 10. What has caused such terrible unbelief among men? We shall now briefly review the causes and the history of modern "Higher Criticism."

After the church had fallen from its apostolic purity of life and doctrine, it found that, where the Bible was read by the common people, they lost faith in the church and opposed her worship as a species of idolatry. This was particularly true of the Waldenses, who had retained the Bible in their native language hundreds of years before the Reformation, and had copied and spread its pages over Catholic Christendom, wherever their missionaries traveled. It was natural, therefore, that the Roman Church, instead of supplying the common people with the Scriptures in their native tongue, should oppose this availability of the Scriptures to the people. Cardinal Merry del Val says that on account of the activity of the Waldenses, and later of the Protestants, in spreading the Scriptures in the native language of the people, —

the Pontiffs and the Councils were obliged on more than one occasion to control and sometimes even forbid the use of the Bible in the vernacular. . . .

Those who would put the Scriptures indiscriminately into the hands of the people are the believers always in private interpretation—a fallacy both absurd in itself and pregnant with disastrous consequences. These counterfeit champions of the inspired book hold the Bible to be the sole source of Divine Revelation and cover with abuse and trite sarcasm the Catholic and Roman Church. Foreword, *Index of Prohibited Books*, revised and published by order of Pope Pius XI, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1930, x-xi, quoted in *Facts of Faith*, 10-11.

These plain words from such an authentic source need no comment. Ever since the first Index of Prohibited Books was issued by Pope Paul IV in 1559, the Bible has had a prominent place in these lists of forbidden books. And before the invention of printing it was comparatively easy for the Roman Church to control what the people should, or should not, read; but shortly before the Reformation started the Lord prepared the way for its rapid progress by the discovery of the art of printing. The name of Laurence Coster, of Holland, is often mentioned in connection with the story of the first production in Europe, in 1423, of movable type. In 1450 to 1455 John Gutenberg printed the Latin Bible at Mentz (Mainz), Germany. He endeavored for a time to keep his invention a secret, but Samuel Smiles relates:

In the meanwhile, the printing establishments of Gutenberg and Schoeffer were for a time broken up by the sack and plunder of Mentz by the Archbishop Adolphus in 1462, when, their workmen becoming dispersed, and being no longer bound to secrecy, they shortly after carried with them the invention of the new art into nearly every country in Europe. *The Huguenots*, London: John Murray, 1868, 7, quoted in *ibid.*, 11

There being so few books to print, and there being a ready sale for Bibles, the printers risked hazards from the opposition of the Church, and printed Bibles in Latin, Italian, Bohemian, Dutch, French, Spanish, and German. While these were so expensive that only the wealthy could afford to buy them, and their language was not adapted to the minds of the common people, yet they—

seriously alarmed the Church; and in 1486 the Archbishop of Mentz placed the printers of that city, which had been the cradle of the printing press, under strict censorship. Twenty-five years later, Pope Alexander VI issued a bull prohibiting the printers of Cologne, Mentz, Treves, and Magdeburg, from publishing any books without the express license of their archbishops. Although these measures were directed against the printing of religious works generally, they were more particularly directed against the publication of the Scriptures in the vulgar [common] tongue. *Ibid.*, 8, quoted in *ibid.*, 12

The time had now come for the light to shine, and God's Word could no longer be kept from the people. Prophecy states that in spite of captivity, fire and sword, —

they shall be holpen with a little help. Daniel 11:34

But the people had been kept in darkness so long that they could not endure the glaring light of all the Bible truths at once. They had to come gradually, and the hour had struck for the Reformation to begin.

In preparing for the Reformation, the Lord had worked in marvelous ways to provide protection for the Reformers. The night before Martin Luther nailed his ninety-five theses on the door of the castle church at Wittenberg, the Elector Frederick of Saxony had a remarkable dream. In relating it to Duke John the next morning he said:

I must tell you a dream which I had last night . . . For I dreamed it thrice, and each time with new circumstances . . . I fell asleep, . . . I then awoke . . . I prayed . . . God to guide me, my counsels, and my people according to the truth. I again fell asleep, and then dreamed that Almighty God sent me a monk. . . . All the saints accompanied him by order of God, in order to bear testimony before me, and to declare that he did not come to contrive any plot. . . . They asked me to have the goodness graciously to permit him to write something on the door of the church of the Castle of Wittenberg. This I granted through my chancellor. Thereupon the monk went to the church, and began to write in such large characters that I could read the writing at Schweinitz. The pen which he used was so large that its end reached as far as Rome, where it pierced the ears of a lion that was crouching there, and caused the triple crown upon the head of the Pope to shake. All the cardinals and princes, running hastily up, tried to prevent it from falling. . . . I awoke . . . it was only a dream [Again he fell asleep].

Then I dreamed that all the princes of the Empire, and we among them, hastened to Rome, and strove, one after another, to break the pen; but the more we tried the stiffer it became, sounding as if it had been made of iron. We at length desisted. . . . Suddenly I heard a loud noise—a large number of other pens had sprung out of the long pen of the monk. I awoke a third time: it was daylight. . . .

So passed the morning of the 31st October, 1517, in the royal castle of Schweinitz. . . . The elector has hardly made an end of telling his dream when the monk comes with the hammer to interpret it.

J.A.Wylie, LL.D., *History of Protestantism*, vol. 1, 263-266, quoted in *ibid.* 14

One can hardly be surprised that the elector of Saxony became Luther's protector during his long struggle with the Papacy. The greatest work that was accomplished by these "pens" of the Reformation was the translation of the Bible into the language of the common people. True, there had been some attempts made before this time to produce the Scriptures in the vernacular, but without much success, as the language was almost unintelligible to the common people, and the price prohibitive.

After Martin Luther had spent much time in the homes and company of the people that he might acquire their language, he, with his co-workers, translated the Bible into a language that, while it was dignified and beautiful, was so natural and easy to be understood by the ordinary mind that it made the Bible at once "the people's book." The New Testament was translated in 1521, and fifty-eight editions of it were printed between 1522 and 1533: seventeen editions at Wittenberg, thirteen at Augsburg, twelve at Basel, one at Erfurt, one at Grimma, one at Leipzig, and thirteen at Strassburg. The Old Testament was first printed in four parts, 1523 to 1533, and finally the entire Bible was published in one volume in 1534.

In 1522 Jacques Lefevre translated the New Testament into French, and Collin, at Meaux, printed it in 1524. In 1525 William Tyndale translated the New Testament into English. All these New Testaments were translated from the original Greek, and not from the imperfect Latin Vulgate used by the papal church.

Printing presses were kept busy printing the Scriptures, while colporteurs and booksellers sold them to the eager public. The effect was tremendous.

Every honest intellect was at once struck with the strange discrepancy between the teaching of the Sacred Volume and that of the Church of Rome. Eugene Lawrence, *Historical Studies*, New York: Harper Brothers, 1876, 255

In the Book of God there were found no purgatory, no infallible pope, no Masses for the dead, no sale of indulgences, no relics working miracles, no prayers for the dead, nor worship of the Virgin Mary or of the saints. But there the people found a loving Saviour with open arms welcoming the poorest and vilest of sinners to come and receive forgiveness full and free. Love filled their hearts and broke the shackles of sin and superstition. Profanity, coarse jests, drunkenness, vice, and disorder disappeared. The blessed Book was read by young and old, and became the talk in the home and shop, while the Church with its Latin Mass lost its attraction.

Rome was awake to the inevitable result of allowing the common people to read the Bible, and the vicar of Croydon declared in a speech at St. Paul's Cross, London:

We must destroy the printing press, or it will destroy us. Quoted in E.R.Palmer, *The Printing Press and the Gospel*, 24, quoted in *ibid.*, 14

The papal machinery was therefore set in motion for the destruction of the Bible.

There now began a remarkable contest between the Romish Church and the Bible—between the printers and the popes. . . . quoted in *ibid.*, 15

To the Bible the popes at once declared a deathless hostility. To read the Scriptures was in their eyes the grossest of crimes. . . . The Inquisition was invested with new terrors, and was forced upon France and Holland by papal armies. The Jesuits were everywhere distinguished by their hatred for the Bible. In the Netherlands they led the persecutions of Alva and Philip II; they rejoiced with a dreadful joy when Antwerp, Bruges, and Ghent, the fairest cities of the workingmen, were reduced to pauperism and ruin by the Spanish arms; for the Bible had perished with its defenders. . . . quoted in *ibid.*, 15

To burn Bibles was the favorite employment of zealous Catholics. Wherever they were found the heretical volumes were destroyed by active Inquisitors, and thousands of Bibles and Testaments perished in every part of France. Lawrence, *op. cit.* 254-257, quoted in *ibid.*, 15

In Spain, not only were the common people forbidden to read the Bible, but also university professors were forbidden by the "Supreme Council" of the Inquisition to possess their valuable Bible manuscripts.

The council, in consequence, decreed that those theologians in the university who had studied the original languages, should be obliged, as well as other persons, to give up their Hebrew and Greek Bibles to the commissaries of the holy office, on pain of excommunication. D.J.A. Llorente, Secretary of the Inquisition, *History of the Inquisition of Spain*, London, 1827, 105, quoted in *ibid.*, 15

In 1490, Torquemada [the Inquisitor-General] caused many Hebrew Bibles and more than six thousand volumes to be burnt in an *auto-da-fé* at Salamanca. Joseph Mendham, M.A., *Literary Policy of the Church of Rome*, London, 1830, 97, quoted in *ibid.*, 15

How many thousands of invaluable manuscripts thus perished in the flames of the Inquisition, eternity alone will reveal. It is exceedingly difficult for a Protestant in our day to fathom the extent of this fear of, and enmity against, the Bible, manifested by the Roman Church. With her it was actually a life-or-death struggle. A person must read the history of the Inquisition, and examine the Roman indexes of forbidden books, to understand her viewpoint. Inquisitor-General Perez del Prado gave expression to her feelings and her bitter lament when he declared in horror—

that some individuals had carried their audacity to the execrable extremity of demanding permission to read the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, without fearing to encounter mortal poison therein. Quoted in Llorente, *et al.*, 111, quoted in *ibid.*, 16

The funeral pyres were lit all over Europe. Samuel Smiles says of France:

Bibles and New Testaments were seized wherever found, and burnt; but more Bibles and Testaments seemed to rise, as if by magic, from their ashes. The printers who were convicted of printing Bibles were next seized and burnt. The *Bourgeois de Paris* [a Roman Catholic paper] gives a detailed account of the human sacrifices offered up to ignorance and intolerance in that city during the six months ending June, 1534, from which it appears that twenty men and one woman were burnt alive. . . . In the beginning of the following year, the Sorbonne obtained from the king an ordinance, which was promulgated on the 26th of February, 1535, for the suppression of printing! Smiles, 20-21 and first footnote, quoted in *ibid.*, 16

Further attempts continued to be made by Rome to check the progress of printing. In 1599 [1559] Pope Paul IV issued the first *Index Expurgatorius*. Henry Charles Lea, *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, vol. 3, 587, quoted in *ibid.*, 16

The first Roman "Index of Prohibited Books" (*Index librorum prohibitorum*), published in 1559 under Paul IV, was very severe, and was therefore mitigated under that pontiff by decree of the Holy Office of 14 June of the same year. "Index," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. vii, 722, quoted in *ibid.* 17

* * *

Persecution raged over nearly all Europe: in 1545 the massacre of the Vaudois of Provence was perpetrated; and on the twenty-fourth of August, 1572, the St. Bartholomew Massacre commenced, and continued until between 70,000 and 100,000 innocent and unsuspecting persons were murdered in cold blood for being Protestants. The massacre was secretly planned by the leaders of the Roman Church. Sully says 70,000 were slain, though other writers estimate the victims at 100,000. *Ibid.*, 71-72

Catherine de Medici wrote in triumph to Alva, to Philip II, and to the Pope. . . . Rome was thrown into a delirium of joy at the news. The cannons were fired at St. Angelo; Gregory XIII and his cardinals went in procession from sanctuary to sanctuary to give God thanks for the massacre. The subject was ordered to be painted, and a medal was struck, with the Pope's image on one side, and the destroying angel on the other, immolating the Huguenots. *Ibid.*, 71-72

Finally, however, the papal church discovered that her opposition to the Bible only betrayed the sad fact that, instead of being the divinely instituted church of the Bible, she and the Scriptures were deadly enemies, and that her open fight was furnishing the world with the clearest evidences to justify the Reformation. Her relentless persecution was making martyrs, but not loyal Catholics. She must halt her course and forge new weapons against Protestantism, if she ever hoped to win the battle. But what were these weapons to be? (Extracted from *Our Firm Foundation*, November, 1990.)

The answer lay in the foisting of perverted Scriptures upon gullible Protestants.

Chapter 12

The Jesuits and Their Versions

In May 1962, Russell travelled for the first time across Australia, to Perth in the state of Western Australia, representing the University of Sydney. The Sydney University group was billeted at St. Thomas More College. The college is an adjunct of the University of Western Australia, run by the Roman Catholic Church, conducted by the members of the order of the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits).

This college was no isolated work of the Jesuits, for since their founding by Ignatius of Loyola in 1540, the chief thrust of the Jesuits has been in the field of education. They are described as a mendicant order of Clerks Regular. By the term *mendicant* is meant that they rely upon alms for their maintenance. The term *regular* was applied to those priests who do not serve as parish priests (termed *secular*) but rather belong to a contemplative order.

While initially the Jesuits confined themselves to establishing their own colleges for the training of members of their order, the first in Gandia, Spain, in 1546, very shortly they were penetrating the tertiary institutions of secular and even Protestant organizations.

In countries where Catholicism was threatened by Protestantism, the early Jesuits took up key positions, usually in colleges, in order to stop the defections from the Roman church." *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1963 ed., Article *Society of Jesus*

Education is the principal occupation of Jesuits in the missions as well as in Europe and America. Ibid.

Some of the most prestigious universities in the United States, such as Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., are operated by the Jesuits. In 1896, the Jesuits obtained the permission of Oxford University to open Champion Hall as a part of the university. This pattern was adopted by the University of Western Australia when it permitted a similar privilege to the Jesuits in the establishment of St. Thomas More College.^{[1](#)}

The Jesuits were committed to the restoration of the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, which had been critically damaged by the Protestant Reformation. Perceptively, these servants of Rome recognized that the strength of the Reformation lay in its acceptance of the pure Word of God as the sole basis of truth. The Word of God was of only marginal consequence, in the minds of the Jesuits, as compared with the maintenance of papal authority. Thus, unlike the Reformers, the Jesuits possessed no conviction dictating to them that they preserve God's Word inviolate. Indeed, it perfectly suited their purposes to denigrate God's Word and to cast doubt upon its purity. If they could achieve this aim, then Christians would once again be compelled to depend upon the edicts and traditions of the papists to find a platform for their faith.

Even in the fourteenth century a companion of Wycliffe had declared:

Although there should be a hundred popes in the world at once, and all the friars living should be transformed into cardinals, we must withhold our confidence from them in the matter of faith so far as their teachings are those not of the Scriptures. Merle D'Aubigné, *The Reformation in England*, vol. 1, 97

It was this stand for truth which confrontationally challenged the entire authority of the papal system, an authority which the Jesuits sought to restore by their subtle activity in the educational institutions of Europe and abroad.

Sir Thomas More had challenged the trail-blazing work of William Tyndale in presenting these Scriptures translated from the original languages to the English people in their own tongue. Said More, We must not examine the teaching of the church by Scripture, but understand Scripture by means of what the church says. Ibid., 395

Tyndale was quick to reply and apt to destroy the Lord Chancellor's foolish assertion.

What! Does the air give light to the sun, or the sun to the air? Is the church before the gospel, or the gospel before the church? Is not the father older than the son? *God begat us with His own will, with the word of truth*, says St. James (1:18). If He who begetteth is before Him who is begotten, the *Word* is before the church, or, to speak more correctly, before the congregation.

Compelling as were arguments such as those proffered by Tyndale, they did not pierce the blind bigotry of papists determined to ignore the centrality of Scripture to a pure faith. Thus the Jesuits were absolutely correct in their discernment that a pure Scripture would destroy the power of Roman Catholicism.

No order of the Roman Catholic Church was better designed than the Jesuit, for the task of perverting Scripture:

It was at the feet of the Jesuits that the youth of the higher and middle classes were brought up from childhood to manhood, from the first rudiments to the courses of rhetoric and philosophy. . . . Jesuits were to be found under every disguise, and in every country; scholars, physicians, merchants, serving men; in the hostile court of Sweden, in the old manor-house of Cheshire, among the hobbles of Connaught; arguing, instructing, consoling, stealing away the hearts of the young, alienating the courage of the timid, holding up the crucifix before the eyes of the dying. MaCaulay, *Essays*, 480-481²

In the Council of Trent, convened in the sixteenth century to re-establish the supremacy of Roman Catholicism, the Jesuits played a decisive role. A significant group of delegates, taking their cues from the Protestant Reformers, advocated the concept of the supremacy of Scripture in providing doctrinal authority. But the Jesuits, and those delegates of like thought, saw the danger of accepting such a proposal; for had it been adopted, it would destroy, rather than establish, the Papacy. After much discussion, Gaspare de Posso, archbishop of Reggio, put forward an unassailable argument which decided the issue. He correctly asserted that there is absolutely no biblical sanction for Sunday observance. The "sanctity" of Sunday could only be validated by acceptance of the establishment of papal tradition as a God-ordained doctrine. The archbishop's argument has been preserved. He stated:

The authority of the church is illustrated most clearly by Scriptures: for while on the one hand she [the church] recommends them, declares them to be divine, [and] offers them to us to be read . . . on the other hand, the legal precepts in the Scriptures taught by the Lord have ceased by virtue of the same authority [the church]. The Sabbath, the most glorious day in the law, has been changed into the Lord's day. . . . These and other similar matters have not ceased by virtue of Christ's teaching (for He says He has come to fulfill the law, not to destroy it), but they have been changed by the authority of the church. Mervyn Maxwell, *God Cares*, vol. 1, 128

Thus the Council of Trent accepted four errors in relationship to Scripture:

1. That tradition has equal standing with Scripture in determining doctrine.
2. That the apocryphal books are canonical.
3. That the Latin Vulgate is errorless and that it is unnecessary to study the original Greek and Hebrew writings.
4. That Scripture cannot be understood by the layman guided alone by the Holy Spirit.

Armed with the authority of the Council of Trent, the Jesuits exerted every effort to destroy the authority of the English version of Scripture based upon the received texts (*Textus Receptus*). They conceived a plan to destroy the value of Scripture and thus turn the English back to Rome: it was decided to concede the need for a Bible in the English language, but to base it largely upon the Latin Vulgate, with some reference to the original languages. This work was undertaken in Douay, a small

town near Lille in France where the Jesuits had set up a university to train English priests to return to their homeland to promote the return to Catholicism.

It is instructive to compare the aims of the translators of the Douay Version with those of the King James translators. The Jesuits had no love for Scripture, for it was the greatest adversary of the Papacy. Thus in pursuing their translations, —

the Jesuits were acting to turn the English people from the Bible, back to Romanism. B.G.Wilkinson, *Our Authorized Version Vindicated*, 66

Compare this attitude toward their task with that of fifty-four godly men who brought forth the King James Version.

But among all our joys, there was no one that more filled our hearts than the blessed continuance of the preaching of God's sacred Word among us; which is that inestimable treasure which excelleth all the riches of the earth; because the fruit thereof extendeth itself, not only to the time spent in this transitory world, but directeth and disposeth men unto that eternal happiness which is above in heaven. *Dedication of King James Version of Scripture*

So despised was the Scripture by Roman Catholics that one learned Catholic theologian declared to Tyndale:

We were better to be without God's laws than the pope's. E.G. White, *The Great Controversy*, 246

While the Douay Version of Scripture was never able to achieve the acceptance accorded the King James Version, it was the influence of this Jesuit-inspired version of Scripture which has, in the latter half of the twentieth century, prevailed through the plethora of modern translations foisted upon present-day Christians. From the failure of the Douay Version has risen the success of the New International Version and similar other modern versions.

The Jesuits' scheme was masterful. They did not discredit Scripture as did our ancestor, Dr. Henry Standish, bishop of St. Asaph in Wales. In 1516, Bishop Standish threw himself at the feet of King Henry VIII and Queen Catherine and exclaimed, —

Great King, your ancestors who have reigned over this island—and yours, O great queen, who have governed Aragon, were always distinguished by their zeal for the church. Show yourselves worthy of your forefathers. Times full of danger have come upon us; a book has just appeared, and been published too, by Erasmus!³ it is all over with the religion of Christ among us. Merle D'Aubigné, *The English Reformation*, vol. 1, 163

As D'Aubigné remarked,

Bishop Standish's courage was worthy of a better cause. Ibid.

How we wish that the bearer of our own surname had distinguished himself as did one of this successors to the see of St. Asaph who, seventy-two years later (1589), translated the Word of God into the Welsh language!

The Jesuits possessed much more guile than this mistaken bishop. They recognized that so loved and esteemed were the Holy Scriptures, such a source of faith and comfort, that any attempt to wrench them from the devout Christians of Britain was bound to fail. Thus they directed their attack along the

subtle lines of producing an alternative version, one not only incorporating papal errors, but also casting doubt upon masses of retained texts.

Some have looked at the changes accepted into the Catholic Version of Scripture and have correctly pointed out that these changes are not favorable to Roman Catholic doctrine in some cases. Let us instance one example. The passage quoted earlier in this book, 1 Timothy 3:16 which affirms both the human flesh and the divinity of Jesus Christ, is not in accord with Roman Catholic doctrine. Roman Catholics firmly believe in the divinity of Jesus. Why then, it is often asked, should the Catholics accept this change? The answer is quite simple. Roman Catholics do not depend upon Scripture for their doctrinal positions. They depend upon the word of the pope and church tradition. That which is recorded in Scripture is of but marginal interest to them, for they have a preferred source of authority. However, the Jesuits rightly perceived that if the Bible were equivocal, even contradictory, the inconsistency would well serve the purpose of the Papacy in weakening the Bible as the sole authority for Protestant faith. If this aim were achieved, then the Jesuits felt certain that there would be a return to the acceptance of the authority of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. As we will see, this judgment was far from faulty.

1 Sir Thomas More (1478 - 1535) was Lord Chancellor of England under King Henry VIII. He sent many English Reformers to the stake, being a staunch Roman Catholic layman. His influence over the king was strong, but eventually he lost favor with the king and was beheaded. This act of Henry VIII, which was not specifically related to More's faith, transformed More into a Catholic martyr and led eventually to his canonization.<[BACK](#)>

2 There are those in our midst today who are using the same threefold attack on truth:

- a. The presentation of false doctrine to the youth
- b. The intimidation of the timid
- c. Uplifting the pagan symbol of the cross

It was a successful formula in the sixteenth century and is proving no less successful four centuries later. <[BACK](#)>

3 This was Erasmus' Greek New Testament upon which the *Textus Receptus* was later based.<[BACK](#)>

Chapter 14

Roman Catholic Elation

Surely the Jesuits had waited longer than they had hoped, to see the rise to pre-eminence of their mutilated version of Scripture. But by the time of the production of the Revised Version of Scripture in 1881, they had, after three centuries, achieved their aim. It is little wonder that Catholic leaders throughout the world rejoiced when they read this new version. Today their joy is likely to be even greater as they see that the vast majority of Protestants in virtually every country of the world are now studying the Bible from new translations based upon the perverted manuscripts.

In Bible outlets today modern versions compatible with the Latin Vulgate are offered in profusion, while those based upon the *Textus Receptus* are sometimes difficult to acquire. In 1988, the Chaplaincy Department of an overseas hospital had to wait well over six months to receive its order for the Authorized Version of Scripture. Yet the Revised Standard Version and the New International Version

of Scripture were both available for immediate delivery. When one enters a motel or a hotel room today, the great work of the Gideon Society is bound to be tarnished by their placement of modern translations in the room. Through the world, in many languages, new translations are being produced inexorably using the corrupted Greek manuscript dear to the hearts of the Jesuits.

In 1990 Colin was preaching at a Korean campmeeting in Georgia. He mentioned the widespread use of Bibles in many languages translated from the corrupted Greek manuscripts. After the service a number of Korean pastors wanted to know if their Bible was translated from corrupted manuscripts. It took little time to confirm the worst fears of the pastors. They explained that only one translation is now available in Korean—and this translation is from corrupted manuscripts.

Even in the minuscule Pacific Island nation of Kiribati (formerly the Gilbert Islands), the present translation is based upon the corrupted Western manuscripts. No wonder God foresaw,

And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast. Revelation 13:3

In March 1989 Russell was walking up Victoria Street in London. On his right, he noticed Westminster Cathedral, the seat of Catholic power in England. Here the present primate of England, Cardinal Basil Hume, presides. Russell decided to pay a visit to the book store of the Westminster Cathedral (not to be confused with Westminster Abbey, an Anglican church). As he scanned the shelves of the bookstore where Bibles were located, Russell noticed that he could purchase many different versions including the Douay Bible, the Jerusalem Bible, the New International Version, the New English Bible, the Revised Standard Version, Today's English Version and a number of others. But he did not see a single copy of the King James Version of the Scripture for sale. Noting this lack, he approached the manager and asked to see his stock of King James Versions. Very politely, the manager said, "I am afraid, sir, we have none in stock." Pressing the point a little further, Russell asked, "When do you intend to have your new stock available?" The manager replied as Russell suspected he would, "Oh, sir, we do not stock the King James Version of Scripture." In the most ecumenical time of earth's history, the Roman Catholic Church still cannot tolerate the King James Version of Scripture.

It should serve as a red flag to Protestants to learn that virtually every one of the modern translations may be purchased at Catholic book stores, but not the King James Version, so despised is this version by the Roman Catholic faith. Perhaps the most perceptive comment upon the Revised Version was that made in Dublin, the capital of Roman Catholic-dominated Ireland,

One thing at least is certain, the Catholic Church will gain by the new Revision both directly and indirectly. *Dublin Review*, July 1881, quoted in B.G. Wilkinson, *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, 228

How accurate this prophecy has proved to be! For now we are overwhelmed by the haste in which Protestant churches are seeking to ally themselves with the Roman Catholic Church. Indeed the Roman Catholic Church has gained, and gained enormously, in the era following the acceptance of this perverted form of Scripture.

Let us look at some instances of this fact:

Australia's Christian Churches will for the first time speak with one voice. If a breakthrough proposal announced yesterday to form a new national ecumenical body is adopted, the new body would

incorporate the Catholic Church, which has refused to join the Australian Council of Churches during the Council's forty-four year history. The Catholic Church is the biggest single Christian denomination in Australia, accounting for 26.3% of the population. The Council at present represents 13 Orthodox, Anglican and Protestant member churches. The proposal was announced in Adelaide by the president of the Australian Catholic Bishops' Conference and Archbishop of Sydney, Cardinal Edward Clancy, and the president of the Council, the Anglican bishop of Bendigo, Bishop Oliver Heyward. *Sydney Daily Telegraph*, June 13, 1990

Archbishop Robert Runcie of Canterbury has asked the churches of the Anglican communion, divided over ordination of women priests and other issues, to consider a united Christian church under a reformed papal primacy. Runcie, spiritual leader of the Anglican church, told the 525 bishops attending the Decennial Conference on Monday night that the 70-million-strong Anglican communion could be preserved only if its churches were directed by a central authority. *The Korean Times*, July 21, 1988

The Archbishop of Canterbury has caused a major controversy with his call for Protestants to accept the pope as "universal leader." *Singapore Straits Times*, October 3, 1989

After ten years of periodic discussion, the Baptist-Catholic dialogue group, quoting Ephesians 4:5, concluded, "We not only confessed but experienced one Lord, one faith and one baptism." *Williamson Daily News*, August 26, 1989

Roman Catholics and Lutherans stepped closer together Monday when church officials from both denominations announced plans to draw up a covenant that will increase co-operation between the most powerful religious bodies in Minnesota. *Minneapolis Star and Tribune*, October 17, 1989

Thus we can see that virtually every mainline church of Protestantism is following the road to Rome. The acceptance of perverted modern translations of Scripture has made a significant contribution in stimulating this reversal of the great Protestant movement. Is it any wonder that God foresaw:

And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Revelation 13:8

Naturally Cardinal Wiseman, the Roman Catholic primate of England, was delighted with the new translation (the Revised Version of 1881). He stated:

When we consider the scorn cast by the Reformers upon the Vulgate, and their recurrence, in consequence, to the Greek, as the only accurate standard, we cannot but rejoice at the silent triumph which truth has at length gained over clamorous error. For, in fact, the principal writers who have avenged the [Latin] Vulgate and obtained for it critical preëminence, are Protestants. Cardinal Wiseman, *Essays*, Vol. 1, 104, quoted in B.G. Wilkinson, *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, 227

The Roman Catholic bishop of Erie, Pennsylvania, was no less delighted:

It must be admitted that either the Revisers wish to withdraw several important passages of the Holy Scripture from Protestants, or that the latter, in their simplicity, have all along been imposed upon by King James translators, who, either through ignorance or malice, have inserted in the Authorized Version a number of paragraphs which were never written by an apostle or other inspired author. Tobias Mullen, *The Canon of the Old Testament*, 366

Thomas S. Preston, the priest of St. Anne's Catholic Church in New York, also perceived the advantages of the Revised Version to the Roman Catholic Church,

It is to us a gratification to find that in very many instances they [the translators of the Revised Version] have adopted the reading of the Catholic Version, and have thus by their scholarship confirmed the correctness of our Bible. Dr. Wakefield, *Collection of Opinions*, vol. 2, 21

In its perceptive article, the *Dublin Review* had this to say:

How bitter to them must be the sight of their Anglican bishops sitting with Methodists, Baptists, and Unitarians to improve the English Bible according to modern ideas of progressive biblical criticism!

Dublin Review, July 1881, quoted in B.G. Wilkinson, *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, 227-228

It is the final word of the *Dublin Review* which should strike the heart of every Protestant as he or she looks at the manner in which Protestantism has been virtually decimated in the second half of the twentieth century. The writer of the article in the *Dublin Review* predicted:

The New Version [The Revised Version] will be the death knell of Protestantism. Ibid., 230

This prediction has now been completely fulfilled, for in the 1990s the Protestant churches have virtually entirely lost their significance and their purpose. Most of the mainstream Protestant churches are eager for association with the Roman Catholic Church. Those who resolutely resist such association are frequently seen to be bigots and disuniting elements in Christendom.

Chapter 15

The Forth and Twentieth Centuries

There is a remarkable parallel between the fourth and the twentieth centuries. It was during the fourth century of the Christian era that many apostate doctrines entered the Christian church. The source of apostasy is not difficult to identify. The conversion of Emperor Constantine occurred in the fourth century. Hailed as a divine blessing by the majority of Christians, history testifies to its baleful effects. It is doubtful that Constantine truly embraced the teachings of Jesus. Without a deep sense of Scripture, he permitted the merging of Christian truth with pagan error. The rapid "conversion" of the Germanic tribes of Europe to the Christian faith, although superficially a mighty evangelistic success, simply saw the merging of two diametrically opposed faiths, Christianity and paganism. The one was ordained of God, the other by Satan. The merger caused Christianity to develop into a mere pagan religion using Christian designations for its idols and pagan practices.

Thus during the fourth century the pagan symbol of the cross became the symbol of the church, Sunday worship was decreed, idol worship developed, and pagan festivals masquerading as Christian memorials were introduced. The century culminated in the development of the Augustinian doctrines of original sin, Christ as possessing an unfallen nature upon earth, eternal damnation of the lost, purgatory, limbo, predestination, penances, the designation of sexual relations as evil even within the marriage relationship, together with the introduction of other pagan doctrines. Further, it was this

century which forged the union of church and state that led to clerical degradation, intellectual darkness, and a thousand years of cruelty in the name of Christ.

At the center of this appalling demise of the Christian faith was the acceptance of a perverted Scripture: the Latin Vulgate Bible produced by Jerome in the early part of the fifth century.

Now let us turn to our own century. It commenced with Protestant Christians condemning the practice of homosexuality, abortion of embryos apart from severe danger to the life of the mother, pornography, divorce, the use of alcoholic beverages, ballroom dancing and many other evil practices inconsistent with a love for Jesus. The century ends with some of the staunchest advocates of these practices found, not only among the laity, but in the ministry of many churches. Ministers shamelessly "marry" homosexuals; bishops brazenly deny the virgin birth and the resurrection of Christ; they ordain practicing homosexuals to the clergy; they ordain women to the ministry; some ministers even deny the existence of God, while others loudly support the doctrine of abortion on demand and the remarriage of guilty divorcées.

The twentieth century opened with most Protestants prepared to declare the Papacy to be the antichrist of Scripture. They abhorred contact with Rome and loudly declared its spiritual abominations, from the practice of the Mass to the sale of priestly indulgences. Such men recalled the history of the Middle Ages and the price their spiritual ancestors had paid to bring freedom of conscience, the open Word, and the spiritual truth into the hearts of men. Most faithful Christians less than a century ago upheld the temperance cause; they eschewed disorderly conduct including the practice of glossolalia within the church. Church music was reverent as befits adoration of our high and holy God. The use of worldly music within the church was frowned upon. Nor did genuine Christians resort to trumpery such as clowning and puppetry.

The churches of the 1990s are almost unrecognizable as the descendants of those of the 1890s. Would Luther now recognize the Lutheran church, or Wesley the Methodist? Would Knox select the Presbyterian church as the one he helped to form? It is doubtful. Marked alterations of faith have been weakly accepted, in some cases without so much as a whimper of protest. These changes have been urged under the cloak of relevance, with an expressed desire to capture the allegiance of youth, in a professed effort to meet the challenges of the era. The result of this large-scale abandonment of truth and righteous practice has not been a strengthening of Christian commitment or practice, for that could never be the fruit of shameful apostasy. Never has the Protestant church been weaker. As a consequence, ecumenism has become virtually a tenet of faith, as if God would approve the violation of doctrinal purity in search for a Christian "unity" based not upon truth, but upon damnable error. Ecumenism has become the "icon" worshiped by blind Protestantism.

The prayers for Christian unity, now frequently seen as evidences of the working of the Holy Spirit in the church, are in reality simply prayers to the arch-deceiver demanding that Protestants turn their steps along the broad path that leads to Rome. For surely no thinking Protestant expects that the ecumenical movement will lead Rome into Protestantism. Shortly persecution will follow, and deeds worse than any enacted in the Dark Ages will be legitimized by men claiming service to a God of love.

As persecution followed from the perversion of Scripture and the subsequent introduction of apostasy in the fourth century, no other result can be anticipated from the adoption of an identical course sixteen centuries later, for we have now completed the full circle of:

(Graphic missing)

Only persecution awaits the completion of the circle. And it will come, for God's Word is sure. Speaking of our day, God's infallible Word foretells just such a result:

And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name. Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six.

Revelation 13:15-17

Shall we return to the fourth century? Or shall we progress from the sixteenth, ever upholding God's precious Word and completing the Reformation? A vital key to the outcome of this question is the preservation of the true Word of God.

Chapter 16

Profitable Prophets

Few persons give consideration to the fact that Bible translations are big business. To produce a popular version will assure the publisher a handsome return. In his booklet *Profit-Dealers! Make Big Profits Selling the New International Version*, p. 5, Pastor George Burnside reports the observation of a man associated with a Christian Book Center:

A short time ago, a well-known Bible Institute teacher visited our Book Room, the Christian Supply Centre, which handles only KJV Bibles. In the course of conversation concerning the effectiveness of Christian Book Stores in the ministry of our Lord Jesus Christ, he made this remark: "Most Book Rooms are no longer a ministry for the Lord, but a commercial business." With this we agree.

There is probably no group of people doing more to promote compromise, the ecumenical and charismatic movements, new evangelicalism, and corrupt Bibles than the so-called Christian Book Stores of our day.

If this conclusion is correct, we have reached a sorry state in Christianity. Surely the Word of God, which is of priceless value, should not become a matter of mere commercialism. God help those who would so treat this sacred book. We have often wondered why new, "improved" versions of modern versions are appearing with such rapidity. We have the Revised English Bible, the New Jerusalem Bible, the New Revised Standard Version, and others published within two or three decades of the original. There cannot be any grounds for a further proliferation of versions on the basis that the language has dramatically altered in that period. But it is possible that economic considerations may have played a part in the desire to bring out yet another version, simply because many faithful souls collect Bible versions almost as a philatelist collects postage stamps.

In 1978 *The Wall Street Journal* commented on the financial gains from the New International Version of Scripture. Their editor headlined the article: "Zondervan, Blessed with Bible Contract, Lifts Profit Forecast." Its sub-heading stated: "Church Leaders' Endorsement Aids Sale of New Version: Initial Press Run Sold Out." Church leaders should give careful consideration to the propriety of their endorsement of various versions. Do such versions clarify truth or do they simply fill coffers? Pastor Burnside has remarked upon Billy Graham's penchant for eulogizing new translations as they appear. Certainly his approval provides a great boost for sales.

The New International Version has been endorsed by well-known evangelicals like Dr. John R.W. Stott of Inter-Varsity fame and by Dr. Billy Graham. Dr. Graham said,

I believe this will be one of the most serviceable versions available, eminently suited to be read in the churches. It preserves, in a sense, a certain historic familiarity, but couches God's message in contemporary and easily understood terms.

The same Dr. Graham endorsed the RSV, one of the most liberal of all versions, in these words:

The RSV will express itself in a language that the English-speaking world uses today. These scholars have probably given us the most perfect translation in the English. While there may be room for disagreement in certain areas of translation, yet this new version should supplement the KJV and make Bible reading a habit throughout America.

Dr. Graham also promoted The Living Bible:

In this book I read the age-abiding truths of the Scriptures with renewed interest and inspiration as though coming to me directly from God.

Is Billy Graham referring to 1 Samuel 20:30 in the Living Bible? "Saul boiled with rage. You ____!" [1](#) Or does he refer to John 9:34 as coming directly from God? "You illegitimate ____, you."? [1](#)

It is important to study the report in *The Wall Street Journal*, for it does indicate the extent to which commercial considerations are a focus of the production of such a version. The statement was made in the early days of The New International Version. Since then this version has achieved the dubious distinction of being the first English-language version of Scripture to outsell the King James Version in any year since the latter was produced. It can only be assumed that profits have risen as a consequence.

Grand Rapids, Mich.—Zondervan Corp. believes it has struck a new vein of gold in the ancient and well-mined lode: the Bible. Accordingly, it told analysts here, it raised its already-gleaming sales and earnings forecasts.

Zondervan, a publisher of religious books and music, has been blessed with a 30-year exclusive contract to publish the New International Version of the Bible, translated and edited by the New York International Bible Society. After the version was endorsed by a number of church leaders, the initial press run of 1.2 million copies sold out before the book went on sale Oct. 27, the company said.

Thus, Zondervan raised its earnings prediction 10 cents a share, to \$1.85, and its sales prediction \$3 million, to \$41 million, for the year. In 1977, the concern earned \$1.5 million, or \$1.41 a share, on sales of \$32.7 million.

"Bibles are always a much-wanted item at Christmas," commented Peter Kladder Jr., president. Noting that a second printing will bring the total of New International Version Bibles in print at year-end to 1.6 million, he said he isn't sure stores will be able to meet customer demand.

The executive prophesied that sales of the Bible will rise in 1979 and 1980, then remain on a "high plateau" because "the sales pattern for a well-accepted version of the Bible tends to continue years longer than other best-selling books." *The Wall Street Journal*, November 16, 1978

Well may we consider whether these new versions are written to uplift the Word of the Law and the Prophets or whether they are seen more in terms of popularity and profits.

1 These words are so foul that we felt it proper that they be omitted from the quotations as undoubtedly it would offend any right-thinking person. <[BACK](#)>

Chapter 17

Subtle Catholicism

The great majority of Protestants do not discern the subtleties of the new translations. Yet many changes have been made which are specifically designed to support Roman Catholic errors. Tobias Mullen, Roman Catholic bishop of Erie, Pennsylvania, wrote,

It will be perceived here, that the variation between the Catholic Version and the Revision [The Revised Version] is immaterial, indeed no more than what might be found between any two versions of different but substantially identical copies of the same document. Quoted in B.G. Wilkinson, *Our Authorized Version Vindicated*, 204

It will be seen that this close similarity of the Catholic and the new versions was not a coincidence, but of deliberate design. Yet most of God's people appear to be quite oblivious to the peril inherent in these new versions. Let us examine a few instances.

Confess your faults one to another. James 5:16 KJV

Therefore confess your sins to each other. James 5:16 NIV

Therefore confess your sins to one another. James 5:16 NEB

Confess therefore your sins one to another. James 5:16 ASV

The alteration of the word *faults* to *sins* seems innocent enough at first glance, but is it? Not to the Roman Catholics is it! The Roman Catholic *Dublin Review* of July 1881 had this to say, speaking of the same translation in the Revised Version:

The Apostles have now power to "forgive" sins and not simply to "remit" them. "Confess therefore your sins" is the new reading of James 5:16. Quoted in *Ibid.*, 206

Further, the Scripture has also been altered to uphold the papal blasphemy of the Mass. Compare the verses below:

For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body. 1 Corinthians 11:29 KJV

For he who eats and drinks eats and drinks judgment on himself if he does not discern the Body. 1 Corinthians 11:29 NEB

For anyone who eats and drinks without recognizing the body of the Lord eats and drinks judgment on himself. 1 Corinthians 11:29 NIV

It will be noted that the new translations consistently omit the word *unworthily*. This word is most important, for it places the emphasis of the verse where the Lord intended it to be—a warning to those who, while unbelieving or without proper solemnity and gratitude, participate in this sacred ordinance. The Catholic omission, on the other hand, transparently seen in the translation of the New International Version, provides grounds for the Roman Catholic error of transubstantiation—that the bread is actually Christ's body.

It will also not surprise the astute reader to learn that strong biblical evidence concerning the resurrection at the Second Coming is distorted.

I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God. Job 19:25-26 KJV

Let us compare this body of truth with the rendering of one modern translation:

But in my heart I know that my vindicator lives and that he will rise last to speak in court; and I shall discern my witness standing at my side. Job 19:25-26 NEB

We could be excused if we doubted that this was the same text of Scripture. It would, further, be revealing to examine the rendering of portions of this verse in other translations. It will be seen that among the diversity one common thread is present—a denial of the "latter day upon the earth"—the Second Coming. We quote the various translations equivalent to "and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth."

And that he shall stand up at the last upon the earth. Job 19:25 RV

And he, the last, will take his stand on earth. Job 19:25 Jerusalem Bible

And as the next-of-kin he will stand upon my dust. Job 19:25 Goodspeed's Translation

Worse follows, for replacing the positive proof that we see God, not as bodiless spirits, but in real physical flesh, many new translations support the same Catholic error of the soul, unencumbered by a body, seeing God, thus utterly reversing the truth. We shall observe some of the translations of Job 19:26. Read them carefully.

And after this my skin is destroyed. And without my flesh, I shall see God. Job 19:26, The Holy Bible containing the Old and New Testaments: An Improved Edition, American Baptist Publication Society

This body may break up, but even then my life shall have a sight of God. Job 19:26 Moffatt

And after my skin has thus been destroyed, then, out of my flesh I shall see God. Job 19:26, the New Berkeley Version

And after my skin, even this body, is destroyed, then without my flesh shall I see God. Job 19:26 ARV

These translations, and many others, deliberately distort the plainest words of the Hebrew text to support the pagan error concerning man's state in death. Surely with Dr. Edgar we can exclaim:

It is certainly a remarkable circumstance that so many of the Catholic readings in the New Testament, which in Reformation and early post-Reformation times were denounced by Protestants as corruptions of the pure text of God's Word, should now, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, be adopted by the Revisers of our time-honoured English Bibles. Dr. Edgar, *Bibles of England*, 347-348

The variation in the translation of Hebrews 9:27 will at first appear totally inconsequential. Let us examine these translations, for in them is a most subtle and deliberate attack upon the crucial doctrine of the end-time judgment.

And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment. Hebrews 9:27 KJV

And in as much as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this cometh judgment. Hebrews 9:27 RV

The significant change is the omission of the adjective *the* before the word *judgment*. This is not just a careless matter in one translation alone. Some others are cited.

And after death comes judgment. Hebrews 9:27 NEB

And after that to face judgment. Hebrews 9:27 NIV

But after this, judgment. Hebrews 9:27, American Bible Union Version

And after this cometh judgment. Hebrews 9:27 ASV

With judgment following. Hebrews 9:27, Berkeley Version

(Death being followed by judgment). Hebrews 9:27, The Twentieth Century New Testament

Nothing remains after this but judgment. Hebrews 9:27, Knox Translation

But is the omission of *the* really significant? Indeed it is. No lesser authority than Canon Farrar, a great supporter of the modern translators, cited this apparently minor variation as being one of the most significant alterations made by the Revisers. He well knew the thinking of Westcott and Hort since he was a member of the Apostles' Club at Cambridge University to which they belonged, and he wholeheartedly supported their Anglo-Catholic bias. Canon Farrar thus asserted

There is positive certainty that it does not mean "*the* judgment" in the sense in which that word is popularly understood. By abandoning the article [*the*] which King James translators here incorrectly inserted, the Revisers help, as they have done in so many other places, silently to remove deep-seated errors. At the death of each of us there follows "a judgment," as the sacred writer says. *The* judgment, the final judgment, may not be for centuries to come. In the omission of that unauthorized little article from the Authorized Version by the Revisers, lies no less a doctrine than that of the existence of an Intermediate State. Canon F.W. Farrar, *Contemporary Review*, March 1882, quoted in B.G. Wilkinson, *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, 209

Here we note the subtle significance which those who believe the pagan concept of the immortality of the soul place upon the deletion of the definite article *the*. Meticulously and cunningly Satan constructs

his web of deception. The great truth of the mighty end-time judgment to which this text points is destroyed by the artifices of those who value the mystery of iniquity.

But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you. Matthew 5:44, KJV

But I tell you: Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you. Matthew 5:44, NIV

Here we notice a most subtle accommodation of Catholic thought. The missing phrases are "Bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you." Who could be offended by these Christ-given directions, given in the Sermon on the Mount?

But if we think carefully, we see that Rome is in the business of cursing and hating heretics, those faithful Christians who believe the Word of God and accept it as their spiritual guide rather than the faulted doctrines of men. The word Rome uses is *anathema*. It is applied liberally throughout the findings of councils. And of course they do not want their people to see Christlikeness in those whom they curse.

Roman Catholicism has ever taught that man may die in his sins and yet ultimately reach the state of bliss. The whole doctrine of purgatory supports this concept. The act of performing requiems for the dead is supposed to facilitate this transition. Many Protestants have accepted various modifications of this view, some asserting that God will eventually save all through a worldwide conversion during the millennium. Dr. Samuel Cox expressed such a belief this way:

The states of being, shadowed forth by the words, Gehenna, Paradise, Hades cannot, therefore, be final or everlasting; they are only intermediate conditions, states of discipline in which the souls of men await, and may be prepared for, their final award. Cited in B.G. Wilkinson, *Our Authorized Version Vindicated*, 210

With this mind-set, Dr. Cox was delighted with the following alteration:

In my Father's house are many mansions. John 14:2 KJV

In my Father's house are many abiding places. John 14:2 RV margin

Is the substitution of *abiding places* for *mansions* worthy of our attention? Those who promote the doctrine of *the larger hope* (a time of probation after death) certainly believe so. Other translations offer similar alterations in the text substituting for *mansions* such terms as dwelling places (New English Bible), abiding places (American Bible Union Version), dwellings (Twentieth Century New Testament) and resting places (Rieu's Translation).

Stirling Berry in upholding the substitution of abiding places claimed that in this term

the contrasted notions of repose and progress are combined in this vision of the future. *Expositor*, vol. 3, 2nd series, 397

Another "minor" alteration which may escape the notice of a superficial reader is worthy of examination. Speaking prophetically, Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, had referred to Christ as being the One who would come,

To perform the mercy promised to our fathers. Luke 1:72 KJV

Many new translations have followed the Douay Translation. Thus one rendition is
To show mercy to our fathers. Luke 1:72 RV

How the papists have rejoiced over the omission of the word *promised!* They pointed to this latter translation as indicating that while Jesus was on earth He was at that time extending mercy to the forefathers of the Jews who were yet in one of the intermediary states. Let us note Bishop Tobias Mullen's exuberance over the changed translation.

For the text was one which, if rendered literally, no one could read without being convinced, or at least suspecting, that the "fathers" already dead needed "mercy"; and that "the Lord God of Israel" was prepared "to perform" it to them. But where were those fathers? Not in heaven, where mercy is swallowed up in joy. And assuredly not in the hell of the damned, where mercy could not reach them. They must therefore have been in a place between both, or neither the one nor the other. What? In Limbo or Purgatory? Why, certainly. In one or the other. Bishop Mullen, *Canon*, 332

On what pathetically slim "evidence" do papal apologists base their soul-destroying errors! Yet, subtly, Scripture has been perverted to bolster their errors.

There is a need for Christians to make decided efforts to return to that Version of Scripture from which the Roman Catholic tampering was almost totally expunged. To persist in promoting faulted translations will seriously damage our ministries and our capability to present positive truth with certainty. We must not permit the bait of simpler English to seduce us into accepting a perverted Scripture.

Chapter 18

A Crucial Text

No passage of Sacred Writ more powerfully verifies Christ's deity than that found in Paul's epistle to Timothy.

And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh. 1 Timothy 3:16

Here is presented one of the two mighty mysteries of the universe—the mystery of godliness. The second mystery is its antithesis—the mystery of iniquity. Paul introduced God's people to this mystery when he wrote to the early church in Thessalonica. There he declared,

For the mystery of iniquity doth already work. 2 Thessalonians 2:7

While the mystery of godliness is explained—that God appeared in human flesh—Paul does not define the mystery of iniquity. Could this mystery be the denial that Christ came in the flesh? Indeed, Scripture confirms this precise definition.

In a letter to the Thessalonians, Paul prophesies of the emergence of the Papacy, whom he refers to as the man of sin and the son of perdition (2 Thessalonians 2:3). The apostle John uses alternative

terminology to identify the papal apostasy. It is in relation to this synonym, antichrist, that he reveals that the denial that Christ came in the flesh is the precise doctrine of the papal power.

And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist. 1 John 4:3

For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist. 2 John 7

If there is one characteristic of Satan above all others, it is the trait of deception. Since 1 Timothy 3:16 provides the key to the understanding of the mystery of iniquity, it is to be expected that, desiring to veil his true character, the devil would make every effort to pervert that text. This he has done by placing a question over the divinity of Christ. Many astute Bible students have grasped this fact, but few have perceived that by minimizing Christ's deity, the devil has equally challenged His humanity.

First, let us examine the alteration in the corrupted Greek manuscripts which have destroyed this text as a powerful witness confirming Christ's divinity. The Latin Vulgate first destroyed this passage. Instead of the Latin Vulgate using the word *Deus* (God) in the appropriate place in 1 Timothy 3:16, it has altered the word to *quod* (which). This alteration is reflected in Wycliffe's and the Douay-Rheims translations. Since he based the first English Version of Scripture upon the Latin Vulgate, John Wycliffe in 1380 translated this passage as

that thing that was shewid [showed] in fleisch [flesh]. 1 Timothy 3:16, Wycliffe translation

Not surprisingly the 1582 Jesuit version (Douay-Rheims Version) also destroyed Christ's divinity. It translates the passage:

which was manifested in flesh. 1 Timothy 3:16, Douay-Rheims Version

Modern Catholic versions also destroy this passage.

Revelation made in human flesh. 1 Timothy 3:16, Ronald Knox's Version, 1945

But no English Bible of the Protestant Reformation affronted our Lord in this manner. They translated this passage as follows:

God was shewed in the flesche. Tyndale, 1534

God was shewed in the flesche. Great Bible, 1539

God is shewed in the flesche. Geneva New Testament, 1557

God was shewed manifestly in the flesh. Bishop's Bible, 1568

Virtually all modern translations with the exception of the New King James Version follow the lead of Catholicism and despoil this text. A selection of translations is quoted.

Who was manifested in the flesh. Alford

It is he who was manifest in the flesh. Moffatt

He who appeared in the flesh. New World - Jehovah's Witness

Who was revealed in the flesh. Berkeley

The One who appeared in human flesh. Phillips

He who was manifested in the body. New English Bible

But while these translations rely on a handful of corrupted manuscripts, especially the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus, they ignore the extensive testimony to the contrary.

It was a simple matter to alter *God* to *who* in the Greek. This was accomplished by the omission of two letters. This alteration could be achieved by deliberate decision or by accident. Similarly *who* could be altered to *which* by the careless omission of the second letter. The progression can be seen when the Greek equivalents of the three words are cited:

ⲑⲉⲟⲩⲟⲩ — God

ⲑⲉⲟⲩⲟⲩ — who

ⲑⲉ — which

Beside the overwhelming evidence of extant Greek manuscripts, the testimony of the early church fathers powerfully supports the word *God* in 1 Timothy 3:16. Second-century writers such as Barnabas, Hippolytus, and Ignatius, third-century writer Dionysius of Alexandria, Diodorus of Tarsus (died A.D. 370), Gregory of Nyssa (died A.D. 394), Chrysostom (died A.D. 407), and the fifth-century writer Euthalius are among those who testify the presence of the word *God* in this vital text.

Another important source of evidence is the Codex Alexandrius "A." This Greek manuscript was presented to King Charles I of England (ruled 1625 - 1649) by Patriarch Cyril Lucar. It is a fifth-century manuscript and contains the word *God* in the passage. Some have cast doubt upon its evidence because the two strokes which distinguish *God* from *who* are of more recent vintage. Indeed some have used this fact as evidence of a later alteration. But the evidence is all against this conclusion.

The original custodian of the manuscript, Patrick Young, in whose hands the manuscripts were from 1628 to 1652, assured Archbishop Ussher that the original reading was *God*. Many others who carefully examined this manuscript confirmed the same fact. Huish (1657), Bishop Pearson (1659), Mill (1677), Wotton (1718), Wetstein (1716), Berriman (1737), Woide (1785), and Prebendary Screvenier (1885) were among those who confirmed this fact. Each personally noted that although

the middle stroke has been retouched, the fine stroke originally in the letter is discernible at each end of the fuller stroke of the corrector. Wetstein, 1716, quoted in David Otis Fuller, *True or False?*, 33

The overwhelming weight of evidence supports the *Textus Receptus* in its rendition of 1 Timothy 3:16.

Some adopt a casual attitude to such changes. They suggest that there are no grounds for concern since even in modern translations there are other passages supporting Christ's divinity. Such thinking indicates that God provided surplus evidence which may be discarded at man's will without causing damage to the message of Scripture. But every passage of God's Word contains vital truth.

Further, such an argument also disregards the crucial connection between this passage and the identification of antichrist as noted earlier in the chapter. Clearly there is no deep mystery in a man being manifest in the flesh. While each conception and birth is a true miracle, nevertheless it is a miracle of such daily occurrence that it does not rate a place among the deep mysteries of mankind. But for *God* to be manifest in the flesh is not only characterized by being unique, but is a mystery beyond human comprehension as well, and one which draws our most sublime love for our Saviour.

The second deep mystery of the universe is that of the mystery of iniquity. It was a mystery in its origin—that in a universe knowing nothing but perfection and selfless love, sin and its attendant evils could originate. That mystery is perpetuated in the lives of sinners. Initially Lucifer did not contemplate that his rebellion would be utterly repulsed. Only after God was manifest in human flesh, and paid the supreme penalty for man's sins, was man's redemption assured. This act of infinite love, so contrary to the character of Satan, he has ever sought to conceal.

As we have seen, John testifies that this deception is the specific identification of antichrist. Many, identifying antichrist as the Papacy, will hasten to protest that the Roman Catholic Church upholds the truth that Christ appeared in human flesh. But does this apostate power really declare the biblical truth of this matter? Does its view, that Christ did not take our nature but the human nature of unfallen Adam, truly realize the depths to which our Saviour descended in order to save us from our sin? Listen to the testimony of Scripture:

Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh. Romans 1:3

Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted. Hebrews 2:14-18

For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Hebrews 4:15

For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh. Romans 8:3

It is little wonder that modern translations seriously distort Hebrews 2:16. Its testimony is so strong and availing that the enemy of souls dare not let it stand. It will be noted in the next two verses (Hebrews 2:17-18) that Christ's very High Priestly ministry for us is predicated upon His possession of our human nature—that He was made like unto His brethren in every respect.

In accepting the fifth-century error of Augustine, bishop of Hippo, the Roman Catholic Church incorporated the mystery of iniquity into its dogma, for Christ's living sacrifice in accepting the nature of weakened man elevates the trials He endured. Only thus could He be our true Example, as testified by Peter:

For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps: who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. 1 Peter 2:21-22

From the basic tenet of the mystery of iniquity (that Christ's nature was different from ours), the Roman Catholic Church has fashioned the evil doctrines of the Immaculate Conception (of Mary), original sin, limbo, infant baptism, the confession of sins to priests and "saints," the mediatorial role of Mary, and other doctrines offensive to our pure and holy God.

Thus the alteration of that single word in 1 Timothy 3:16, regarded by many as an innocent alternative, provides ample testimony to ramifications of even a change in a single word of Scripture. Our God does not provide us with extraneous material or details of little consequence.

At a time when Protestantism is moving ever closer to Rome and has lost all understanding of the biblical doctrine of antichrist, the destruction of one relevant verse is disquieting. All great Protestant Reformers were agreed that the antichrist power is the Papacy; virtually all nineteenth-century Protestant writers agreed. But in the twentieth century the church has lost this doctrine in a sea of wild and nonsensical speculation.

In a recent two-page spread in the Sydney *Sun-Herald* (February 17, 1991), not one religious leader showed even an elementary understanding of the subject of the antichrist. Uninformed guesses as to the identity ranged from the absurd thought that he will be a homosexual to the ridiculous concept that probably Henry Kissinger is the antichrist. The title of the article demonstrated further confusion—*Is Saddam Hussein the Antichrist?* [1](#)

How precious is the pure Word of God, which shines as a beacon of truth in the mind of every true Christian to defend the purity of the Word of God and uphold its every word, for it is in those words, and those alone, that we find the revealed will of our God!

1 See Colin Standish and Russell Standish, [*The Antichrist is Here*](#), 1990, Hartland Publications, Box 1, Rapidan Virginia 22733, U.S.A.

Chapter 19

The Destruction of the Doctrine of Antichrist

So important is the destruction of the true identity of the antichrist that we will follow the previous chapter with a second examination of this matter. We trust that minds will be enlightened.

We have seen that the modern translations greatly favor the heretical doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. We have further noted that this bias is not coincidence, but rather is the result of a carefully orchestrated program of scriptural sabotage engineered over four centuries chiefly by the Jesuits.

At the time of the Reformation, Protestants were united in proclaiming the Papacy to be the antichrist (1 John 4:2-3), the man of sin and son of perdition (2 Thessalonians 2:3), the little horn (Daniel 7:8), the beast with seven heads and ten horns (Revelation 13:1), Babylon (Revelation 14:8), the mother of harlots (Revelation 17:5), and the whore (Revelation 17:15). The identification was so convincing, and was verified by such powerful scriptural evidences, that the Roman Catholic Church was at a loss to deflect the charges. Eventually the Jesuit innovator Francisco Ribera succeeded in devising a theory which satisfied Roman Catholics, but its faults are apparent to any true student of God's Word. This theory suggested that the antichrist was to be an evil, Satan-inspired individual who will appear at the end of the age and pursue the acme of apostasy through terrible persecution for three and one-half years.

Since this cunning theory lacked scriptural support, Protestants in former centuries saw it for what it was—a self-serving Roman Catholic deception. The theory was rightly given short shrift in Protestant circles. But in the nineteenth century a chink in Protestant unity on this issue became evident. The Oxford movement of England, a group of young Anglican clergymen anxious to bring their church closer to the Church of Rome, recognized that it could not be achieved while the Anglican Church maintained the Westminster Confession, which specified the papacy to be antichrist and the man of sin. Desperately seeking a solution to their problem, they lent their support to Ribera's theory. So successful was the Oxford movement in its promotion of this flawed theory that today almost all Protestant churches, whether ritualistic or evangelical, accept it as their position. It accords well with the ecumenical motives of most Christian denominations, but it defies the plain evidence of Scripture.¹

Thus we could anticipate that modern translations would corrupt the Scriptures to destroy the divine evidence identifying the Papacy as antichrist. They have achieved this aim.

The central heresy of antichrist is not clouded in darkness. It is the belief that Christ did not come in *the* flesh.

Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world. 1 John 4:2-3

For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist. 2 John 7

Many protest that the Roman Catholic Church strongly supports the concept that Christ came in human flesh. In this they are correct, but in his book *Facts of Faith* Christian Edwardson points out:

Antichrist was not to deny that Christ had come in flesh, but was to deny that He had "come in *the* flesh," in "the same" kind of flesh as the human race He came to save. Christian Edwardson, *Facts of Faith*, Southern Publishing Association, 1943; cited in G. Burnside, *The NIV and the Antichrist*, 7

The Roman Catholic Church has led out in the proclamation of the false doctrine that while Christ's flesh (nature) was human, it was nevertheless quite different from ours since it was that possessed by Adam prior to his Fall. But God declares quite differently:

Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh. Romans 1:3

For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Hebrews 2:16

How then do the modern translations thwart this plain truth of God? Quite simply, by corrupting the compelling biblical evidence. God informs us what is the mystery of godliness:

And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory. 1 Timothy 3:16

Let us examine how one typical modern translation renders this key text:

Beyond all question the mystery of godliness is great: He appeared in a body. . . . 1 Timothy 3:16 NIV

We have emphasized the fact that the word *God* has been altered to *He* thus destroying a potent text which evidences Christ's divinity. But most Bible students also overlook an equally serious omission—that the term, *the flesh* is rendered in the NIV as *a body*. The key mystery of godliness is not that Jesus appeared in a body—angels have at times done that—but that He appeared in *the* flesh, our flesh, the same flesh (nature) as that of David and Abraham.

Clearly the mystery of iniquity (2 Thessalonians 2:7) is the antithesis of the mystery of godliness. It is the denial that Jesus came in *the* flesh. This identification is confirmed by the evidence of 1 John 4:2-3 and 2 John 7 quoted above.

The New International Version confuses the matter by translating the term *mystery of iniquity* as *secret power of lawlessness* (2 Thessalonians 2:7 NIV). In such a translation the identifying evidence of the antichrist is weakened. While it is true that the New International Version does make reference to the chief identifying feature of the antichrist—

Many deceivers, who do not acknowledge Jesus Christ as coming in the flesh, have gone out into the world. Any such person is the deceiver and the antichrist. 2 John 7 NIV

—nevertheless this concept is replaced in the second reference by "does not acknowledge Jesus" 1 John 4:3.

This translation further diminishes the evidence that Jesus came in the flesh (nature) of fallen man. We return to the two texts cited above from the King James Version. These texts should be compared with the following translation:

regarding his Son, who as to his human nature was a descendant of David, Romans 1:3 NIV

This translation does possess the virtue of demonstrating that the term *flesh* as translated in the King James Version does equally refer to *nature*. However, the translation seriously weakens the possession of David's fallen nature by failing to emphasize that Christ was *made* of the seed of David according to the flesh.

In respect of the second reference, the entire text is distorted in such a way as to make the two translations almost unrecognizable as referring to the same original. Certainly Christ's possession of the same human nature as Abraham is entirely lost.

For surely it is not angels he helps, but Abraham's descendants. Hebrews 2:16 NIV

Now it is true that the King James Version is forced by context and obvious intent to insert a few additional words to make plain the meaning of the text. But it is quite necessary and is demanded by the context. The translation offered by the New International Version is totally devoid of any relevance to either the preceding or succeeding verses.

Yet in all fairness we must admit that one text supporting the fallen human nature of Christ is strengthened by the New International Version translation. We shall compare the two versions.

For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. Romans 8:3-4 KJV

For what the law was powerless to do in that it was weakened by the sinful nature, God did by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful man to be a sin offering. And so he condemned sin in sinful man, in order that the righteous requirements of the law might be fully met in us, who do not live according to the sinful nature but according to the Spirit. Romans 8:3-4 NIV

That Rome denies that Jesus possessed a fallen nature is beyond dispute, for to sustain this unscriptural position it proclaimed the heretical doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary.

The Virgin Mary, in the first instance of her conception . . . was preserved free from all stain of original sin. . . .

She was created more sublime and glorious than that of all natures. . . .

Very different from the rest of mankind. . . .

The Blessed Virgin . . . by communicating to the Second Person of the adorable trinity . . . a true human nature of the same substance with her own. . . . *Catholic Belief*, 214-217, quoted in G. Burnside, *NIV and the Antichrist*, 3

We define that the Blessed Virgin Mary in the first moment of her conception . . . was preserved free from every taint of original sin. . . .

Unlike the rest of the children of Adam, the soul of Mary was never subject to sin. *Faith of Our Fathers*, Cardinal Gibbons, 203-204, quoted in *ibid.*

The merits of Jesus, shall be dispensed through the hands and by the intercession of Mary. *Glories of Mary*, 180, quoted in *ibid.*, 9

God has chosen to bestow no grace upon us but by the hands of Mary. . . . *Ibid.*, 180

Whoever asks and wishes to obtain graces without the intercession of Mary, attempts to fly without wings. *Ibid.*, 189

Mary is all the hope of our salvation. *Ibid.*, 195

Thou [Mary] are the only advocate of sinners. *Ibid.*, 129

All those who are saved, are saved solely by means of this divine mother, . . . the salvation of all depends upon preaching Mary. *Ibid.*, 19-20

We ask many things of God and do not obtain them; we ask them from Mary and obtain them. *Ibid.*, 150

Well may it be asked why God identified antichrist by the single criterion of the denial of the truth that Jesus came in the flesh. After all, does not Rome propose numerous disgraceful heresies such as confession to priests and saints, the baptism of infants, the doctrine of original sin which declares that we are lost because of Adam's sin, the immaculate conception, limbo, the issuing of indulgences, and many other perversions of the Christian faith? This claim is true, and it will be found that the central doctrine upon which each of these depends is the human nature of Christ.² One example will suffice to illustrate.

The Bible teaches that in order to qualify as our Mediator, Christ had to be made like unto us in every respect.

Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted. Hebrews 2:17-18

Rome, in denying that Jesus possessed our fallen nature, not only deprive Christ of His role as our Example, but also disqualify Him from being our Mediator. Thus, they turn not only to Mary, but also to "saints" and priests to be mediators between man and God.

The merits and virtue of the sacrifice of the cross are infinite; but that virtue and these merits must be applied, and this can only be done by certain means. *Doctrinal Catechism*, S. Keenan, 129: New York, Kennedy and Sons, 1846

The priest has the power of the keys, or the power of delivering sinners from hell, of making them worthy of paradise, and of changing them from the slaves of Satan into the children of God. And God himself is obliged to abide by the judgment of His priests; . . . the Sovereign Master of the universe only follows the servant by confirming in heaven all that the latter decides upon earth. *Dignity and Duties of the Priest*, St. Alphonsus de Liguori, 27-28: New York, Benziger Brothers, 1888

Thus it is that the weakening of the identification of antichrist in the modern translations seriously reduces God's witness and warnings concerning this power. It is lulling present-day Protestants into an ecumenical slumber which will have devastating effects upon their eternal destinies unless aroused by the power of the valid Word of God.

1 See C.D.Standish and R.R.Standish, [Antichrist Is Here](#), 1990; Hartland Publications, Box 1, Rapidan, Virginia 22733 U.S.A. <BACK>

2 A far fuller explanation of this statement will be found in C.D. Standish and R.R. Standish, [Antichrist Is Here](#), Hartland Publications, Box 1, Rapidan, Virginia 22733, U.S.A. <BACK>

Chapter 20

Defaming Scripture

Some sincere folk believe that it is a defamation of God's Word, if not downright blasphemy, to oppose the various modern translations; after all, is not

All Scripture . . . given by inspiration of God. 2 Timothy 3:16

It would be a perilous stand to uphold that all human perversions of Scripture are inspired of God. Do not the Roman Catholics confidently assert that the Apocrypha is part of Holy Writ? They do. Is it blasphemy then for Protestants to rightly ignore these books? Of course not. Manifestly Paul's statement refers only to the pure Scriptures, unadulterated by human reasoning and additions and subtractions.

Other Bible students point out that the Septuagint was a faulty version of the Old Testament, yet Christ at no time condemned it, and indeed He and His disciples quoted freely from it. Suffice to say that the

biblical writers were very selective in their use of this version, and that, in any case, silence upon an issue is often less than a persuasive argument in its favor.

What is certain is that many godly authors have freely condemned corrupted Scriptures. The Latin Vulgate from which John Wycliffe translated his version of the English Bible was seriously defective.

Wycliffe's Bible had been translated from the Latin text, which contained many errors. . . . In 1516, a year before the appearance of Luther's theses, Erasmus had published his Greek and Latin version of the New Testament. Now for the first time the Word of God was printed in the original tongue. In this work many errors of former versions were corrected, and the sense was more clearly rendered. Ellen White, *The Great Controversy*, 245

Undoubtedly the Protestant Reformers were far from inhibited in this matter. They freely condemned false versions.

Again, that your vulgar Latin text is full of many errors and corruptions, I have showed by the confession of Isidorus Clarius and Lindanus, two of your own profession; . . . and where you say that Luther and his followers forsook it for none other cause in the world, but that it is against them, is utterly untrue. For besides that they have made clear demonstration of many palpable errors therein (which they that have any forehead amongst you cannot deny) they have and do daily convince you of horrible heresies, even out of your own vulgar translation. Fulke, *Defense of Translations*, 1583, 70

It is certainly a remarkable circumstance that so many of the Catholic readings in the New Testament, which in Reformation and early post-Reformation times were denounced by Protestants as corruptions of the pure text of God's Word, should now, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, be adopted by the Revisers of our time-honoured English Bibles. Dr. Edgar, *Bibles of England*, 347

As early as about the turn of the fifth century, Helvidius condemned the Latin Vulgate, then only recently translated by Jerome, in the most strident terms.

You cannot for shame say Joseph did not know of them, for Luke tells us (Luke 2:33) "His father and His mother were marvelling at the things which were spoken concerning Him." And yet you with marvelous effrontery contend that the reading of the Greek MS is corrupt, although it is that which nearly all the Greek writers have left in their books, and not only these, but several of the Latin writers have taken the words of the same way. Jerome against Helvidius, from *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Scribner's Edition, vol. vi, 338

Noting this condemnation, Dr. Benjamin Wilkinson, president of Columbia Union College, commented:

You will see by this that Helvidius, the great scholar of the Italic Church, which was the predecessor of the Waldensian or the pre-Waldensian Church, accuses Jerome of using Luke 2:33 just as we find it now in the American Revised Version from corrupt Greek MSS. It is clear that Helvidius had the pure Greek MSS, which were older than the corrupt Greek MSS used by Jerome. The pure Greek MSS read Luke 2:33 as we now read it in the King James Version; so on this one text the present battle between the King James and the American Revised Versions is the centuries-old battle fought between the pre-Waldensian Church and the growing Roman Catholic Church. B.G. Wilkinson, *The Attitudes and Teachings of Mrs. E.G. White Toward Different Versions of the Bible*, 2

Rather than being a defamation of Scripture, it is the proper duty of sincere Christians to point out corruptions of the precious Word of God. To do less is to condone satanic perversions of Scripture.

Chapter 21

The Youth Factor

Sincere Christian parents face increasing difficulties in bringing Jesus to their children. Worldly competition, both without and within the church, is almost overwhelming. How many parents, their hearts in deep concern, have claimed God's promise!

For I will contend with him that contendeth with thee, and I will save thy children. Isaiah 49:25

Yet there is a decided falling away of Christian youth from the faith. Playing upon the fears of parents and their desperate desire for the salvation of their children, liberal theologians and liberal church leaders have cruelly used what we would term *the youth factor* as a wedge to open the doors to lowered standards and principles, and to the acceptance of apostate doctrines.

How often we hear the necessity of enlivening church services by the introduction of various blasphemous modes of worship, with the catchcry that these techniques will preserve our children for God! Thus activities as diverse as Pentecostalism, the singing of "gospel" rock, puppetry, clown "ministries," emphasis of church youth groups on competitive sport, drama groups, the cinema, un-Christian video, and many more such activities have been accepted as "good" concepts designed "to save our youth." Indeed about the only tactic never suggested as a means of saving our youth is to bring to their hearts the love of Jesus through the study of His Word, an understanding of biblical doctrines, and a pure witness. But such a course would not subserve the hidden agenda of many liberal minds.

To follow the advice of liberal church leaders is to doom the church, for denomination after denomination has been decimated by policies which introduce worldly compromise as a means to retain the youth of the church. We say, Challenge the youth with the Scriptures and they will remain true. But compromise the standards and the faith, and youth will depart.

Perhaps the most disquieting feature is the way in which some theologians and senior church people presume to speak for the youth. Frequently they place in young people's mouths words that they do not speak. Thus the youth are said to complain that the music is too dull, we are assured that they wish to move away from time-honored forms of worship, and many other claims are made in behalf of the youth. Usually it is found that until inserted into the minds of the young people by these persons, who believe themselves to be experts on the thinking of youth, many of these matters have scarcely entered their heads. It is almost as if a massive brainwashing of our young people is being orchestrated. The requirements of the youth are repeated so often that ultimately they assume that this must be what they believe.

Of course we believe that worship services should be vibrant and that the hymns of Zion should generate an enthusiastic expression. All this, as we study God's Word, we believe He approves. But

mixing the world and the church will *never* truly convert our youth; rather it will increase apostasies, for the world performs evil more effectively than the church.

It is in this general frame of reference that unceasing efforts are being put forward to convince our youth that they cannot comprehend the King James Version of Scripture. Only recently have youth commenced to mouth this sentiment, for they have now been told it so frequently that not only do they believe it; but in many cases they have not read the King James Version to verify or refute the "conventional wisdom." The result of accepting this pronouncement of liberal theologians is so appalling that one hopes that Christian parents will critically analyze their claim before accepting it.

But playing upon the fears of godly parents, some of these men used this line of reasoning as a carefully designed means to replace the Word of God from the purest Greek manuscripts, substituting versions based upon manuscripts both carelessly and deliberately corrupted. It was a cunning ploy, and it has succeeded no doubt beyond the wildest dreams of those who planned it. So successful is it that we frequently hear even very responsible laity echoing this misinformation. Now nearly all theology students are informed that modern translations are preferable to the King James Version. Men are graduating with Masters' degrees in Divinity believing this error, without the slightest knowledge that the modern versions are based upon entirely different Greek manuscripts. Failure to highlight this fact in seminaries which promote the new versions is tantamount to a monstrous cover-up.

We are now treating our highly educated young people as if they were illiterate. We do them a gross injustice in this assumption. There is nothing wrong with a modern translation, but there is everything wrong with the use of mutilated manuscripts as its basis. Our young people deserve the very best—the uncorrupted Word of God.

In an era when higher education has never been so commonly achieved, we now pretend that young people cannot understand that which caused not the least difficulty to people with a mere elementary-school education only a few decades past. It is time that these liberal theologians stopped insulting the intelligence of our young people.

The early Reformers proposed to issue a Bible so easy to understand that the plough-boy could readily comprehend it. Today, we have reached the incredible situation where the plough-boys are in little difficulty in their understanding, while the theological professors find the beautiful English of the King James Version beyond their comprehension. Or do they? It may be that their *real* reason for displacing the King James Version is not to please our youth. It may be that the hidden motive is to foist upon Christians an ecumenical Bible pleasing to Rome and to those who no longer fear her pagan practices.

Our youth merit far better than that. Let us not make them pawns in a subtle move to reverse God's Word. By all means let us have a *youth factor*, but let it be the youth of the church proclaiming the pure Word of God.

Chapter 22

Archaic Words

In defense of the use of modern translations, it is frequently asserted that the use of archaic words in the King James Version makes it incomprehensible to young people (see chapter 21 entitled *The Youth Factor*). Such arguments, while sometimes offered by sincere souls, are frequently used by those who have no great interest in the Bible study of the youth, but rather wish to find persuasive arguments to spread the use of corrupted versions of Scripture, versions which better suit their perverted doctrines. It is tragic that so many good people are persuaded by such pitiful lines of reasoning. Those convinced by such arguments seldom stop to reason why, if it was the genuine desire of modern translators to make Scripture clearer, it was thought essential to associate such changes with a perversion of the Bible. The revisers of 1881, including Westcott and Hort, were presented the opportunity to make only those corrections required by the change in language, and in a few minor areas where the King James Version did not provide the best translation. They were expected to maintain the Scriptures inviolate. Had they done so, they would have performed for the English-speaking Christian community a thorough service. But although they were commissioned only to make such changes, they used the exercise to totally pervert God's Word. It was a shameful breach of trust.

Once more we assert that there is virtue in having the Bible presented in contemporary language, but decidedly not in association with destruction of the purity of the Word.

We contend that defenders of modern translators have protested the matter of archaic words in the King James Version far too much. Such protests disguise their hidden desire to insinuate corrupted material, which otherwise would be found totally unacceptable by every true lover of the Word.

If archaic words are a problem, a simple glossary in each King James Version would suffice. Indeed we believe that such an addition would be desirable. It would also serve to increase the vocabularies of the believers. Such an inclusion would be infinitely preferable to the present trend of combining the use of modern language with large scale alterations in God's Word. We can but wonder if the true reason for the printing of modern versions is to deliberately pervert God's Word, while the modernization simply provides the excuse.

The emphasis placed on the need for youth to use a Bible in simple English overlooks that it is in our youth we make the most rapid growth in our vocabularies, and that often the meaning of a new word is not gleaned from a dictionary or glossary, but rather is inferred from its context. If we remember how we ourselves and our children established a vocabulary of tens of thousands of words, many of the arguments concerning archaic words, specious as they are, simply fade away.

Let us illustrate this matter with a single word, *tale*. As used in the book of Exodus, this word has not the common meaning of a story, but means a quota or an assigned number. If the word *tale* is seen in isolation, most people would not give it this meaning. But when read in context, no person of average intellect would have the least doubt concerning its meaning.

Ye shall no more give the people straw to make brick, as heretofore: let them go and gather straw for themselves. And the tale of the bricks, which they did make heretofore, ye shall lay upon them; ye shall not diminish ought thereof: for they be idle; therefore they cry, saying, Let us go and sacrifice to our

God. . . . Go therefore now, and work; for there shall no straw be given you, yet shall ye deliver the tale of bricks. And the officers of the children of Israel did see that they were in evil case, after it was said, Ye shall not minish ought from your bricks of your daily task. Exodus 5:7-8, 18-19

As a complementary issue, in verse 19 the archaic word *minish* is used. Such a word devoid of context may not be easily defined, but once again few readers of this verse would stumble over its meaning—*diminish*.

What does *helve* mean? Most readers would have no idea. But in its context in Scripture its meaning is perfectly plain.

As when a man goeth into the wood with his neighbour to hew wood, and his hand fetcheth a stroke with the axe to cut down the tree, and the head slippeth from the helve, and lighteth upon his neighbour, that he die; he shall flee unto one of those cities, and live. Deuteronomy 19:5

Sometimes the immediate context does not reveal the exact meaning of an archaic word. An example of this may be seen in the following verse.

But the hand of the LORD was heavy upon them of Ashdod, and he destroyed them, and smote them with emerods, even Ashdod and the coasts thereof. 1 Samuel 5:6

The word *emerods* is unknown to most contemporary English-speaking people. In its context in this verse, it could mean a disease, or equally a weapon such as a type of rod. But if only we would encourage God's people to be thorough students of His Word they would be left in no doubt as to which of these alternatives is correct. The King James Version in its margin refers the reader to another passage of Scripture which states,

The Lord will smite thee with the botch of Egypt, and with the emerods, and with the scab, and with the itch, whereof thou canst not be healed. Deuteronomy 28:27

Clearly *emerods* is a disease, as can further be deduced from the context of other verses in the original passage, such as

And it was so, that, after they had carried it about, the hand of the LORD was against the city with a very great destruction: and he smote the men of the city, both small and great, and they had emerods in their secret parts. 1 Samuel 5:9

Now it is true that the term *emerods* is not one known to us today. Although Russell is an Internist (consultant physician) he had never heard this term, nor read it outside of Scripture. But the impact and general understanding of the text remain. Many persons read of diseases the nature of which they do not know, but it does not detract from understanding. For example, in Russell's clinical examination for his specialist qualification in England he was shown a lady with a rare disease known as *pseudoxanthoma elasticum*. It is unlikely that most readers have ever heard of this disease. But one does not require a detailed knowledge of its pathology to understand the meaning of the sentence above which includes this contemporary term.

It is true that some words or terms still have contemporary meaning (just as *tale* did), which has been completely altered since the days in which the King James Version was translated. We are frequently told that this ambiguity causes great confusion. Yet here again context is so illuminating that in most cases there is no difficulty.

The command to *take no thought*, if given to a person today, may be construed to mean, *stop thinking*. While that meaning is implicit in the term as used in the King James Version, its fuller meaning is a command to cease being anxious. That understanding of the term is perfectly conveyed by the context in which it is used.

Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body more than raiment? Matthew 6:25

Similarly the term *chief estates* as used in Scripture does not mean *major properties* but rather *chief men* as the context evidences.

And when a convenient day was come, that Herod on his birthday made a supper to his lords, high captains, and chief estates of Galilee. Mark 6:21

Modern speakers of English would refer to Paul's *conduct* in persecuting Christians, but in eighteenth-century English the word used was *conversation*. Yet in the context this archaic use of the word *conversation* causes not the least problem.

For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it. Galatians 1:13

At times the Hebrew poetical form gives us an understanding of a word. In this form parallel thoughts are expressed. Notice this construction below.

Thou shalt destroy them that speak leasing: the LORD will abhor the bloody and deceitful man. Psalm 5:6

Clearly the word *leasing* here does not possess its modern meaning but is set in parallel with deceit, indicating that *leasing* in this text meant *lying*.

That *meat* in the New Testament meant *food* is specifically indicated by the word in its context. One instance is cited.

And the same John had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins; and his meat was locusts and wild honey. Matthew 3:4

Thus we contend that any problem caused by the use of archaic words in the King James Version is greatly overstated. Where an occasional word is not clarified by its context, we suggest that a Bible be prepared which includes the modern meaning of the word in question. Certainly there is absolutely no ground to mutilate Scripture in response to the presence of a few archaic words or phrases in the Bible.

Chapter 23

The Bible Societies

National Bible Societies have proliferated. The British and Foreign Bible Society has become a model for other such societies all over the world. We can but applaud the work of many of these societies in providing the Word of God, in many tongues, distributed by the millions. But recent trends give cause

for alarm, for now most of these societies have become agents for ecumenism. Many Scriptures now distributed by these societies are those approved by the Roman Catholic Church. Such Bibles are always based upon the corrupted Greek manuscripts beloved of Rome, and they also contain the uninspired books of the Apocrypha.

Lest any be in doubt as to the baleful effects of the distribution of such perverted Scriptures, we remind the reader of the Roman Catholic attitude toward the Bible.

The attitude of the church toward the Bible societies is one of unmistakable opposition. Believing herself to be the divinely appointed custodian and interpreter of Holy Writ, she cannot without turning traitor to herself, approve the distribution of Scripture "without note or comment." The fundamental fallacy of private interpretation of the Scriptures is presupposed by the Bible societies. It is the impelling motive of their work. But it would be likewise the violation of one of the first principles of the Catholic faith—a principle arrived at through observation as well as by revelation—that of the insufficiency of the Scriptures alone to convey to the general reader a sure knowledge of faith and morals. Consequently, the Council of Trent, in its fourth session, after expressly condemning all interpretations of the sacred text which contradict the past and present interpretation of the church, orders all Catholic publishers to see to it that their editions of the Bible have the approval of the bishop.

Besides this and other regulations concerning Bible reading in general we have several acts of the popes directed explicitly against the Bible societies. Perhaps the most notable of these are contained in the Encyclical *Ubi Primum* of Leo XII, dated 5 May, 1824, and Pius IX's Encyclical *Qui Pluribus*, of 9 November, 1846. Pius VIII in 1829 and Gregory XVI in 1844, spoke to similar effect. It may be well to give the most striking words on the subject from Leo XII and Pius IX. To quote the former (*loc. cit.*):

You are aware, venerable brothers, that a certain Bible Society is impudently spreading throughout the world, which, despising the traditions of the holy Fathers and the decree of the Council of Trent, is endeavoring to translate, or rather to pervert the Scriptures into the vernacular of all nations. . . . It is to be feared that by false interpretation, the gospel of Christ will become the gospel of men, or still worse, the gospel of the devil."

The pope then urges the bishops to admonish their flocks that owing to human temerity, more harm than good may come from indiscriminate Bible reading.

Pius IX says (*loc. cit.*): "These crafty Bible societies, which renew the ancient guile of heretics, cease not to thrust their Bibles upon all men, even the unlearned—their Bibles, which have been translated against the laws of the church, and often contain false explanations of the text. Thus, the divine traditions, the teaching of the Fathers, and the authority of the Catholic Church are rejected, and every one in his own way interprets the words of the Lord, and distorts their meaning, thereby falling into miserable errors." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 3, art. "Bible Societies," 545

Having failed to stop the work of the Protestant Bible Societies, the Roman Catholic Church now appears to support them. The United Bible Societies (UBS), an organization which includes both the British and Foreign Bible Society and the American Bible Society, along with most other national Bible Societies, has encouraged Roman Catholic participation in joint evangelistic services, joint prayer sessions for Christian unity, and participation in local church councils and organizations.

Roman Catholics, who have no love for the Scriptures as testified in their unrepented history, have, in recent times, seen fit to promote the Word of God. However, it is not promoted on the basis of a belief that the Scripture is the sole foundation of Christian faith, nor a true love for the Word of God. To ensure that the reader is biased toward Roman Catholic dogma, Roman Catholic versions are "assisted" in five ways:

1. The inclusion of the uninspired Apocrypha.
2. Profuse explanatory notes designed to destroy the plain meaning of the Word of God.
3. Provision of courses instructing readers in Roman Catholic dogma.
4. Use only of Scriptures based upon perverted Greek manuscripts.
5. Approval only of Scriptures containing subtle Catholicism.

Thus when Protestants support the distribution of Bibles approved by the Roman Catholic Church, they are unwittingly assisting that church to extend its influence and authority and to spread unscriptural doctrines offensive to God. For example, the Roman Catholic Church cites the twelfth chapter of the Apocryphal book, 2 Maccabees, which enjoins prayers for the dead, in support of the damnable doctrine of purgatory, and in support of the church's extension of this doctrine to demand money for Masses offered in behalf of those dead believed to be suffering in this fictitious state of torture, that their severe agonies be alleviated.

We suggest that the time has come for true Protestants to withdraw their support from such Bible Societies. Under no circumstance should a faithful Christian regard it as good stewardship of the means God has entrusted to him, to use it in support of the distribution of Scriptures which, rather than uplifting the light of God's Word, promote Roman Catholicism's darkness.

In 1986 the British and Foreign Bible Society issued a catalogue of English-language Bibles and New Testaments published by the society. In this catalogue were included the Jerusalem Bible, which the catalogue correctly states to be the work of Roman Catholic scholars, three editions of the New American Bible which is accurately stated to be an American Catholic translation, an edition of the Revised Standard Version containing the Apocrypha, the New Jerusalem Bible, and the Good News Bible containing the Apocrypha and which the catalogue claims is stamped with the imprimatur of Basil, Cardinal Hume, the Roman Catholic archbishop of Westminster. Again we remind each reader that any donations given to the British and Foreign Bible Society are, in part, used to distribute these Bibles which comply with Roman Catholic views. Further, we believe that the common practice of inviting representatives of the British and Foreign Bible Society or national Bible Societies to preach in Protestant churches be discouraged, for it simply gives credence to these societies and encouragement to congregations to support their work, including their distribution of Bibles containing error.

The Second Vatican Council in 1965 opened the way for ecumenical Bible translations by approving translation projects in "co-operation with the separated brethren." Already in 1964 a meeting of major Bible Societies had agreed to the production of a common biblical text in the original Hebrew and Greek, acceptable to both Protestants and Catholics, so that a Bible acceptable to all faiths could be prepared in the languages of the world. Such Bibles could be prepared only by Protestant compromise, for the Roman Catholic Church would never lend its approval to Bibles devoid of the Apocrypha, nor to

those translated from the *Textus Receptus*. Protestants, on the other hand, have become so weakened in their opposition to Roman Catholic error that they will accept such appalling compromise with truth.

In 1966 the British and Foreign Bible Society amended its constitution to permit the inclusion of the Apocrypha in versions which it distributed. The American Bible Society and most other national societies followed the British lead.

The Roman Catholic Church formed the World Catholic Federation for the Biblical Apostolate (WCFBA) under the leadership of Monsignor Alberto Ablondi, the Roman Catholic bishop of Livorno, Italy, to promote these ecumenical translations. A spokesman for this organization stated that such projects were

An act of common witness and an expression of common grounds. *World-Event*, No. 57/1984, 6

It was also suggested that

this collaboration opens doors to a better understanding of each other's point of view and prepares the way for ecumenical dialog. *Ibid*.

Further the spokesman confirmed that

The WCFBA is not merely interested in, but committed to, this common witness in joint Bible work, which does break new ground for future ecumenism. *Ibid*.

Bishop Ablondi sees interconfessional translations as

One of the important advancements of post-Vatican II ecumenism—an important step toward unity. *Ibid*

True Christians must examine the very Scriptures which these Bible Societies are perverting, especially as the bishop claims that these translations

will help overcome prejudice in a divided church. *Ibid*.

It is these Scriptures which shout an urgent warning against this ecumenical movement which is bound to be so successful that

all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him [the beast, symbolic of Roman Catholicism^{[1](#)}], whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

Revelation 13:8

Further, God's people are called by our loving God in His last desperate plea to mankind to

Come out of her [out of Roman Catholicism and apostate Christianity] that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. Revelation 18:4

We are too late in earth's history for Christians to align themselves with organizations promoting unity condemned of God.

It is not alone in English-speaking lands that this thrust of the Bible Societies is to be found. The distribution of Arabic Bibles in North Africa and the Middle East by the United Bible Societies is a combined effort of Protestants and Roman Catholics. This fact was highlighted by the Executive Secretary of the Bible Society in North Africa when he reported:

1985 got under way with the inauguration of our new offices. . . . This event, preceded by a reception for various heads and staff of diplomatic missions, and marked by an outstanding sermon delivered by the Cardinal Archbishop of Algeria, Monsignor Léon-Etienne Duval, will be remembered as a high point in the rich interconfessional life of this country. *UBS Report* 1985, 131

In Brazil a Portuguese translation of Scripture which included the Apocrypha was produced by an ecumenical team led by Dr. Robert Bratcher, the United Bible Societies international translation consultant (*UBS World Report* 180, May 1985, 3). Dr. Bratcher was the chief translator of the Good News Bible. In his writings this minister has denied the inerrancy of Scripture.

Even more sinister is it, that in Latin America the distribution of these modern Bible versions, approved of Rome, is seen as a powerful weapon in the Roman Catholic counterattack against the inroads of Protestantism in that part of the world.

Ecumenical cooperation . . . which includes the distribution of over one million Bibles a year, has been successful in minimizing the divisive inroads of sectarian proselytizing. *World-Event*, Nos. 65-6/1986

Thus the United Bible Societies' work is counterproductive to the work of the gospel. Dare any true Christian support such ventures, knowing that Rome boasts their efficacy in keeping its flock in medieval darkness? It must be pointed out that the United Bible Societies in Latin America appointed Miss Maria Teresa Porcile, a Roman Catholic, as their consultant for interconfessional translations. This same organization has assisted Catholicism by providing translations of the Apocrypha in some of the minor languages of Latin America, including the Quechua and Aymara languages of Bolivia, and Creole in Haiti. Undoubtedly many contributors to the United Bible Societies would be deeply disturbed if they knew how their funds are being used.

In Burundi, a nation of Central Africa,

a new interconfessional translation of the Bible in Kirundi [the national language] was started . . . by the Roman Catholics together with the Protestants: work is done by a staff of three—a Roman Catholic and a Protestant translator, and a typist. *UBS Report* 1984.21

In 1984 the Burundi Bible Society arranged to print

40,000 copies of the traditional Catholic version of the New Testament in Kirundi. *Ibid.*

The UBS signed an agreement with the Roman Catholic bishopric in Burundi regarding the production of this edition, which will be printed until the new interconfessional translation is completed. *Ibid.*

The situation in Cameroun is tragic. There the ecumenical movement led to severe persecution of Protestants who would not compromise their faith. In 1967 the leader of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church of Cameroun reported:

In one year, at least fifty people in our congregation were imprisoned, my mother being a victim. My father, who was a pastor, died in prison. During a three-year period we were all pushed out. The ecumenical group took over all our territory, they took all our churches, they took all our resources. Trinitarian Bible Society *Quarterly Record*, October 1985, 4

Yet despite this terrible consequence of ecumenism, the General Secretary of the Bible Society of Cameroun reported:

The visit of the Pope to Cameroun was an opportunity for distribution of Scriptures among Roman Catholics. We supplied a summary of our activities to the Holy See and the Pope mentioned it with satisfaction during his visit to our country. . . . Many of our translation projects, most of which are interconfessional, are progressing extremely well. *UBS Report* 1984.22 and 1985.22

In Ethiopia the work of the United Bible Societies was of the same order as in other African nations.

The 1984 Report of the United Bible Societies mentioned with evident satisfaction that "the annual general assembly of the Bible Society of Ethiopia was held in the Patriarchate conference hall of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church." By way of change, the 1985 Report stated that the "prayer day" of the United Bible Societies "was held in the Catholic cathedral and was attended by His Grace Abune Paulos Tsadiwa, Cardinal of the Catholic Church" and that "a Bible rally was held in a Catholic church in Addis Ababa to raise funds, to encourage Scripture distribution and to enlist new members." *UBS Report* 1984.26 and 1985.25, quoted in G. Burnside, *The Bible Societies and Rome*, 8

The nation of Kenya has also been invaded by ecumenical translators. The Bible Society in that nation has translated the Bible into three languages and has included the Apocrypha and also satisfied their Roman Catholic pastors by using the corrupted Greek manuscripts. These languages are Swahili,² Luo and Borana. The same group has produced these faulted translations in four other languages—Massai, Meru, Pokot and Turkana.

There is no secret as to what is happening in the field of Bible translation in Kenya, for Roman Catholic Bishop C. Davies of Kenya has stated:

The Kenya Episcopal conference has had a much greater say in translation work through the good relations which are expressed by having three members of the Board of Governors (of the Bible Society). World-Event No. 59/1985, 32 and WCFBA III, 68-69

Further, Peter Kiarie, a Roman Catholic, is the Bible Society's chairman and also a member of the African Regional Executive Committee of the United Bible Societies.³

In the Seychelles, an island nation in the Indian Ocean, the ecumenical committee consists of representatives of the Seventh-day Adventist, the Roman Catholic, and the Anglican Churches. The General Secretary of the Bible Society of Mauritius (a nearby nation, also in the Indian Ocean) holds regular meetings with the Roman Catholic bishops of Mauritius, Réunion and Seychelles. The result of this ecumenism is that

To mark the Pope's visit to Mahé, the main island in the Seychelles group, a Scripture portion was distributed containing an introduction to the role of the Pope in the Catholic Church as well as the text of the two Letters of Peter in Today's French translation. The Scripture portion was published by the Bible Society of Mauritius, which is responsible for Bible Society work in the Seychelles, and was produced in cooperation with local Catholics. *UBS World Report* 199, January 1987.

Can God approve such a work?

Even in Sudan the Sudan Bible Society has been engaged in the ecumenical translation of Scripture into four languages of that nation—Belanda, Jur, Ndogo and Viri. WCFBA III, 80-81

In Europe the Catholic Church has such influence in the United Bible Societies that Bishop Ablondi is a member of the General Committee and European Regional Executive of the United Bible Societies. As noted earlier, he is also the president of the World Catholic Federation for the Biblical Apostolate.

The evidence of the work of most Bible Societies is all too easy to document. Undoubtedly many sincere supporters are ignorant of the real work of these societies. Careful consideration must lead any true-hearted Christian to withdraw his support from these societies.

1 See C.D. Standish and R.R. Standish, [*Antichrist Is Here*](#), Hartland Publications, Box 1, Rapidan Virginia 22733 U.S.A.

2 See the appendix entitled [*God's Word Made a Joke*](#) The cartoonist little realized that these translations are underway, when he sneeringly put down those interested in true Bible translations by referring to a Swahili translation.

3 All data on Kenya derived from *World-Event* No. 59/1985, 32 or WCFBA III, 68-69

Chapter 24

The Trinitarian Bible Society

The British and Foreign Bible Society created controversy almost from its outset. On December 7, 1802, the formation of a society for the dispersion of Scripture throughout the world was first mooted. On March 7, 1804, a public meeting was convened to inaugurate the British and Foreign Bible Society.

From the beginning the society was conceived as a worldwide venture, to bring the Bible to every person in their own language. Andrew J. Brown, *The Word of God Among All Nations*, 7

The source of the first major controversy in the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS) was a seemingly innocuous resolution passed in June 1813. It stated

that the manner of printing the Holy Scriptures by Foreign Societies [i.e. societies in convention with the BFBS] be left to their discretion, provided they be printed without note or comment. W. Canton, *A History of the British and Foreign Bible Society* (1904), 335

The true purpose of this resolution was concealed from the rank-and-file members until 1821 when Robert Haldane, a Scottish patron of the Society, discovered that the resolution had been adopted so that the Apocrypha could be included in Bibles distributed in predominantly Catholic nations. This realization caused a furor in the Society. In 1824, a new resolution was adopted which satisfied many of those who did not wish uninspired materials associated with the Word of God. It was resolved that no pecuniary grants be made by the Committee of this Society for the purpose of aiding the printing or publishing of any edition of the Bible, in which the Apocrypha shall be mixed and interspersed with the Canonical Books of Holy Scriptures. Ibid, 337

The Scottish members still were not satisfied, believing the new resolution too lax, for it did not prevent the provision of grants for the printing of the Apocrypha separately. On the other hand, a

group at Cambridge University objected to the resolution and preferred the one of 1813. In March 1825 they presented the "Cambridge protest."

Alexander Haldane, a nephew of Robert, sat on the Society Committee and strongly objected to the printing of the Apocrypha. His cry for biblical purity did not meet the minds of the more liberal elements on the committee. It was decided to vote Alexander Haldane off the committee in a meeting from which his chief supporters were absent. Providentially, just as the motion of expulsion was about to be put, in walked Henry Drummond, Edward Irving, and Hugh McNeile, three of Haldane's ardent supporters.

No sooner did they understand it than Edward Irving sprung to his feet with flashing eyes, burst into one of his flights of oratory, delivered an eulogium on the conduct of his assaulted friend, shook his staff in the heat of his indignation at the unworthy conspiracy, and so completely turned the fortune of the hour that a counter Resolution was carried. *The Record* (Newspaper), July 28, 1828

In 1827 a further new resolution on the matter of the Apocrypha still did not meet the minds of the Scottish delegates. All Scottish bodies withdrew and followed an independent course. In 1861 they united to form the National Bible Society of Scotland. That the secession of the Scots had been proper was apparent when it was later discovered that the BFBS was sending grants for the production of the unbound Bibles with the intention that later these Bibles should be bound with the Apocrypha for distribution in Europe.

Thus the leadership of the BFBS early demonstrated itself to be unprepared to take a decided stand against Roman Catholic wishes in biblical translations. This lack of direction is demonstrated today as the BFBS unites with Catholics in the preparation of new translations of Scripture. An instance is the input of the BFBS into the preparation of the 1989 Revised English Bible, which was carried out in conjunction with Protestants and Roman Catholics. This Bible carries a number of false translations, favorable to Catholic doctrine.

A second major schism shortly developed. A number of supporters of the BFBS were Unitarians, especially on the European continent. Since these members did not believe in the divinity of Jesus, they favored the use of manuscripts minimizing the divinity of Christ. The problem became entwined with the matter of opening Society meetings with prayer. Unitarians and those supporting them opposed the procedure of commencement of meetings with prayer, lest God be addressed through Jesus Christ.

One of the vice-presidents of the BFBS, Viscount Mandeville, refused to chair any meeting which was not opened with prayer. The viscount was not alone. The matter reached a climax at the 1831 Annual Meeting held in May. The meeting was chaired by Lord Bexley. His Lordship was most decidedly opposed to the calls for the expulsion of the Unitarians. The meeting erupted in disorder when Captain J.E. Gordon spoke, supporting the expulsion of those who did not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ. Some clapped and cheered. While applause was thunderous and lasted minutes, others interrupted Gordon. Finally, general uproar ensued.

Amid scenes of wild disorder, one speaker after another failed to make themselves heard. Andrew J. Brown, *The Word of God Among All Nations*, 16

When Gordon's motion was finally put, it was rejected by a six-to-one majority. This decision engendered a second breakaway movement. Captain Fredrick Harcourt, the son of the Anglican Archbishop of York, chaired a meeting two days later on May 20, 1831. A decision was taken to form a provisional committee to set up a new Bible Society whose membership would be confined to Protestants who acknowledged the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Two nobles, General Viscount Lorton and Viscount Mandeville, later to succeed his father as the sixth duke of Manchester, were the two vice-presidents.

Eventually the Trinitarian Bible Society (TBS) was formed at a public meeting, with over 2,000 in attendance, on December 7, 1831. Among the original members of this TBS were some fascinating men. These men had been caught up in the worldwide Advent movement which studied the prophecies, especially those of the books of Daniel and Revelation. Much emphasis was placed upon the passage in Daniel 8:14 which refers to a 2,300-day period at the conclusion of which the sanctuary would be cleansed. Believing that a symbolic day represented a literal year, these believers pinpointed the 1840s as the time of the conclusion of this prophetic period. From the information found in Daniel 9:25, they concluded that the 2,300-year prophetic period commenced at the time of the proclamation of the decree of Artaxerxes, king of Medo-Persia, to restore and rebuild Jerusalem after the Babylonian captivity of the Jews. It was determined from archeological records that this decree was issued in 457 B.C.

There was a belief, popular worldwide among sincere Christians in the 1820s and 1830s, based on the mistaken impression that the sanctuary mentioned in Daniel 8:14 represents the earth and that its cleansing represents the Second Coming of Christ. It was only after the failure of the prediction of Christ's return that some believers recognized that the sanctuary to which the scriptural passage referred is the heavenly sanctuary.^{[1](#)}

In the 1830s, over 700 ministers of the Church of England were preaching the return of Jesus in the 1840s. Among these were some of the founders of the Trinitarian Bible Society. Included among these ministers were Hugh McNeile and G.W. Philips. Prominent lay figures accepting the Advent teaching and involved in the TBS formation were Henry Drummond, Edward Irving, himself an outstanding preacher, Alexander Haldane, Viscount Mandeville, Captain Gambier, James Hatley Frere, Spencer Percival, M.P., and the Honorable J.J. Strutt. Drummond organized the famous Prophetic Conferences at his residence in Albury, Surrey, from 1826. The renowned converted Austrian Jew, Joseph Wolfe, attended some of these conferences. He later preached his Advent message before a joint sitting of the American Congress.

This group proved to be a great strength, but later a weakness, to the fledgling Society. Some of the members disagreed with Irving's view

That the human nature of Christ was subject to sinful tendencies. Andrew J. Brown, op. cit., 29

However, it was Irving's subsequent claim to mediate divine healing and his encouragement of glossolalia (speaking in tongues) which greatly diminished his influence.

The TBS survived this crisis and gradually developed in the nineteenth century. Today it follows a most commendable policy in respect of the Scriptures. Its present Law and Regulation No. III states:

This Society shall circulate the HOLY SCRIPTURES, as comprised in the Canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, WITHOUT NOTE OR COMMENT to the exclusion of the Apocrypha; the copies in the English language shall be those of the Authorized Version (King James Bible). In promoting and editing new translations, and selecting versions in foreign languages, the competency of the translators employed, and the faithfulness and Christian character of the versions, shall be ascertained by the Committee, before the publication or circulation of such versions is in any way aided by this Society.

Members must be Protestants and must acknowledge the Holy Trinity. The aims of the TBS are fivefold:

To publish and distribute the Holy Scriptures throughout the world.

To promote Bible translations which are accurate and trustworthy.

To bring light and life, through the Gospel of Christ, to those who are lost in sin and in the darkness of false religion and unbelief.

To uphold the doctrines of reformed Christianity, bearing witness to the equal and eternal deity of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, three Persons in one God.

To uphold the Bible as the inspired, inerrant Word of God.

In 1990 the Presbyterian Church of Queensland withdrew from the Queens-land branch of the Bible Society of Australia, from which it had arisen. The reasons for making this decision were cited:

One of these concerns is the increasing incidence of translation work being undertaken by groups of scholars from widely differing backgrounds and widely differing approaches to the absolute reliability of the Bible. The Assembly did not agree with the Bible Society's view that translation work is a "neutral" activity.

A second concern was the openly professed purpose of the United Bible Society as a vehicle of "common witness" and one of the most important advancements in the modern ecumenical movement. It was reported to the Assembly that 70% of UBS projects are "interconfessional" projects, that is, that they are joint ventures of Protestant Churches and the Roman Catholic Church. This involvement was officially acknowledged last year when at its Annual General meeting, the Queensland Branch of the Bible Society resolved to add the Roman Catholic Church and the Seventh Day Adventist Church [*sic*] to its list of constituent members. *Australian Beacon*, South Australia, quoted in *The Sentinel*, the periodical of the Orange Lodge, vol. 43 No. 1, Summer 1990

The Assembly commended the Trinitarian Society . . . to the prayerful support of the church. *Ibid*.

The TBS head office is at 217 Kingston Road, London SW 19 3NN. In Canada headquarters are at 39 Caldwell Crescent, Brampton, Ontario L6W 1A2. Australian headquarters may be located through P.O.Box 97, Yamba, New South Wales 2464.

It is long overdue that the Trinitarian Bible Society should be supported by Bible-believing Protestants who are concerned about the growing Roman Catholic influence in modern versions. The majority of contemporary Bible Societies have long since compromised the desire of their founders to present the pure Word of God to the peoples of the world. The Trinitarian Bible Society has eschewed such compromise.

1 For a more detailed study of this subject see Standish, C.D. and R.R., *The Sacrificial Priest*, Hartland Publications, Box 1, Rapidan Virginia 22733 U.S.A. [<BACK>](#)

Chapter 25

The Dead Sea Scrolls

While the Dead Sea Scrolls are not central to a book on the modern translations, they do have some peripheral impact.

The Dead Sea Scrolls were initially discovered in caves near the Dead Sea in 1947. Hundreds of scrolls were discovered, some dating back to 400 B.C. Every Old Testament book with the exception of Esther has been found among these scrolls, although not all in their entirety. In addition to Bible passages, the scrolls included many secular manuscripts, for this find represented the library of the Essene community living in Qumran from about 130 B.C. to A.D. 68. The settlement was eventually destroyed by the Romans just two years prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. A second group lived nearby at Masada. These the Romans destroyed in A.D. 72, while the third settlement at Murabbaat survived until A.D. 132 when this community too fell to Roman arms at the time of the Second Jewish Revolt.

Recognizing that they were facing perilous times, these people hid their precious scrolls in almost inaccessible caves. This action must be evaluated in the knowledge that, so precious was God's Word to them that when the scrolls became unusable they were buried, a type of funeral service being said over the scroll.

The great significance of this archeological discovery is that it provided evidence of the Old Testament text at the time of Christ or even earlier. One evangelist has reported on his conversation with the director of the museum examining the Dead Sea Scrolls. The evangelist stated:

As the director of the Jerusalem Museum assured us that they had found manuscripts or fragments of all the books of the Old Testament, I asked him if there was any difference between these ancient manuscripts and our present Bible. He quickly answered, "There is virtually no difference. In practically all things they are exactly the same as the Authorized Version. You can take that for certain," he assured me personally. *What's All This About The Dead Sea Scrolls?*, G. Burnside, 4

Professor Frank Cross confirmed that

Not only in Isaiah, but in other prophetic books, indeed in the entire Old Testament, we must now assume that the Old Testament text was stabilized early, and that late recensional activities were of only slight effect. This conclusion, of course, powerfully supports textual scholars of conservative persuasion. *The Christian Century*, August 11, 1955, 920, quoted in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, G. Burnside, 5

In confirmation, another authority stated:

In the latter years of the nineteenth century the champions of Christianity were mainly on the defensive. Natural science was in the heyday of the progress which took its rise in the discoveries and doctrine of Darwin. At the same time within the sphere of religious study itself a school of thought asserted itself which questioned the authenticity and trustworthiness of the fundamental doctrines of

Christianity, and applied the utmost freedom of skepticism to their narratives. Against this attitude the state of our knowledge of biblical archeology did not supply arguments which could effectively convince those who did not wish to be convinced. The advocates of the Christian faith fought at a disadvantage and were on the defensive. Now all this is changed, and the point I want to make is that we are no longer on the defensive. It is no longer the Christian scholar who is out of date. The up-to-date scholars are now those who recognize the authenticity and authority of the Christian literature. It is the critics who formerly claimed to be advanced, who are now belated and behind the times. Sir Frederick Kenyon, former head of the manuscript department of the British Museum in his presidential address to the Victoria Institute, quoted in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, G. Burnside, 7

A scroll of great significance is the Isaiah scroll, which is in excess of twenty-four feet in length, and contains Isaiah's entire prophecy. Higher critics had long held that Isaiah was written by separate authors, one writing the first thirty-nine chapters and the other the remainder. The basis for this speculation was that the fortieth chapter focuses on the Babylonian exile which occurred over one hundred years after Isaiah's death. Faithful students of Scripture have long discarded such theorizing, believing rather that Isaiah wrote a prophetic message under divine guidance. Let it not be overlooked that the New Testament writers quoted both sections of Isaiah and ascribed the quotations to his pen. Jesus Himself quoted from both the early and the latter sections of the book, identifying Isaiah as the author of both.

And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive. [Jesus is quoting Isaiah 6:9-10.] Matthew 13:14.

That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses. [Jesus was quoting Isaiah 53:4.] Matthew 8:17

Thus when the Isaiah scroll was discovered it was eagerly examined for clues to settle the dispute. All evidence indicated that the book was written by a single author. There was absolutely no evidence of a distinction between the thirty-ninth and the fortieth chapters, no break in the material. Nor has the least evidence of separate authors been identified in the more than one dozen other copies of Isaiah discovered. While these findings do not provide proof beyond dispute, they accord with the writers of the New Testament who, we assert, do provide irrefutable evidence.

Yet it is men of higher critical bent who have been most active in planning and supporting new Bible translations. They have been wrong in their every attack on Scripture, and they cause great harm when their opinions are accepted in the matter of biblical translation.

Of course, a further matter of great significance is that the discovery of the Isaiah scroll, copied about 150 B.C., provided absolute certainty that the precise Messianic prophecies of Isaiah were indeed written long before Christ's birth (the Septuagint translation around the same period also confirms the matter). This evidence of Christ's Messiahship is outstanding.

It is rather sad to find in their writings that while the members of these communities were avidly studying the Messianic prophecies, yet the Messiah came during their era and they were totally oblivious of it. In their earnest search these Essenes came to the conclusion that they could anticipate four Messiahs—one a king in the line of David, one a priest of the Levitical rite, another a prophet in

the mold of Moses, and last a Messiah of the order of Melchizedek. How close these men were to the truth! If only they could have fused these four "Messiahs" in their minds! But they could conceive neither of a priest of the tribe of Judah, nor of a prophet who was also a conquering king. But in Jesus was their kingly Prophet and Priest of the Order of Melchizedek. Interestingly, in their commentaries on Melchizedek, these men recognized his role in judgment. One scroll states:

Melchizedek shall exact the vengeance of the judgments of God from the hand of Belial and from the hands of all the spirits of his lot.

When Hebrews chapters 5 and 7 are read we discover that the conclusions of these people were not far from the truth. Yet they tragically failed to recognize the One they earnestly sought.

At the time of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls the oldest Hebrew text known was copied in the ninth century after Christ. Thus the Dead Sea Scrolls were up to one thousand years older than the earliest Hebrew manuscripts used by the King James translators. The same translators had been able to utilize manuscripts four hundred years older for their translation of the New Testament. Yet we find that God in His goodness had so preserved His Word that those ninth-century copies almost exactly accorded with those of one thousand years earlier. This powerful testimony should establish the faith of God's people in His power to preserve the Word of God, whether it be the Hebrew text of the Old Testament or the Greek text of the New Testament. There are many such lessons to be underscored in the minds of Bible students who cast doubts upon the majority text.

Chapter 26

The Missing Comma

Christians have often used the King James Version translation found in Acts 19:12, where the expression *sick handkerchiefs* appears, as an instance verifying that there is no punctuation in the Greek language. The insertion of a comma between the words *sick* and *handkerchiefs* would have indicated that the term *sick* was not an adjective but a noun. Such a proof was given in explanation to students of the Bible who were unacquainted with Greek. It served to explain the misplacement of the comma after the word *thee* in the following text:

And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To day shalt thou be with me in paradise. Luke 23:43

Since this text has frequently been used to indicate that a person goes to heaven upon death, it was necessary to point out to those studying God's Word that the placement of the comma was a matter of judgment by the translators. The appropriate position for the insertion of the comma is after the word *To day*, ensuring a meaning consistent with the rest of Scripture, which asserts that the dead have no conscious existence.

However, there is another "comma" which is omitted from most modern translations, called the Johannine comma. This comma has little to do with punctuation; it consists of the following text of Scripture:

For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. 1 John 5:7

Of all the omitted texts, this one has caused the greatest difficulty to Bible students, for it must be admitted that numerous Greek manuscripts do not contain it, although it is to be found in the Latin Vulgate, a version of the Scripture to which most true Protestants give little credence. This text, of course, is a powerful evidence for the Godhead. Nevertheless, it is important for us to examine the evidence for the validity of its inclusion in the *Textus Receptus*.

The usual story circulated concerning the inclusion of this passage in Tyndale's English Scripture is that when the matter of its omission was brought to his attention, Tyndale promised to include it, provided a single manuscript could be found containing the passage. It was promptly supplied. Thus to keep his word, Tyndale included it. However, some stated the produced manuscript to be a forgery. Those accepting this account clearly could have no confidence in the authenticity of the text.

But is this superficial view a correct one? It has been said that Tyndale included this text only in parentheses. For example, Dr. Adam Clarke in his commentary *The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, in addressing 1 John 5:7 states:

Tindal [*sic*] was as critical as he was conscientious; and though he admitted the words into the text of the first edition of his New Testament printed in 1526, yet he distinguished them by a different letter, and put them in brackets.

However, in the only extant first edition of Tyndale's Bible, in Bristol, England, no such parenthesis appears. Thus Dr. Adam Clarke is incorrect in his statement. What is true is that in the later edition of William Tyndale's New Testament, published in 1534 after his execution, these words are in parentheses.

(For ther are thre that beare recorde in heuen, the father, the word and the holy ghost. And these thre are one). 1 John 5:7, 1534 edition of William Tyndale's New Testament

It is thought that the parentheses were added after Tyndale's death.

Perhaps no group of Christian believers more diligently kept the purity of the faith alive in Europe than did the Waldenses. Their missionaries went to many countries, including Hungary, Czechoslovakia, France, England, Scotland and Italy. These Christian believers refused to use the Latin Vulgate, but used the old Latin Bible which was written in the Romaunt language. When the early leaders of the Reformation entered the valleys of the Waldenses, it was agreed that they would translate the Waldensian Bible into French, comparing it with the original Hebrew and Greek. This translation became the Olivetan Bible, the first Protestant Bible in the French language. The second edition of the Olivetan Bible, which was later produced by Calvin, became the basis of the Geneva Bible in the English language, a forerunner of the King James Version. Since the Waldensians had maintained their Scripture for over 900 years, it is instructive to record that the Olivetan Bible and the Geneva Bible both contain the passage of 1 John 5:7. It is recorded in the Olivetan Bible as follows:

Car il y en a trois qui rendent témoignage au ciel, le Père, la Parole, et le Saint Esprit: et ces trois-là sont un. 1 John 5:7 in the French edition of 1569

The English translation for the above is as follows:

For there are three who give witness in the heavens, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit: and these three are one.

John Calvin, in his Bible Commentary, made an interesting statement upon this contested passage:

[Verse] 7 *there are three that bear record in heaven*. The whole of this verse has been by some omitted. Jerome thinks that this has happened through design rather than through mistake, and that indeed only on the part of the Latins. But as even the Greek copies do not agree, I dare not assert anything on the subject. Since, however, the passage flows better when this clause is added and as I see that it is found in the best and most approved copies, I am inclined to receive it as the true reading. John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Catholic Epistles*, 257

What did Calvin mean when he claimed that the passage flowed better when it was included in the substance of the first epistle of John? Dr. P.S. Ruckman has pointed out:

The evidence that shows the passage should be there (if it was ever omitted) lies in the fact that *when the Johannine comma is removed* (part of verses 7 and 8), we get the following reading, which is grammatically impossible.^{[1](#)}

Dr. P.S. Ruckman, *Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*, 129

The problem with the Greek of the perverted manuscripts is that in 1 John 5 the three words, *Spirit*, *Water*, and *Blood* are neuter gender and thus require neuter articles. However, the articles retained in verse 8 are masculine gender and thus indicate that the presence of verse seven is needed to make the passage grammatically correct.

No doubt there is another reason which compelled Ruckman to observe:

But Origen and W.H. [Westcott and Hort] never hesitated to violate the rules of Freshman Greek Grammar if it afforded an opportunity to destroy the despised Reformation! Ibid.

Indeed, very careful research has been undertaken to evaluate the authenticity of the Johannine comma. One such researcher was Dr. Frederick Nolan who concluded that the Johannine comma was indeed part of the original biblical manuscript.

Dr. Nolan, who had already acquired fame for his Greek and Latin scholarship and researches into Egyptian chronology, and was a lecturer of note, spent twenty-eight years to trace back the Received Text to its apostolic origin. He was powerfully impressed to examine the history of the Waldensian Bible. He felt certain that researches in this direction would demonstrate that the Italic New Testament, or the New Testament of those primitive Christians of northern Italy whose lineal descendants were the Waldenses would turn out to be the Received Text. D.O. Fuller, *Which Bible?*, 212-213

Frederick Nolan's conclusions were as follows:

The author perceived, without any labor of inquiry, that it derives its names from that diocese, which has been termed the Italic, as contra-distinguished from the Roman. This is a supposition, which received a sufficient confirmation from the fact,—that the principal copies of that version have been preserved in that diocese, the metropolitan church of which was situated in Milan. The circumstance is at present mentioned, as the author thence formed a hope that some remains of the primitive Italic version might be found in the early translations made by the Waldenses, who were the lineal descendants of the Italic Church; and who have asserted their independence against the usurpations of the Church of Rome, and have ever enjoyed the free use of the Scriptures.

In the search to which these considerations have led the author, his fondest expectations have been fully realized. It has furnished him with abundant proof on that point to which his inquiry was chiefly directed; as it has supplied him with an unequivocal testimony of a truly apostolical branch of the primitive church, that the celebrated text of the heavenly witnesses [1 John 5:7] was adopted in the version which prevailed in the Latin Church previously to the introduction of the modern Vulgate.

Frederick Nolan, *Integrity of the Greek Vulgate*, xvii-xviii

Here is sound evidence that the disputed passage from 1 John 5:7 was included in manuscripts prior to the publication of the Latin Vulgate. Indeed,

The Reformers held that the Waldensian Church was formed about A.D. 120, from which date on, they passed down from father to son the teachings they received from the apostles. The Latin Bible, the Italic, was translated from the Greek not later than A.D. 157. Scrivener, *Introduction*, vol. 2, 43 quoted in D.O. Fuller, *Which Bible?*, 208

Even Augustine, bishop of Hippo, admitted about the year 400:

Now among translators themselves the Italian (Itala) is to be preferred to the others, for it keeps closer to the words without prejudice to clearness of expression. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Christian Lit. Ed. vol. 2, 542, quoted in *ibid*.

However, so ingrained has it become in the thinking of modern students of the Bible that this passage has no place in Scripture, that when Greek manuscripts support its authenticity, often there is a sense of dejection. Thus, Ruckman reported:

Observe the "conservative" scholar, F.F. Bruce, bemoaning the fact that a Greek manuscript *was found* which backed up the A.V. [Authorized Version] text of 1 John 5:7! (F.F. Bruce, *The Books and the Parchments*, 210.) It would have pleased the "conservative" if the Greek manuscript had never showed up! Dr. P.S. Ruckman, *Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*, 199

When translating the Authorized Version in 1611, the translators had

before them four Bibles which had come from Waldensian influences: the Diodati in Italian, the Olivetan in French, the Lutheran in German, and the Genevan in English. We have every reason to believe that they had access to at least six Waldensian Bibles written in the old Waldensian vernacular. D.O. Fuller, *Which Bible?*, 212

Thus the translators of the Authorized Version were very indebted to the Waldensian biblical traditions for including 1 John 5:7 as an authentic portion of Scripture.

Many critics of this passage are unacquainted with the powerful evidence for its validity, and accept the attacks upon it by those who have no love for the pure Word of God.

[1](#) Editor's note: To illustrate, an English construction which is grammatically impossible would be, for instance, She agrees with themselves.

Chapter 27

The Revised Standard Version and Islam

One significant feature of the use of the perverted manuscripts of Scripture is its influence upon those of other faiths. This aspect has, we believe, received no attention in any other work considering the new translations of Scripture. The influence of the new translations is most marked in Islam. To many in the West it may seem to be a matter of minor import. But such ignore that Islam is growing at a rate which exceeds that of Christianity and that almost one-fifth of the population of the world professes this faith. Only nine nations upon earth have populations exceeding 100 million. Yet three of these (Indonesia, Pakistan, and Bangladesh) are Islamic nations and three others (India, China, and the former U.S.S.R.) have large Islamic minorities. Even in huge nations which we traditionally see as Christian, Islam is making giant strides. Thus the Islamic population of Brazil has reached two million. In Colombia where the population contained only four Islamic believers per 10,000 citizens in 1988, no fewer than 26 adherents of that persuasion were members of parliament; two held ministerial portfolios and many of the journalists of the country professed the Islamic faith.

The use of the corrupted version of Scripture is understandably cited by Moslem apologists as proof beyond dispute that the Bible has been corrupted by human devising. And unquestionably, so it has, in the manuscripts upon which the new translations are based. In his book, *The Choice—the Qur'an or the Bible*, the South African Moslem author, Ahmad Deedat, devotes an entire chapter to the topic of *The Multiple Bible Versions*. He avidly quotes from the demeaning introduction to the Revised Standard Version of Scripture which falsely asserts that

The King James Version has grave defects and that these defects are so many and so serious as to call for revision. Ahmad Deedat, *The Choice—the Qur'an or the Bible*, 7, The Thinker's Library, Selangor, Malaysia

Little could the writers of this disgraceful introduction have anticipated that their words would be seized upon as evidence of the inferiority of the Bible as compared with the Qur'an, concerning which Sir William Muir is credited with asserting two hundred years ago:

There is probably in the world no other book that has remained twelve centuries with so pure a text. Ibid, 9

It is of no casual interest that Deedat invariably points to the Catholic and the modern Protestant versions as more accurate than the King James Version. This latter version always appears to strike at the heart of unbelievers and call forth their greatest wrath. This striking power in itself should be cause for contemplation. Quoting God's denunciation of those who delete material from Scripture (Revelation 22:18-19), Deedat attacks Protestants who have

bravely expunged seven whole books from their Book of God. Ibid., 9, emphasis in the original

His reference is here to the absence of the Apocryphal books from the King James Version of Scripture.

The Jehovah's Witnesses have, for their own purpose, also made efforts to destroy the credibility of the King James Version of the Bible. They claim that

as early as 1720, an English authority estimated that there were at least 20,000 errors in the two editions of the New Testament commonly read by Protestants and Catholics. Modern students say that there are probably 50,000 errors. *Awake*, September 8, 1957

This article did not escape Deedat's attention. When visited by a Jehovah's Witness in his home, he produced the article, The following conversation ensued.

I asked, "Is this yours?" He readily recognized his own. I said, "It says: 50,000 errors in the Bible, is it true?" "What's that!" he exclaimed. I repeated, "I said, that it says that there are 50,000 errors in your Bible."

"Where did you get that?" he asked. (This was printed 23 years ago, when he was perhaps a little nipper.) I said, "Leave the fancy talk aside—is this yours?" pointing again to the monograph, "Awake." He said, "Can I have a look?"

"Of course," I said. I handed him the page. He started perusing. They (the Jehovah's Witnesses) are trained. They attend classes five times a week in their "Kingdom Halls." Naturally they are the fittest missionaries among the thousand-and-one-sects-and-denominations of Christendom. They are taught that when cornered, do not commit yourself to anything, do not open your mouth. Wait for the Holy Ghost to inspire you with what to say. I silently kept watching him, while he browsed the page. Suddenly, he looked up. He had found it. The "Holy Ghost" had tickled him.

He began, "The article says that most of these errors have been eliminated."

I asked, "If *MOST* are eliminated how many remain out of the 50,000? 5,000?, 500?, 50? Even if 50 remain, do you attribute those errors to God?" He was speechless. He excused himself by suggesting that he will come again with some senior member of his Church. That will be the day! Ahmad Deedat, op. cit., 13-14

The perversions of Scripture relating to Christ's divinity have been eagerly exploited in the Islamic world. Referring to the exclusion of 1 John 5:7 from all modern versions, Deedat asserts:

This verse is the closest approximation to what the Christians call their *Holy Trinity* in the encyclopedia called the Bible. This keystone of the Christian faith has been scrapped from the Revised Standard Version without even a semblance of explanation. It has been a pious fraud all along and well-deservedly has been expunged in the RSV for the English-speaking people. Ahmad Deedat, op. cit., 16

Here the perverted text used in the modern versions of Scripture is used as a powerful argument by Moslems against the divinity of Christ, whom they debase to the status of a mere prophet.

Another Islamic author seizes upon the "evidence" of some modern versions of Scripture which state that the last verses of Mark, chapter 16, are not authentic, to cast doubt upon Christ's ascension.

Neither Matthew nor John speaks of Jesus' Ascension. Luke in his gospel situates it on the day of the Resurrection and forty days later in the Acts of the Apostles, of which he is said to be the author. *Mark mentions it (without giving a date) in a conclusion thought today not to be authentic.* The Ascension, therefore, has no solid scriptural basis. Maurice Bucaille, *The Bible, The Qur'an and Science*, 62. The Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Tripoli, emphasis added

Many more examples of the misuse of the new versions of Scripture by Islamic apologists could be cited. There is no doubt that these versions are accomplishing much more harm to God's cause in the non-Christian world. Missionaries there must meet these arguments. Much time is thus needlessly expended which could be better invested presenting positive truth.

The new translations of Scripture are the work of Catholics, a segment of Christianity which has never valued God's Word, and of Protestant higher critics, and often of Jews. This unholy alliance has performed untold evil to the cause of God. That Protestants would promote translations of Scripture bearing such poor credentials needs thorough investigation. We should be careful not to support such works. Virtually all the arguments used against the Holy Bible by Islamic authors are not original but are extracted from the works of "Christian" theologians with a penchant for higher criticism. Platitudes used by "Christian thinkers" who do not believe the historicity of the gospels are understandably scorned by writers from Moslem nations. Their opposition to Scripture is bolstered by that which they read in "Christian" literature. Thus Bucaille used Roguet's wordy excuse for ignoring the plain statements of fact in the gospels as proof of the Bible's lack of veracity. Roguet's offending statement follows:

Here, as in many similar cases, the problem only appears insuperable if one takes biblical statements literally, and forgets their religious significance. It is not a matter of breaking down the factual reality into symbolism which is inconsistent, but rather of looking for the theological intentions of those revealing these mysteries to us by providing us with facts we can apprehend with our senses and signs appropriate to our incarnate spirit. Roguet, *Initiation to the Gospel*, 187, 1973

By subtly using the doubt-engendering words of apostate theologians and their scriptural translations, non-Christian authors powerfully hinder the progress of the gospel. This hindrance to our missionary endeavors has scarcely received attention in the West. But for those who are on the cutting edge of the worldwide commission, it is significant. The time surely has come for God's people to take a stand against perverted scriptural versions.

Chapter 28

The Defense of Modern Translations

One of the strongest defenses of modern translations, especially the New International Version (NIV), has been made by the Canadian, Dr. D.A. Carson, in his 1977 work, *King James Version Debate—A Plea for Realism*, Baker Book House. Even those who, like the authors, are firmly convinced that the King James Version is still the most reliable English translation of the Bible, are indebted to scholars like Dr. Carson for making them aware of the weakness of some arguments presented by overeager defenders of the King James Version.

Dr. Carson with detailed care points out that no two manuscripts are identical, and that the age of a manuscript is not final proof that it is more accurate (though later in his book he does seem to give great emphasis to the likely superiority of older manuscripts). Neither can we always trust the majority reading of any text or passage. Dr. Carson details the way intentional and unintentional errors have crept into the manuscripts. Usually substantial changes, such as the effort of Marcion in the second

century to delete all references to Jesus' Jewish background, have not been difficult to detect. Marcion attempted to dissociate Christianity from the Jews, who were then under fearful persecution by the Roman Empire.

It is significant that when Erasmus put out his Diaglot (Greek and Latin translation) it varied significantly from the Catholic Vulgate of Jerome. Erasmus' second edition formed the basis of Luther's German translation and it became the basis of almost all of the Protestant translations of Europe in the sixteenth century.

Unfortunately, Carson failed to acknowledge the tremendous thrust that translations based upon Erasmus' Greek text gave to the Reformation. Though Erasmus did not renounce the Roman Catholic Church, there is no doubt he hoped his text would foreshadow sweeping reforms within that church. Such reforms did not eventuate, and the Latin Vulgate continued to dominate Catholic thinking. Unfortunately, Carson spends considerable space detailing how Erasmus had to resort to the use of the Vulgate for the final six verses of Revelation since these verses were missing from the Greek manuscripts he was using. Carson also enters into lengthy arguments on Erasmus' inclusion of 1 John 5:7-8. While both these issues are worthy of review, they are presented in a way that casts unnecessary doubts upon the *Textus Receptus*. That term was coined in 1624 to express that it was the standard text of the era. In reality, it was almost identical to the Erasmus text of the previous century.

Though Carson does not indicate it, the leaders of the Protestant Reformation certainly saw in the Erasmus text, or the *Textus Receptus*, a presentation of scriptural purity that had been missing from the Latin Vulgate. Therefore all over Europe the translations of that text were used in the preparation of the Protestant Bibles, which differed markedly from the Catholic Bible of the Latin Vulgate and the later vernacular translations by Catholic scholars. It is only in recent years, with the rise of the ecumenical movement, that many Protestant scholars have sought the Alexandrian (Western) text in preference to the Byzantine (Eastern) text. We could not detect any substantive evidence presented by Carson to verify his claim that the Alexandrian text is superior to that of the Byzantine tradition, except that a few remaining manuscripts are earlier in origin. And on his own testimony, the age of a manuscript is not decisive in determining accuracy.

Carson presents fourteen theses to defend his viewpoint. His third thesis is that the Byzantine text type is demonstrably a secondary text. He bases this assertion upon the greater harmonization of the synoptic gospels (the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke) in the Byzantine text than in the Alexandrian-type text. We do not contest that there is harmony of the gospels in the Byzantine text, but we deny that his thesis is thereby strengthened. Yet this argument is set forth as one of the strongest. Of course, such an argument does nothing to injure the doctrinal truth of the gospels.

Another argument presented by Carson is that the famous Papyrus P75, dating from about A.D. 200, is very close to the Codex Sinaiticus. He claims that this correspondence suggests an early dating of the Alexandrian text.

The ultimate thesis set forth by Carson seems to develop in his chapter on nontextual questions. It is evident that he has a preference for the New International Version. He argues that the King James Version is too insensitive to English idiom. This insensitivity, he says, leads to awkward English. The King James Version, he further states, gets into difficulty trying to translate Greek imperfect verbs into English imperfect verbs, and is too literal at other points as well. This awkwardness he says is

minimized in the New International Version. However, we are willing to accept a little awkwardness, if by so doing we have greater accuracy.

In his book Carson states:

Some modern translations tend toward the heretical by virtue of the fourth of the presuppositions that govern the translations. D.A. Carson, *op. cit.*, 65

Perhaps Carson has not recognized that the New International Version is certainly guilty of this tendency, independent of the merits of the manuscripts used in its translation. Unwittingly he has attested to this fact when he says of the awkwardness of the King James translation:

This is one of the errors that the translators of the New International Version, all of whom were selected because of both their scholarship and their *evangelical commitment*, seek to minimize. *Ibid.*, 89, emphasis supplied

This thesis we hold strongly. The New International Version reflects the biases of evangelical translators, just as the Douay reflects Catholic bias.

Perhaps most surprising is that Carson provides not one substantive doctrinal issue that is presented erroneously in the King James Version. If he is aware of them, he certainly chose to refrain from their presentation. Admittedly, he states that he is presenting only a few examples, but we wonder why he does not present such important defects if they exist. Carson asserts:

The onus of proof, in my view, still rests with the defenders of the Byzantine tradition. *Ibid.*, 111

We wonder why. Surely any significant change from a 350-year Protestant tradition should rest on the one *urging the change*. We agree that tradition is meaningless in itself, but surely substantive evidence is required to support a case for change.

Of course most of the New Testament is already textually certain; and as I have already argued, the remaining variations may affect the interpretation of various passages, but they do not affect a single doctrine. *Ibid.*, 119

In this assertion, Carson is demonstrably in error. In various passages the disputed readings do weaken the testimony of Scripture in defense of the divinity of Christ, the investigative judgment, the state of the dead, the doctrine of the Lord's supper, and the mediatorial work of Christ. In view of this fact, we question Carson's strong support of the New International Version, which seeks, by interpretive translation, to support the evangelical concept in such areas as Augustine's doctrine of original sin (Psalm 51:5), and immediate life after death (2 Peter 2:9), and in the other various doctrines (see chapter 17, *Subtle Catholicism*). These are substantial doctrinal aberrations that have their roots in the infiltration of pagan doctrines into the early Christian church.

Our major disappointment is that Carson either fails to address, or addresses with only passing reference, many important issues. He does not address, for example, the well over 3,000 differences between the Codex Vaticanus, and the Codex Sinaiticus upon which so much of the Westcott-Hort Greek text is established. Neither does Carson address the numerous missing words, phrases, and passages in the Codex Vaticanus. Neither does he address the numerous "corrections" and changes made by twenty or thirty scribes over a period of half a millennium within the Codex Sinaiticus.

Carson emphasizes that no Byzantine-type text has been discovered which can be dated before A.D. 350. We are sure he does not believe that it had no origin before this date; it must have come from somewhere. There are also very, very few Western and Alexandrian texts from before this time, and for the next three or four centuries there are few of the Byzantine texts that are now known. Why not acknowledge that there may be some earlier Byzantine texts that are waiting to be discovered? Surely we have not found all that are hidden in some remote building, or archeological area, yet to be uncovered.

Carson makes much of the invalidity of arguments as to why we have no Byzantine texts earlier than A.D. 350. Let us suggest a probability. Carson correctly points out that after the fourth century, Greek almost vanished as a spoken (or read) language in the Western Roman Empire. Therefore it would be logical to assume that with Jerome's Latin Vulgate dominating the educational institutions, this translation was copied over and over again by copyists. Thus the Greek manuscripts in the West all but disappeared. Given this reality, demonstrated by the very few Greek manuscripts discovered in the West from later periods of history, we would logically expect that Western scholars would be more likely to preserve the tattered and torn copies of the earlier Greek New Testament, since preparation of new copies had fallen into abeyance. Further, since the Latin Vulgate became the standard Scripture of the West, older copies of the Greek manuscripts held there were less likely to be read and thus destroyed by constant use. However, in the Eastern Roman Empire, the situation was entirely different. For a half millennium after the fourth century, Greek continued to be a strongly active language. Thus, Greek New Testament manuscripts continued to be copied in significant numbers in the East. We can logically assume, with the much larger numbers of manuscripts available in the East, as is attested by the number that have been recovered, that old, tattered, and worn copies of the manuscripts would be far more likely to be discarded and destroyed. Also their constant use would ensure their rapid deterioration.

Carson asserts that the earlier church fathers quoted from the Western Alexandrian texts in their writings rather than from the Byzantine. We point out that those church fathers resided in the Western empire, not the Eastern. Further, there is increasing evidence now that the Byzantine text was very frequently used in the writings of the ante-Nicene period (before 340). This evidence is quite remarkable, since these men almost all resided in the West. Such a finding is powerful evidence for the validity of the Byzantine text.

Another strong concern expressed over the last century is the evidence of the Anglo-Catholic commitment of Westcott and Hort. This bias is confirmed in their own writings, and naturally leads to suspicion of the motives behind the translation of the Revised Version, which is the forerunner of virtually all modern English translations, and not a few in other languages. Faithful Protestants are hardly comforted by the reported statements of the distaste of Westcott and Hort for the King James Version. Carson surprisingly does not address this issue.

We are also disappointed that Carson does not seriously compare exact equivalence, versus dynamic equivalence, in translation. We assume that he does not believe the King James Version or any other translations use exact equivalence, for he says it ought to be obvious that to some extent *every* translation, from *anywhere* on the spectrum, was necessarily involved again and again with finding the "dynamic equivalent." In the perspective from which he was writing, his statement is true; but it

sidesteps the real issue. The Hebrew language has been judged to be one of the most "concrete" languages in the world, and even the writers of the New Testament, though writing in Greek, were writing with the mind-set of Hebrews. Therefore, many Hebrew phrases needed to be translated from the concrete to the abstract. Thus, the translators of the King James Version attempted to give the exact meaning of the original languages in an altogether different way from the liberties taken by most modern translators in the name of "dynamic equivalence."

As an attempt to discredit the King James Version of Scripture, Carson's book falls far short of its aim. He uses selective evidence, ignores difficult questions, fails to give weight to more substantial explanations of proven facts, and altogether provides no sound basis for his preference for the New International Version of the Bible.

Chapter 29

The Revised Version

In the second half of the nineteenth century, strident moves afoot in England aimed at a revision of the King James Version of Scripture. Since the resultant Revised Version became the model for virtually all the modern translations, it is worthy of our investigation.

While the King James Version was translated in an atmosphere of deep dedication to God and to His truth, and abhorrence of the apostasy promoted by the Roman Catholic Church, the motivation of the translators of the Revised Version was altogether different. In their unwearied efforts to restore the primacy of the papal faith in Britain through its educational institutions, the Jesuits did not overlook the institution which epitomized English educational excellence—the University of Oxford. Indeed Dr. Desanctis asserted that there were

a greater number of Jesuits [in Britain] than in Italy. Desanctis, *Popery and Jesuitism in Rome*, 128, quoted in Walsh, *Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, 33

Since Dr. Desanctis had held the position of professor of Theology in Rome and official Theological Censor of the Inquisition and was himself a member of the Jesuit order before converting to Protestantism, we can give credence to his report. Indeed the same author claimed:

There are Jesuits in all classes of society: in Parliament, among the English clergy, among the Protestant laity, even in the higher stations. Ibid.

So successful were these Jesuit infiltrators that in the middle of the nineteenth century, the entire ecclesiastical history of Britain was revised. In his insightful work, the historian J.A. Froude related his own experiences during this period at the University of Oxford:

In my first term at the University, the controversial fires were beginning to blaze. . . . I had learnt, like other Protestant children, that the Pope was Antichrist, and that Gregory VII had been a special revelation of that being. I was now taught that Gregory VII was a saint. I had been told to honour the Reformers. The Reformation became a great schism, Cranmer a traitor, and Latimer a vulgar ranter.

Milton was a name of horror. J.A.Froude, *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, 161, 167, quoted in B.G. Wilkinson, *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, 123

Since Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, and Hugh Latimer were martyred for their opposition to the Roman Catholic faith and Milton was one of the great Protestant poets, this alteration in historical perception by the University of Oxford was a matter of no minor importance. In terms of belief this change meant that while in 1833 Anglicans in Britain believed that the Reformation was the work of God, that the pope was antichrist, and that the celebration of the Mass was satanic, a mere half-century later most Anglicans saw the Reformation as rebellion and the pope as the true successor of the apostles, while many participated in the services of the Mass.

Precisely one hundred years before our birth, the Oxford movement commenced. J.H. Newman was the leading founder of this movement. Newman had entered the University of Oxford as an Evangelical Christian but already the Jesuit influence was so strong that his professors, particularly Hawkins, the provost of Oriel College in Oxford, were teaching that the Bible must be interpreted in the light of tradition. Newman graduated from Oxford University with his Bachelor of Arts degree, and in 1823 was elected a fellow of Oriel College. As a fellow of Oriel College, Newman fell under the influence of numerous persons purporting to belong to the Church of England, but possessing a strong anti-Protestant and anti-Evangelical bias.

In 1833 Newman made a tour of Europe, making Rome his principal destination. While there, he sent a message to the pope requesting details of the terms upon which the Church of England could be accepted by the Church of Rome. The answer he received was that the Church of England must accept the findings of the Council of Trent. That Council, which had been called to counter the spread of Protestantism, had uplifted tradition and had devised plans to destroy the influence of the Protestant Reformation. It was while travelling back by boat from Rome that Newman wrote the words:

Lead, Kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom,

Lead thou me on!

The night is dark and I am far from home;

Lead thou me on!

Keep thou my feet; I do not ask to see

The distant scene;

One step's enough for me.

When one understands the circumstances in which Newman, who later professed the Catholic faith, and was promoted to the rank of cardinal without ever so much as being consecrated a bishop, much less an archbishop, it does reduce one's appreciation of this hymn.

Upon his return, Newman commenced the Oxford movement. This movement was not consciously organized in 1833. But Newman wrote a series of tracts, as did others, and shortly the Association of Friends of the Church was formed. This secretive society formed the powerful impetus for the Oxford movement. Newman's thinking was well expressed in 1841 when he wrote:

Only through the English church can you act upon the English nation. I wish, of course, our Church should be consolidated, with and through and in your communion, for its sake, and your sake, and for the sake of unity. Newman, *Apologia*, 225, quoted in *ibid.*, 129

Since this letter was addressed to a Roman Catholic, its intent cannot be mistaken. So perverted had become the thinking of these treacherous members of the Church of England that they described Protestantism as antichrist. One of Newman's associates in the Oxford movement, F.W. Faber, wrote:

Protestantism is perishing: what is good in it is by God's mercy being gathered into the garners of Rome. . . . My whole life, God willing, shall be one crusade against the detestable and diabolical heresy of Protestantism. G.E. Bowden, *Life of S.W. Faber*, 192, quoted in *ibid.*

Newman gave the date July 14, 1833, as the date of the beginning of the Oxford movement. Perhaps it is of no significance, but that date was the forty-fourth anniversary of the storming of the Bastille in Paris, the event which activated the French Revolution. The Oxford movement commenced a revolution of another order, one no more honorable.

Faber made a visit to Rome in 1843. There he visited the church of St. John Lateran on the Thursday before Easter. His report indicates just how consumed he was by Catholicism, despite still claiming membership in the Church of England.

I got close to the altar, inside the Swiss Guards, and when Pope Gregory descended from his throne, and knelt at the foot of the altar, and we all knelt with him, it was a scene more touching than I had ever seen before. . . . That old man in white, prostrate before the uplifted Body of the Lord, and the dead, dead silence—Oh, what a sight it was! . . . On leaving St. John's by the great western door, the immense piazza [square] was full of people; . . . and in spite of the noonday sun, I bared my head and knelt with the people, and received with joy the Holy Father's blessing until he fell back on his throne and was borne away. Bowden, *Life of S.W. Faber*, 193, quoted in *ibid.*, 131

In October 1850, a very significant event occurred in England. For the first time since the Reformation, a Roman Catholic hierarchy was created with Cardinal Wiseman appointed as the primate of England and archbishop of Westminster. In addition twelve other bishoprics were established. There was still sufficient Protestant sentiment in England for an explosion of wrath which shook the cities of England. The cry went out from villages, towns, and cities, "No popery!" In the city of Salisbury, in the county of Wiltshire, where the famous Salisbury Cathedral is situated, effigies of the pope, Cardinal Wiseman, and the twelve bishops were burnt in protest.

However, despite all this evidence of anti-Catholic sentiment, the continued training of Anglican (Church of England) priests in Anglo-Catholicism had its undoubted effects. Dramatic alterations in the Anglican faith ensued. It is upon this matter that all Protestants need be warned, for one hundred years later, precisely the same method is being used to weaken the faith of all Christians. As young pastors are trained today in a large number of colleges and seminaries they are learning doctrines more akin to the beliefs of Catholicism than of Protestantism, resulting in a rapid decline in faith and principle within Protestantism.

It was in 1870, in this Anglo-Catholic atmosphere dominated by clergymen influenced by the Oxford movement and with a desire for unity with Rome, that the southern communion of the Church of England decided to revise the King James Version of Scripture. It is vital for those who have been

seduced into using the new translations of Scripture as their basic Bibles to understand the fundamental texts upon which those Scriptures have been prepared, and the purpose for which they have been designed. It was in these circumstances that two theological professors, purporting to be members of the Church of England, dominated the revision commenced in 1870. These men were Doctors Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort. Westcott later became bishop of Durham, the fourth ranking bishop of the Anglican Church in England. That these men were fully influenced by the Oxford movement and were more Catholic than Anglican in their outlook can easily be demonstrated from their writings. At the time of his graduation with his Bachelor of Arts degree in 1847, Westcott had feared that he would have to sign belief in the 39 articles of faith of the Anglican Church, for he no longer assented to them. Both men were great believers in Mary worship. As we have previously noted, Professor Hort on one occasion wrote,

I have been persuaded for many years that Mary-worship and 'Jesus'-worship have very much in common in their causes and their result. *Life of Hort*, vol. II, 49, quoted in *ibid.*, 152

This letter interestingly was addressed to Westcott. Westcott on another occasion, as we have seen, told how he knelt for a considerable period of time in front of a statue of Mary.

After leaving the monastery, we shaped our course to a little oratory which we discovered on the summit of a neighboring hill. . . . Fortunately, we found the door open. It is very small, with one kneeling-place; and behind a screen was a "Pieta" the size of life [that is, a life-size statue of Mary and the dead Christ]. . . . Had I been alone I could have knelt there for hours. Letter written by Westcott to his fiancée in 1847, recorded in *Life of Westcott*, vol. 1, 81, quoted in *ibid.*

Thus Doctors Westcott and Hort were both prepared and motivated to influence the translation committee toward the utilization of the corrupted Western manuscripts of the New Testament promoted by the Roman Catholic Church and the Jesuits in their effort to destabilize Protestantism.

Previous to the commencement of the revision, Westcott and Hort colluded to produce alterations consistent with Roman Catholic desires. Writing on May 28, 1870, to Hort, Westcott stated:

Your note came with one from Ellicott this morning. . . . Though I think that Convocation [the Southern Convocation of the Church of England] is not competent to initiate such a measure [the revision of the Bible], yet I feel that as "we three" are together it would be wrong not to "make the best of it" as Lightfoot says. . . . there is some hope that alternative readings might find a place in the margin. *Life of Westcott*, vol. 1, 390, quoted in *ibid.*, 159

It will be seen that Westcott's ambitions were less than the complete revision of Scripture at this point. Nevertheless he was to find, along with Hort, the opportunity for a total capitulation to the Roman Catholic manuscripts as the translation progressed.

On July 1, 1870, Westcott wrote to Hort again stating:

The Revision on the whole surprised me by prospects of hope. I suggested to Ellicott a plan of tabulating and circulating emendations before our meeting which may in the end prove valuable. *Life of Westcott*, vol. 1, 391, quoted in *ibid.*

Perhaps Dr. Hort's letter to one of his friends, Dr. Rowland Williams, exposed the greatest testimony to the cunning design of these translators:

The errors and prejudices, which we agree in wishing to remove, can surely be more wholesomely and also more effectually reached by individual efforts of an indirect kind than by combined open assault. At present very many orthodox but rational men are being unawares acted on by influences which will assuredly bear good fruit in due time, if the process is allowed to go on quietly; and I cannot help fearing that a premature crisis would frighten back many into the merest traditionalism. *Life of Hort*, vol. 1, 400, quoted in *ibid.*, 160

Thus it can be seen that Hort was determined to achieve, through subtlety and artifice, that which he could not openly achieve.

The announcement that there would be a new translation of Scripture undertaken was met with much skepticism from devout English Christians. Archbishop Trench, the archbishop of Canterbury, recognized this fact. While the committee of translators was authorized only to alter proven errors and archaic terms in the King James Version, nevertheless they completely overstepped the mandate and substituted the corrupted Western Greek manuscripts for the pure manuscripts of the Eastern stream. Even the chairman of the New Testament Revision Committee, an ardent advocate of the revision, Bishop Ellicott, was constrained to admit:

Even critical editors of the stamp of Tischendorf have apparently not acquired even a rudimentary knowledge of several of the leading versions which they conspicuously quote. Nay, more, in many instances they have positively misrepresented the very readings which they have followed, and have allowed themselves to be misled by Latin translations which, as my note will testify, are often sadly, and even perversely, incorrect. Dr. Bissell, *Origin of the Bible*, 357, quoted in *ibid.*, 163

This relative ignorance of the manuscripts must be contrasted with the fundamental knowledge of the translators of the King James Version, who translated that version at a time when Greek and Hebrew scholarship was at its zenith.

Most Protestants who are now influenced to use new versions of Scripture need to stop and understand the whole basis upon which these translations have been prepared. If we wish to follow translations favorable to Catholic doctrine, then we may continue to study from the New International Version, the Revised Standard Version, the Jerusalem Bible, the New English Version, Today's English Version, the American Standard version, and other equally faulted modern translations. Now is not a time to listen to our college professors on this matter. Almost without exception, even the most conservative are using versions such as the Revised Standard Version, unaware that in doing so they are uplifting the Bible so precious to the Roman Catholics. Such are preparing themselves and the lay people in the pews for the day, soon to come, when Catholicism will persecute those who refuse its evil dictates. We appeal to our church leaders to study this matter aright; to give the lead in upholding the wonderful Scriptures as prepared by the translators of the King James Version. Now is not the time to weaken our people's faith in any way, and we, as ministers of the gospel, must warn of the enormous dangers to faith and practice inherent in the common use of these faulted versions.

It seems that many do not know that the translations undertaken at the time of the Reformation were performed under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Such cannot be stated of the Revised Version, where men who were deliberately destroying the Protestant faith were the chief spokesmen for the translators.

Chapter 30

A Mutilated New Testament

Few readers of God's Word have the least notion of the differences between the Greek manuscripts on which almost all modern versions of Scripture are based and those used in the translation of the King James Version. That the two manuscripts, the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Vaticanus, contain not only deliberate alterations but are also the product of extremely careless copyists cannot be denied. Yet it is these two faulty manuscripts upon which so much weight is placed by the recent translators of Scripture. When the New International Version states in reference to Mark 16:9-20 that they fail to mention both that hundreds of carefully copied manuscripts do indeed contain these words, and that in the Codex Vaticanus, the space for these verses is very clearly left, indicating a careless omission.

[The two most reliable early manuscripts do not have Mark 16:9-20.] NIV, 1978

[The most reliable early manuscripts and other ancient witnesses do not have Mark 16:9-20.] NIV, 1984

Not only are the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Vaticanus riddled with careless omissions and numerous spelling mistakes, but they also include such spurious books as the Apocrypha, Bel and the Dragon, and the Epistle of Barnabas.

Dr. Dobbin has estimated a total of 2,556 words or clauses omitted from the Codex Vaticanus New Testament alone.^{[1](#)} Not all these omissions are reflected in the modern translations. For instance, the Book of Revelation is totally omitted from the Codex Vaticanus, but has been preserved in the new translations.

Nevertheless numerous omissions are reflected in the new translations.^{[2](#)} The Gideon's edition of the New International Version has attempted to cover up these disgraceful omissions by inserting translations from other texts, using square brackets to indicate that they do not belong to the original manuscripts.

Let us examine some of the great truths that have been totally omitted from the New International Version. These include:

For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost. Matthew 18:11

This beautiful passage would be lost to God's people if versions based upon these corrupt manuscripts were accepted.^{[3](#)} So too would be Christ's stinging denunciation of meanness to the needy:^{[4](#)}

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore, ye shall receive the greater damnation. Matthew 23:14

Perhaps a church which demands penance and offerings for the dead from poor widows, could not tolerate such straight testimony.

Let us examine a further omission from the New International Version .

But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses. Mark 11:26

This emphatic truth, the very words of Jesus, has been deleted. Perhaps it suits the Roman Church since the passage does not accord with the Roman Catholic doctrine that priests have the right to forgive sin. Roman Catholics still deny that God directly forgives our sins.

No Forgiveness "Directly from God," Pope Says. Headline, *Los Angeles Times*, December 12, 1984

Mark sought to emphasize Christ's fulfillment of prophecy when, after describing Christ's crucifixion between two thieves, he quoted from Isaiah 53:12. This important confirmation of Christ's fulfillment of prophecy finds no place in the text of the New International Version.

And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors. Mark 15:28

A portion of the story of the healing of the infirm man by the pool of Bethesda is omitted (John 5:4). The affirmation of belief in Jesus by the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8:37) is deleted, as is the complaint of the Jewish leaders that the chief captain, Lysias, rescued Paul from their hands (Acts 24:7). These are simply a few instances when entire verses have been deleted from Scripture.

In only one case does the New International Version seek to cover a loss of Scripture by dividing one verse in two to preserve the correct numbering of verses. This version omits 1 John 5:7 but divides verse 8 into two to provide a seventh verse. In all other cases the verse is entirely omitted and can be found only as a footnote, indicating that it is not a true portion of Scripture.

In addition, no fewer than 180 phrases and clauses, many of them significant, are missing in the New International Version. Ask someone to repeat the Lord's prayer as rendered by this version of Scripture. If he should be able to do so, and it is doubtful, you will note that the following is not in his recitation:

For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen. Matthew 6:13

Once again the impact of Christ's fulfillment of prophecy is not in this modern version. Quoting David's prophecy from Psalm 22:18, Matthew asserted:

. . . that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots. Matthew 27:35

Yet the New International Version sees fit to omit this fact.

According to this version, when Christ was tempted by the devil, Luke did not record Christ's words:

Get thee behind me, Satan. Luke 4:8

On occasions these omissions have been used with telling effect to destroy Bible truth. Those who minimize the meaning of the term *in Christ* to that of an empty affirmation of belief are delighted to quote the following verse:

Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus. Romans 8:1, NIV

Diligent students of the Bible will recognize that a vital explanatory clause has been omitted at the conclusion of this verse:

who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. Romans 8:1, KJV

Furthermore, this text places an entirely different complexion upon one's understanding of the preceding verses of Romans 7.

According to the New International Version, the following advice to a bishop is not found in Scripture:

Not greedy of filthy lucre. 1 Timothy 3:3

The history of the greed of the Papacy may provide a reason for this omission. Nor is Christ's assertion:

I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last. Revelation 1:11

to be found in the New International Version.

In the grand declaration of victories obtained over the beast and his image and the number of his name, the victory "over his mark" (Revelation 15:2) escapes mention.

These serve simply as a few examples of the mass destruction of Scripture in modern versions. The avid student of the Word may study further by reference to Appendix B.

For some curious reason the name of the Lord is omitted on 173 occasions. *Jesus* is deleted on 38, *Christ* on 43, *Lord* on 35, *God* on 31, and other names on 26 occasions.

Perhaps even more startling are the 229 instances where differences in meaning have been expressed without any omission. Compare the following texts as examples:

Matthew 19:17

And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? KJV

Why do you ask me about what is good? Jesus replied. NIV

Acts 3:20

And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you. KJV

And that he may send the Christ, who has been appointed for you—even Jesus. NIV

1 Corinthians 7:38

So then he that giveth her in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better. KJV

So then, he who marries the virgin does right, but he who does not marry her does even better. NIV

James 3:12

So can no fountain both yield salt water and fresh. KJV

Neither can a salt spring produce fresh water. NIV

2 Peter 2:9

And to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished. KJV

And to hold the unrighteous for the day of judgment, while continuing their punishment. NIV
Revelation 8:13

And I beheld, and heard an angel flying through the midst of heaven. KJV

As I watched, I heard an eagle that was flying in midair call out in a loud voice. NIV

Revelation 22:14

Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. KJV

Blessed are those who wash their robes, that they may have the right to the tree of life and may go through the gates into the city. NIV

Psalms 51:5

Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me. KJV

Surely I have been a sinner from birth, sinful from the time my mother conceived me. NIV (1978)

Surely I was sinful at birth, sinful from the time my mother conceived me. NIV (1984)

This bias in translating discloses a calculated effort to insinuate the Roman Catholic doctrine of original sin into Scripture.

Job 21:30

That the wicked is reserved to the day of destruction? they shall be brought forth to the day of wrath. KJV

That the evil man is spared from the day of calamity, that he is delivered from the day of wrath. NIV

In this chapter, we have only introduced the subject of scriptural mutilation. The many thousands of alterations cannot be fully documented in this book. But God's people need to be aware that massive destruction and alteration of God's precious Word has been foisted upon Christians in the guise of the use of modern English language. The desirable use of contemporary English must not be achieved at the incalculable expense of Bible purity.

1 Scrivener, vol. 1, 120 <[BACK](#)>

2 See Appendices A, B <[BACK](#)>

3 A similar text appears in Luke 19:10 <[BACK](#)>

4 Also quoted in Mark 12:40, Luke 20:47. However the omission from Matthew reduces the compatibility of the gospels. <[BACK](#)>

Chapter 31

The Milieu of the Revised Standard Version

On occasion it is enlightening to analyze the circumstances surrounding the publication of a book, for it reveals the purpose of its presentation. In 1954, the World Council of Churches held its great convention in the Chicago suburb of Evanston. At that convention five slogans were in evidence. These slogans, which included reference to the Revised Standard Version, at that time only recently published, tell much of the spirit in that version.^{[1](#)}

- ☐ 1. Do not call us a council of denominations, for we were born to destroy denominations.
- ☐ 2. We intend to take over the foreign mission work of all denominations.
- ☐ 3. We propose to use this new Revised Standard Version, which is our child, to be our constitution and atomic bomb to bring all other Bibles throughout the world in harmony with it.
- ☐ 4. We are going to build long plans for a bigger and better world.
- ☐ 5. There is only one divine service left—none like it was ever conceived in time elsewhere—to lift the human race up in reverence to God. That is the sacrifice of the Mass.

These slogans are quite a revelation, and merit closer examination. Each one in its own way is threatening to humble souls who wish to avoid the religious intolerance and coercion of former years. The first would force all Christians into a single world church; the second would prevent the full spread of the gospel; the third would foist a faulty Scripture upon all Christians; the fourth implies religious interference in the political sphere, thus introducing a perilous breach in the separation of church and state, the one principle which has given religious freedom to mankind; and the fifth would utterly destroy the very foundations of Protestantism by restoring us to the tyranny and blasphemy of the Mass. In past generations, thousands suffered martyrdom rather than to yield to such practices.

Such is the unpromising milieu surrounding the presentation of the Revised Standard Version of Scripture. It cannot be denied that it was produced to support the cause of ecumenism and the unsanctified aims of the World Council of Churches. It is thus not mere coincidence that the use of the Revised Standard Version and like translations has been accompanied by a blurring of the distinction between Protestantism and Catholicism. We live in an era when the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury feels free to call for a Christian Church led by the pope (*Singapore Straits Times*, October 3, 1989); scholars in the Southern Baptist Church claim that they share one Lord, one faith, one baptism with Roman Catholics (Williamson *Daily News*, August 26, 1989); and Lutherans find that they can join with Roman Catholics in united aims (Minneapolis *Star Tribune*). Yet in all these churches are faithful men and women who will not yield their faith, nor compromise doctrine. They are not blinded by current ecumenical propaganda nor are they willingly ignorant of religious history. Yet Scripture has perceptively foretold the day, which we believe is imminent, when all but God's elect will accept papal dominance once more.

And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Revelation 13:8

This prophecy, of course, received a limited fulfillment in Europe during the Dark Ages. But here is foretold a worldwide return to the blighted conditions prevailing in Europe when the Papacy controlled the destiny of an entire continent. That history should be re-read, for the World Council of Churches is committed to a return to those conditions. And it was as an instrument to achieve such a state of affairs that the Revised Standard Version was prepared. Clearly it was designed to be the lone source of scriptural testimony in the modern era in a manner similar to the supremacy of the Latin Vulgate in the former era. Since it was based upon corrupted manuscripts similar to those used by Jerome in his preparation of the Latin Vulgate, the analogy is close.

Just as the era of the Latin Vulgate led to the virtual abandonment of Bible study and the acceptance of the voice of the church in its place as the authoritative Word of God, even so do we already discern a great falling away from scriptural study and a trend toward compliance with the word of fallible man.

We mentioned that the slogans of the 1954 Evanston World Council of Churches Meeting possessed a tyrannical flavor. We have also noted that such an attitude contributed to the dominance of another corrupted version of Scripture, the Latin Vulgate. We should therefore not be surprised to learn that the return road to Rome will embolden persecutors of nonconformists just as surely as it did in former times, for God has stated, referring to the time when all the unconverted will worship the Papacy, that

It was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. Revelation 13:7

Once again this prophecy was partially fulfilled on the continent of Europe during the medieval rule of the Papacy, but looks to a day beyond, where such persecution will be worldwide and will reach to the remotest corners of the earth.

The same persecution is referred to in Revelation 17.

These shall make war with the Lamb. Revelation 17:14

But in this passage of Scripture the ultimate triumph of our God is revealed.

And the Lamb shall overcome them: for he is Lord of lords and King of kings: and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful. Revelation 17:14

We thank God for this promise of the ultimate triumph of our God, His people, and His Word.

If any wish to follow the return pathway to Rome, and desire deprivation of their God-endowed right to follow the faith of their personal conviction, and wish no freedom in foreign missionary work, and care not if Scripture is corrupted, and desire a union of church and state, and would happily participate in the celebration of the Mass, then manifestly the Revised Standard Version is perfectly designed to serve these wishes.

But for true-hearted men and women who cherish their freedom in the Lord, who wish to witness wherever the Holy Spirit leads them, who fervently desire to study only the unadulterated words of Scripture, who uphold the principle of the separation of church and state as a bastion against violation of the consciences of men, and who humbly partake of the simple emblems of Christ's broken body and His shed blood, unperturbed by the priestly fantasy of their ability to create the very body and blood of Jesus Christ, the Revised Standard Version will find no place in their hearts, nor will it be accepted as the authoritative Word of God.

[1](#) Reported in a letter to friends written September 21, 1954, by Dr. B.G.Wilkinson who attended the meetings in Evanston. [<BACK>](#)

Chapter 32

The New Revised Standard Version

This version was published in 1989, thirty-seven years after the publication of the original Revised Standard Version. G.W. and D.E. Anderson have concluded:

As with most modern translations, in the scholars' desire to improve the previous translations the end result produces more problems than it solves. This is very true of the New Revised Standard Version. Although it is more readable than the New American Standard version, and more accurate than the New International Version, it still falls short of what makes a translation great, long-lasting, and God-honouring. Thus we cannot recommend this translation for those Christian people who desire to understand God's Word. G.W. and D.E. Anderson, "The New Revised Standard Version," *Trinitarian Bible Society Quarterly Record*, Jan-Mar, 1991, 21

This translation has followed the current fad of translators in desiring to eliminate "sexist" language. It seems difficult for men and women today to comprehend the nature of the English language. Many do not understand that some "masculine" words depend upon context for meaning. In some contexts they are exclusive in their reference to those of the male sex. In other contexts the words refer to all humans, irrespective of sex. There is nothing degrading to either men or women in this linguistic arrangement. Many other English words have more than one meaning, and it causes no offense. Let us take the word *house* as an example. Manifestly it means an inanimate structure in the context "He built a brick house." But in the context, "Queen Elizabeth II belongs to the House of Windsor," the same word refers to her family. Yet no one asserts that it degrades the humanity of the Queen's family to use a word which is also used for an inanimate object. We all accept that context can markedly alter the meaning of many words. We hear no protests from men when the pronoun *she* is used in relation to a country or ship.

It must be understood that just like the English language, the Greek also lacks a common singular pronoun including both sexes, and Hebrew is more deficient in this respect, for it does not contain such a neuter pronoun. Thus when "sexist" pronouns are translated in this new manner not only are we doing violence to the English language for no good purpose, but also to the Greek. As the Andersons have written:

The biggest problem with the New Revised Standard Version's gender-inclusive language, however, is that it is not what is found in the original language manuscripts. The fact that the words God inspired are masculine-oriented cannot be escaped; nor can the idea that, if not for the women's movement in the 1970s and the resultant desire of women to abandon their God-given positions in life, there would be no argument for gender-inclusive language in the Scriptures. The question arises: Must God's Word be changed to adapt to culture? And if so, how far will those changes go? *Ibid.*, 17

Yet despite the logic of this viewpoint, it has been stated in reference to this new translation:

Masculine-oriented language should be eliminated as far as this can be done without altering passages that reflect the historical situation of ancient patriarchal culture. Bruce Metzger, New Revised Standard Version, xiii

Thus the statement quoted by Christ from the Pentateuch has been altered:

Man doth not live by bread only. Deuteronomy 8:3, KJV

One does not live by bread alone. Deuteronomy 8:3, NRSV

The impact of Christ's words when asked to judge between a man and his brother is needlessly weakened. When Jesus replied He posed the question:

Man, who made me a judge or a divider over thee? Luke 12:14, KJV

The New Revised Standard Version substitutes the word *Friend* for *Man*. Yet clearly Christ was addressing a man and there was absolutely no logic in altering the plain sense. Surely men are still entitled to be called *Man*.

In the Old Testament the translators have followed a perilous course. Most students of God's Word are aware that in the spelling of Hebrew words only consonants are utilized. This fact has given cause for difficulty. By way of illustration, let us examine such a spelling technique if used in English. If we spelled a word as *ct* it could equally refer to *cat*, *cot* or *cut*. Of course, in practice there would rarely be any difficulty, for the context would make the meaning evident. In the sentence, "I ct my hair," no one would misunderstand that *ct* referred to any word but *cut*. Similarly the sentence, "The mother placed her baby in its ct" would cause no difficulty.

But there are occasional difficulties where context does not suffice. We illustrate: "My *ht* was destroyed." Does *ht* in this sentence refer to *hat* or *hut*? The context does not provide a clear-ct answer.

For this reason, Masoretes between the sixth and the eighth centuries, Christian Era, added vowel points based upon centuries-old traditions, passed from generation to generation by the oral reading of the scriptural scrolls in the synagogues. These are accepted as highly accurate. Yet the translators of the New Revised Standard Version have adopted a policy in which

the vowel signs, which were added by the Masoretes, are accepted in the main, but where a more probable and convincing reading can be obtained by assuming different vowels, this has been done. No notes are given in such cases, because the vowel points are less ancient and reliable than the consonants. Bruce Metzger, op. cit., xiii

Even some of the consonants have been changed.

Departures from the consonantal text of the best manuscripts have been made only where it seems clear that errors in copying had been made before the text was standardized.

Examples of this type of alteration is seen in Genesis 21:9, where Ishmael's mocking of Isaac is changed to playing with him; and in 2 Samuel 18:27, where David's recorded slaying of 200 Philistines is reduced to 100.

A matter of more concern is the use of Apocryphal statements within the text of the canon of Scripture. It occurs in the book of Ezra, and in one instance in the book of Nehemiah, where readings

from the first book of Esdras in the Apocrypha are inserted. Thus on the basis of 1 Esdras 9:2, Ezra 10:6 is altered:

and when he came thither . . . Ezra 10:6, KJV

where he spent the night . . . Ezra 10:6, NRSV

and in Ezra 2:70 is added

lived in Jerusalem and its vicinity. Ezra 2:70, NRSV,

on the basis of these words in 1 Esdras 5:46. Thus by subtle means, the noncanonical books of the Apocrypha are entering the Holy Scriptures.

Perhaps the most serious shortcoming of the new version is that some changes have been made purely upon the conjectures of the translators without the support of a single example of manuscript evidence.

Occasionally it is evident that the text has suffered in transmission and that none of the versions provides a satisfactory restoration. Here we can only follow the best judgment of competent scholars as to the most probable reconstruction of the original text. Ibid.

On this basis Christ's eternity—from everlasting—is altered to

from ancient days . . . Micah 5:2, NRSV,

along with other unwarranted interference in Holy Writ.

We shall add little further concerning the New Testament, for the New Revised Standard Version follows most of the basic mistakes already cited concerning other modern translations. Suffice to say that Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, and Jewish scholars were included with Protestant translators in the work of translation. That they have produced such a faulted result is cause for no surprise.

Nor is there surprise that the New Testament translation is based upon the Greek text of the United Bible Societies, Third Edition Corrected. In Latin America, it is a translation based upon this text which the Roman Catholic Church sees as stemming the tide of Protestant advance (see chapter 24, entitled The Bible Societies).

Thus another new translation has been produced which does little service to the Christian faith and which is hailed by most apostate religions. It cannot be recommended for serious Bible study.

Chapter 33

The New English Bible

The New Testament portion of the New English Bible was issued in 1961 and the complete Bible in 1970.

This translation was conceived in 1946 when the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland produced a memorandum asserting that both the King James Version and the Revised Version contain archaic words and phrases and urged that a new translation using contemporary English idiom more faithfully expressing the underlying Greek be undertaken.

The translators consisted of representatives from the British and Foreign Bible Society, the National Bible Society of Scotland, and all major British Protestant denominations.

As we are fully accustomed to expect, the translators of the New Testament chose the corrupted manuscripts rather than the *Textus Receptus* as the basic Greek text for their translation. The translators also chose to include the Apocrypha in their translation, thus adding noncanonical writings to God's Holy Word. The overall director of the project, appointed in 1947, was Dr. C.H. Dodd, succeeded in 1965 by Professor Sir Godfrey Driver.

While this new translation received wide acclaim, its popularity among Christians has been less than that of the Revised Standard Version and the New International Version. Perhaps this represents more the marketing techniques in the United States and the greater interest in scriptural study here as compared with Great Britain, rather than an inferiority of translation.

Some have felt that the translators have utilized unseemly words in their translation. Thus words such as *intercourse* (Matthew 1:25, Romans 1:26), *breast* (Matthew 21:16), *prostitutes* (Matthew 21:31, 32; James 2:25), *pregnant* (Luke 2:6, Revelation 12:2), *perversion* (Romans 1:27, 1 Corinthians 6:9); *homosexual* (1 Corinthians 6:10) are thought to be too explicit. These terms, which formerly were entirely unacceptable, are used in what today sometimes passes for polite conversation. However, in its review of the New English Bible, the Trinitarian Bible Society does suggest that the use of such terms will make it unsuitable for use in Sunday Schools, Bible classes, and young people's associations.

We do not share this view. The terms are bound to be far more delicate than those used among unconverted associates of these young people. Furthermore, they do represent clarity in relation to the original Greek words. In an age when the "secrets" of conception and the knowledge of sexual perversion are veiled only from infants, the use of such words should not weigh against this Bible version.

However, in addition to the inherent defect of selection of faulted Greek manuscripts, there are a number of other matters warranting our attention.

This version includes a number of unfortunate colloquialisms which tend to lower the reader's regard for the sacredness of Scripture. Some examples, with their counterpart in the King James Version are cited below:

Have sweated the whole day long in the blazing sun! Matthew 20:12, NEB

Have borne the burden and heat of the day. Matthew 20:12, KJV

Tell her to come and lend a hand. Luke 10:40, NEB

Bid her therefore that she help me. Luke 10:40, KJV

He began to feel the pinch. Luke 15:14, NEB

He began to be in want. Luke 15:14, KJV

This is more than we can stomach! John 6:60, NEB

This is an hard saying. John 6:60, KJV

Let us toss for it. John 19:24, NEB

Let us . . . cast lots for it. John 19:24, KJV

This touched them on the raw. Acts 7:54, NEB

They were cut to the heart. Acts 7:54, KJV

You are crazy. Acts 12:15, NEB

Thou art mad. Acts 12:15, KJV

They got wind of it. Acts 14:6, NEB

They were ware of it. Acts 14:6, KJV

I sponged on no one. 2 Corinthians 11:9, NEB

I was chargeable to no man. 2 Corinthians 11:9, KJV

. . . money-grubbing . . . 1 Timothy 3:8, NEB

. . . greedy of filthy lucre . . . 1 Timothy 3:8, KJV

They all left me in the lurch. 2 Timothy 4:16, NEB

All men forsook me. 2 Timothy 4:16, KJV

. . . smashing them to bits . . . Revelation 2:27, NEB

. . . broken to shivers . . . Revelation 2:27, KJV

In addition to lowering the tone of the Scriptures, not a single one of these colloquialisms is clearer than the King James Version rendition.

Incredibly, although one of the chief aims of the New English Bible was to produce a version devoid of little-known and archaic words, on a number of occasions the translators have selected words less known than did the King James translators. A selection of such instances is set out below:

KJV NEB

Exodus 34:13 Groves Sacred poles

Song of Sol. 2:1 Rose of Sharon Asphodel

Song of Sol. 3:9 Chariot Palanquin

Isaiah 13:21 Wild beast Marmots

Isaiah 28:25 Rie Spelt

Isaiah 30:32 Battles of shaking Shaking sistrums

Daniel 3:2 Princes Satraps

Nahum 2:5 Defense Mantelets

Luke 3:15 In expectation On the tip-toe of expectation

John 8:41 Born of fornication Base-born

1 Corinthians 5:9 Fornicators Loose livers

1 Timothy 1:2 Own Son True-born Son

1 Timothy 1:11 (no equivalent) Eternal felicity

Hebrews 1:14 Ministering Ministrant

Hebrews 3:5 Servant Servitor

Revelation 18:16 Decked Bedizened

The translators appear to have disregarded the fact that expressions in the Authorized Version of Scripture have enriched the English language and have become a part of everyday vocabulary and understanding. Had they appreciated this benefit, they would not have altered "whited sepulchres" to "tombs covered with whitewash," or "pearls before swine" to "pearls to pigs." Neither would Paul's "thorn in the flesh" (2 Corinthians 12:7) have become "a sharp pain in my body."

Other expressions of unmatched beauty have lost much in the new translation. Among these are *his unspeakable gift* (2 Corinthians 9:15), translated *his gift beyond words*. Further, *the royal law* (James 2:8) has been perfectly well translated as *sovereign law*, but loses its impact because of a lack of familiarity and adds no new understanding or clarity to the passage.

While the New English Bible does correct the gross error of the King James Version which uses the term *Easter* for *Passover* in Acts 12:4 (a rare example of the King James Version translators deviating from their policy of exact-equivalence in translation), the translators of the New English Bible have incredibly translated *Pentecost* in 1 Corinthians 16:8 as *Whitsuntide* to conform to the Anglican and Catholic term for the celebration of Pentecost. This word, as does the term *Easter*, takes the reader back to the pagan origins of these festivals, which were later Christianized.

Another example of the dangerous policy of dynamic-equivalence in translation is the use of *Friday* for *the preparation* [day] in Luke 23:54, and *Sunday* for *the first day of the week* in Luke 24:1 and also Matthew 28:1, Mark 16:2, and John 20:1. Of course no one can dispute that the first day of the week is now designated Sunday by all English-speaking peoples. But removing the exact-equivalence from this translation of the events of the resurrection history could lead a future generation to lose all knowledge of the fact that Jesus was resurrected on the *first* day of the week. This matter is important, since there are still Christians who believe that in worshiping on Sunday, they are worshiping upon the *seventh* day of the week as specified in the Decalogue. Indeed, our own grandmother was under this illusion prior to being presented with the Sabbath truth. The designation of Sunday as the seventh day of the week, quite contrary to Scripture, is receiving support from airline schedules which list Sunday as the seventh day, and a growing number of calendars and diaries following the practice. Of interest is that in December 1990, in Hanoi, Russell was presented a Vietnamese diary for 1991 while attending a conference of the Vietnamese Ministry of Labor. This diary indicated Sunday as the seventh day of the week.

Another monumental error of translation, no doubt most satisfying to Roman Catholics, states:

You are Peter, the Rock; and on this rock I will build my church. Matthew 16:18, NEB

You shall be called Cephas (that is, Peter, the Rock). John 1:42, NEB

Such translations demean our Lord who alone is the Rock upon which the Christian faith is founded. The King James Version correctly states:

Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, A stone. John 1:42.

Again, the Roman Catholic Church was benefited by another translation. We shall compare the verse with the translation of the King James Version.

As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. Acts 13:2, KJV

While they were keeping a fast and offering worship to the Lord, the Holy Spirit said, "Set Barnabas and Saul apart for me, to do the work to which I have called them." Acts 13:2, NEB

Here again we illustrate one of those subtle Catholicisms. At first reading there would appear to be nothing perverse in the rendition of the New English Bible. However, the Roman Catholic Church has ever substituted the word "offering" for the term "ministered" as in the King James Version. This term, they have declared, verifies that the disciples celebrated the Mass. Indeed, although the evidence for this assertion is pathetically weak, it does no service to truth to assist the assertion with a faulty translation. It is of significance to record that some foreign language versions prepared by Roman Catholics substitute the word *sacrifice* for *offering*, thus adding unwarranted strength to the Catholic claim. Examples may be seen in Pereira's Roman Catholic Portuguese Bible and the Bordeaux New Testament.

At times one wonders if unnecessary alterations are made in new translations, not so much to provide clearer and more modern renditions, but rather to impress Christians with the validity of the need for yet another translation. Let us compare a few Old Testament passages which suggest such a trivial motive.

Those who curse you, I will execrate. Genesis 12:3, NEB

And curse him that curseth thee. Genesis 12:3, KJV

Inaugurate a hereditary priesthood. Exodus 40:15, NEB

Anointing . . . an everlasting priesthood. Exodus 40:15, NEB

Psalms 108:10. Impregnable (NEB). Strong (KJV)

Psalms 139:12. Luminous (NEB). Shiner (KJV)

Summon discernment to your aid and invoke understanding. Proverbs 2:3, NEB

If thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding. Proverbs 2:3, KJV

Do not emulate a lawless man. Proverbs 3:31, NEB

Envy thou not the oppressor. Proverbs 3:31, KJV

Proverbs 10:18. Fluent with calumny (NEB). Uttereth a slander (KJV)

He may cloak his enmity in dissimulation. Proverbs 26:26, NEB

Whose hatred is covered by deceit. Proverbs 26:26, KJV

The kisses of an enemy are perfidious. Proverbs 27:6, NEB

The kisses of an enemy are deceitful. Proverbs 27:6, KJV

Isaiah 32:2. Runnels (NEB). Rivers (KJV)

Joel 2:3. Vanguard . . . rearguard (NEB). Before . . . after (KJV)

Obadiah 5. Vintagers (NEB). Grapegatherers (KJV)

Most readers will conclude that in the examples cited above the passages are neither as clear in the New English Bible rendition nor are the alterations necessary. Too much is often made of the supposed ease of understanding of modern translations, although it is true that in some passages they do provide clearer renderings.

In the chapter entitled *The Revised English Bible*, the deviations of the translation of the Old Testament in the New English Bible from the Hebrew Masoretic Text are discussed. The translators admitted that at times they could not accept the Masoretic Text. Thus they stated that they sometimes used the most probable correction of the text where the Hebrew and the ancient versions cannot be convincingly translated as they stand. New English Bible, Introduction, 16

This procedure is surely most dangerous, and seems akin to the efforts in Alexandria in the early period of the Christian era to "improve" on the Greek text of the New Testament. It is especially dangerous when it is recognized that not fewer than 1,100 of these conjectures were introduced into the Old Testament translation. Furthermore, within these conjectures 136 verses were rearranged and placed in different positions. Some instances of this procedure are listed below:

Job 4:21 is moved to Job 5:4.

Job 41:1-6 is placed to follow Job 39:30.

Psalms 113:9 (portion) has been moved to Psalm 114:1.

Isaiah 5:24-25 has been placed to follow Isaiah 10:4.

Isaiah 41:6-7 has been placed to follow Isaiah 40:20.

Isaiah 52:14 has been placed to follow Isaiah 53:2.

Zechariah 3 and 4 are arranged as follows: 4:1, 2, 3, 11; 3:1-10; 4:4-10.

Zechariah 13:7-9 has been placed to follow Zechariah 11:17.

As the Trinitarian Bible Society points out:

This conjectural rearrangement of the text will be rather confusing to any who try to follow a public reading with some other version in their hands. The New English Bible, 1961-1970, 14

It also highlights the difficulties encountered by users of varying translations in attempting to memorize Scripture. These transferences would surely confuse such persons. They would also render public or responsive readings from these passages impossible if alternative translations were in use.

Not surprisingly a recent trend in biblical translation has been to place more credence in the veracity of the Masoretic Text, a text which has remarkable agreement with the Dead Sea Scrolls. Thus in the

Revised New English Bible many of the conjectures placed in the original New English Bible have been removed.

Perhaps a concluding word from the Trinitarian Bible Society's assessment of the New English Bible is pertinent.

Our conviction is that if any have been hindered in their approach to truth by the alleged "barriers of language," more are likely to be hindered in their apprehension of truth by the numerous and serious deficiencies of the new translation. Ibid., 8

Chapter 34

The Revised English Version

In 1989 the Oxford and Cambridge presses published The Revised English Bible (REB), a revision of The New English Bible which was first published in 1970.

The publication of this Bible had a number of significant implications. That a revision was deemed necessary a mere nineteen years after the publication of The New English Bible is in itself surprising. One matter is certain: in that period there had been no significant shift in the English language, necessitating a revision to discard archaic words. Indeed, it is difficult to dispel the suspicion that the plethora of Bible translations published in recent years is motivated more by commercial considerations than by a desire to bring the precious Word of God to men's hearts. How different is the modern attitude toward God's Word from that of the dedicated Christians who translated the King James Version! We repeat their motives:

But among all our joys, there was no one that more filled our hearts, than the blessed continuance of the preaching of God's sacred word among us; which is that inestimable treasure which excelleth all the riches of the earth; because the fruit thereof extendeth itself, not only to the time spent in this transitory world, but directeth and disposeth men unto that eternal happiness which is above in heaven.

As with a number of new translations, the scholars employed in preparing The Revised English Bible included Roman Catholics. Their faith in God's Word is seriously compromised by their conviction that church tradition and papal pronouncements supersede the precepts of Scripture. We can scarcely anticipate a Spirit-filled translation from such deluded men.

Furthermore, The Revised English Bible, the translation of which was directed by Professor W.E. McHardy, professor emeritus of Hebrew at Oxford University, has had the "benefit" of secular input, for

McHardy called on poets, novelists, even typists to provide advice on readability. *Time*, October 9, 1989
Such contributors, even when confined to the expression of opinion on readability, could scarcely be expected to add to the accuracy or sacredness of the task.

Like The New English Bible, The Revised English Bible is based upon the corrupted New Testament Greek manuscripts, thus giving the translation a major handicap from its very inception.

As with a number of other modern translations, The Revised English Bible contains numbers of passages where the "translation" completely ignores the original to serve the biases of the translators. This procedure is most dangerous, for it gives license to contradict God's precious Word. It can be seen in the foolish effort to remove "sexist" words from the new translation. Two illustrations are provided:

Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. John 15:13, KJV

. . . that someone should lay down his life for his friends. John 15:13, REB

Even in the corrupted manuscripts the Greek word used in this verse is *man*, not *someone*. But it is typical of the absurdity of such removal of sexist" words that the translators still felt compelled to use the masculine gender pronoun *his*, twice in this clause, effectively negating the aim of the mistranslation of the masculine gender noun.

We cite a second example of this sort of absurdity from the Old Testament.

What is man, that thou art mindful of him? Psalm 8:4, KJV

Here the Hebrew noun is *man*, as correctly translated above. The Revised English Version translators chose to ignore the true Hebrew word and to substitute two of their own devising, but once more they were unable to eliminate the masculine gender pronoun.

What is frail mortal, that thou should be mindful of him? Psalm 8:4, REB

While such freedom of translation may seem inconsequential at first sight, the astute student of God's Word will perceive that it usurps a liberty which will not be confined to the elimination of "sexist" nouns at the whim of the translator, but will also permit freedom to make even more serious alterations to God's Holy Word when the original does not accord with the translator's biases.

Nevertheless not all is defective in this new translation. Few users of The New English Bible recognize that when The New English Bible was compiled, it was fashionable among some scholars to depart from the preserved texts of the Old Testament in favor of readings based on nonbiblical writings. *Time*, October 9, 1989

Fortunately, The Revised English Bible has reversed this faulty trend, for since then [since the 1950s and 1960s], newly discovered manuscripts have given increased confidence in the traditional Masoretic Hebrew text. *Ibid*.

It is this Masoretic Hebrew Text which was used by the translators of the King James Version almost 400 years ago. Today many scholars make false claims that influence translators. They cast doubt on the reliability of the pure manuscripts. These claims from the pens of renowned "authorities" have proved convincing to many laymen. But what we see illustrated in respect to the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament is, we believe, equally true of the *Textus Receptus* Greek of the New Testament.

In the 1950s many "experts" pontificated, and their views were accepted to such a degree that the translators of The New English Bible at times preferred to rely upon nonbiblical writings as being more authoritative than the Masoretic Text. With the passage of time, discovery of further evidence has disclosed the fallacy of the conclusion of the "experts" a mere twenty years ago. The readers of God's Word will demonstrate proper prudence by ignoring the fanciful claims of the large majority of present-day Bible scholars, for they have proved to be unsafe guides in the past.

Chapter 35

The New Jerusalem Bible

The original Jerusalem Bible was published in 1966. It was produced by Roman Catholic scholarship. Yet within three years the Anglican Church authorized its use for services within the Church of England. This was the first Roman Catholic translation to be approved for Anglican use since the Reformation. The New Jerusalem Bible, Article No. 73 of the Trinitarian Bible Society, 3

The significant characteristic of this original Jerusalem Bible was that it was freely sprinkled with notes, many of which supported Roman Catholic doctrine. The revision known as The New Jerusalem Bible, published in 1985, reduced the number of Roman Catholic notes but did not, by any means, meet the perception of one reviewer who claimed to have found

the elimination of any pro-Catholic bias. *The Times*, London, October 4, 1985, quoted in *ibid*.

The new translation further introduced notes conforming to the concepts of higher critics. Let us examine a number of these as reported by the Trinitarian Bible Society.

Matthew 8:28: Where Matthew refers to *two* demon-possessed persons, and only one is referred to in Mark and Luke, the NJB comments that "the doubling of persons appears to be characteristic of Matthew's style," with the implication that Matthew's additional narrative detail is simply a result of literary invention.

Matthew 14:13ff: Concerning Matthew's separate record of the Feeding of the Five Thousand and the Feeding of the Four Thousand, the NJB remarks that "this duplication, certainly very ancient, presents the same incident according to two different traditions." A similar note appears at Luke 9:10. The suggestion here is that the gospel account of two separate miracles is unhistorical, and that Christ never actually spoke the words which are attributed to Him at Matthew 16:9-10, referring to these miracles as separate events.

Matthew 17:27: The NJB comments that "this miraculous find of a precious object in a fish's mouth, which is not essential to the episode, has several parallels in Jewish and Greek folklore," implying that this event did not actually take place, but was derived from popular legend.

Matthew 19:9: Regarding Jesus' teaching on divorce, the NJB suggests that probably "one of the last editors of Matthew" added the exceptive clause (on fornication) in response to a rabbinic problem, so that "in this case we would have here an ecclesiastical decision of temporary and local application." The implication here is that Matthew's account interweaves the teaching of the early church with the teaching of Jesus, attributing to Jesus some words which He did not speak.

Matthew 26:68: The NJB comments that "Matthew's editing is awkward," inviting the conclusion that Matthew's presentation of his account was imperfect.

Mark 2:27: Regarding Jesus' teaching that the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath, the NJB states that "this verse, lacking in Matthew and Luke, must have been added by Mark

when the new spirit of Christianity had already reduced the importance of the sabbath obligation," with the implication that Jesus did not actually say the words which Mark attributes to Him.

Luke 1:46: On the Magnificat, the NJB notes that "Luke must have found this canticle in the circles of the 'poor,' where it was perhaps attributed to the Daughters of Zion. He found it suitable to bring into his prose narrative and put on the lips of Mary," thus suggesting that Mary did not use the words which Luke records her as saying.

Luke 1:67: On the Benedictus, the NJB similarly notes that "like the Magnificat, this canticle is a poem which Luke has drawn from elsewhere to put on Zechariah's lips," suggesting that Zechariah did not actually use those words.

Luke 2:29: On the Nunc Dimittis, the NJB this time notes that "unlike the Magnificat and Benedictus this canticle seems to have been written by Luke himself, using especially texts from Isaiah," implying that Luke's account of Simeon's words was simply fictitious.

Luke 9:32: On the account of the Transfiguration, the NJB suggests that the "irresistible sleep of the disciples, occurring only in Luke, recalls that of Gethsemane, which is more natural and from which it could be derived," meaning that this part of Luke's account of the Transfiguration is unhistorical.

Luke 22:63: Concerning the details of the men who mocked Jesus, the NJB declares that "on all these points Luke's account may well be more historical than those of Matthew and Mark."

Acts 1:19: The NJB comments that in this account the manner of Judas' death "mirrors the death of many a criminal in folk legends," implying that the recorded details in Acts were not literally true. Ibid., 5-6

It must be understood that Rome is well served by casting doubt upon Scripture, for it reinforces its claim that the source of faith is "the one true church."

That The New Jerusalem Bible failed to rid itself of all Roman Catholic bias can be readily detected. In its note on Matthew 16:19 The New Jerusalem Bible states:

Peter has the keys. It is his function, therefore, to open or close to all who would come to the kingdom of Heaven through the Christian community. . . . Of the household of God Peter is the controller. . . . In that capacity he is to exercise the disciplinary power of admitting or excluding those he thinks fit; he will also, in his administration of the community, make necessary doctrinal and juridical decisions. The verdicts he delivers and the pronouncements he makes will be ratified by God in heaven. Catholic exegetes maintain that these enduring promises hold good, not only for Peter himself but also for Peter's successors. This inference, not explicitly drawn in the text, is considered legitimate. Ibid., 7

Roman Catholic Mariology is freely supported in the Bible notes. For example, The New Jerusalem Bible, in commenting upon John 19:26-27, claims that Christ's dying words concerning His mother were a declaration that Mary, the new Eve, is the spiritual mother of all the faithful.

This assertion is also supported in the note concerning John 2:4. This note claims that Mary is the new Eve, "mother of the living."

This edition further claims that Mary plays an important role in salvation. In the note related to Luke 2:34, it is stated that

As the true Daughter of Zion, Mary will hear the sorrowful destiny of her race. With her Son she will be at the centre of this contradiction, where secret thoughts will be laid bare, for or against Jesus.

Mary's perpetual virginity is asserted, contrary to biblical evidence. In the note on Matthew 1:25, The New Jerusalem Bible admits that Mary's perpetual virginity is not proved by the verse, but nevertheless asserts that this false doctrine is "assured by the remainder of the Gospel and by the tradition of the Church."

The text in question states:

And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS. Matthew 1:25, NJB

The very words indicate that Mary's virginity was not maintained after the birth of Jesus. The New Jerusalem Bible mistranslates this text to overcome this objection by ignoring all reference to Jesus as her *firstborn*.

He had not had intercourse with her when she gave birth. Matthew 1:25, NJB

Where Scripture refers to Jesus' brothers and sisters (Matthew 12:46-47, 13:55-56; Mark 3:31-32, 6:3; Luke 8:19-20; John 12:12, 7:3; Acts 1:14; Galatians 1:19), The New Jerusalem Bible in some notes dismisses the relationship as merely that of cousins.

The notes also uphold the blasphemy of the Mass commenting upon Genesis 14:18 where Melchizedek offered bread and wine, the relevant note claims this act to be

an image of the Eucharist and even a foreshadowing of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

In a note on Matthew 19:12 which states, in the KJV,

For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.,

the editors of The New Jerusalem Bible conclude, without justification, that

Christ invites to perpetual continence as an expression of total consecration to the kingdom of God.

Such a viewpoint upholds the false doctrine of priestly celibacy.

In December 1985, Russell and his wife, Enid, observed a papal audience in the Vatican. At the conclusion, Pope John Paul II bestowed "absolution" for all sins upon all present and even the relatives of those present. Such sacrilege is staggering. Yet this dogma of priestly absolution is implied in the note on Matthew 18:18 which states:

One of the powers [to forgive sins] conferred on Peter is here conferred also on the community.

While this is a modification of the note in the original Jerusalem Bible, which commented

One of the powers conferred on Peter is here conferred on the Church's ministers, to whom this discourse is primarily addressed.,

it still removes from Christ the sole right to absolve our sins and in practice permits priests to usurp Christ's power.

The sacrament of extreme unction, the sacrament by which dying people are promised by the Roman Catholic Church final remission of sins, is upheld in the note in respect of James 5:14 which states that in the verse

the Church has seen the earliest form of the sacrament of Anointing the Sick.¹

The damnable doctrine of purgatory which has terrified many devoted Roman Catholics and enriched their church, as desperate relatives have sacrificed to have loved ones relieved of the supposed punishment of purgatory through Masses and offerings, also is upheld in a note, in this case related to 1 Corinthians 3:15. This note concedes that

Purgatory is not directly envisaged here, but this text is one of those on the basis of which the Church has made this explicit doctrine.

The Apocrypha is included in this Roman Catholic Bible, and the note on 2 Maccabees 12:44-45 claims that the text expresses the conviction that prayer and expiatory sacrifice are efficacious for the remission of sins for the dead.

Yet another false doctrine, that of original sin and its removal by christening, is upheld. In a note on 1 Peter 3:21, it is asserted that the baptism by which a person is reborn can have no limits to its efficacy.

The note related to Romans 6:12 records that baptism has destroyed human sin.

It has been pointed out that The New Jerusalem Bible contains some significant doctrinal errors.

Some errors of translation in the NJB have a definite doctrinal significance. One example is found in the treatment of the subject of temptation. In the Lord's Prayer, "lead us not into temptation" becomes "do not put us to the test" (Matthew 6:13). At Mark 14:39, "Watch and pray, lest you enter into temptation" becomes "Stay awake and pray not to be put to the test." Similarly at James 1:13, in the NJB, we are told that God "does not put anybody to the test." Yet at Genesis 22:1 we are told in the NJB that "God put Abraham to the test," and at James 1:2 that "the testing of your faith produces perseverance." The Scriptures teach that, while God does not tempt people, He does indeed test their faith, and faith is thereby strengthened. This series of mistranslations is likely to lead people to misunderstand this important truth, and those who use the NJB form of the Lord's Prayer will find themselves praying for something which is contrary to God's purpose. The Trinitarian Bible Society, Article No. 73, The New Jerusalem Bible, 4

Of course, it does not require emphasis to record that this Bible relies upon the corrupted Greek manuscripts. Thus it is an unsafe Bible made even more dangerous by the liberal use of the notes designed to bias the student of God's Word against truth.

Chapter 36

The Amplified New Testament

While the translators of The Amplified New Testament appear to have made a sincere endeavor to treat their project with proper awe and respect, they blighted it from the commencement by selecting the Greek Text of Westcott and Hort as their basic text.

We are at a loss to understand the blindness of translator after translator who fails to perceive the inherent weakness of any translation based upon the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus. It seems that fashion has become such a determining factor in the selection of the basic Greek manuscript to be used by modern translators that it takes these translators beyond the bounds of reason. Perhaps peer pressure has become a deciding factor. In many academic circles, whether scientific, literary, economic, or theological, such facts play a dominant role. In this case, it is hoped that the use of the fashionable will give way to insistence upon the accurate.

Thus while the translators protest that they have remained true to the original Greek, in point of fact this accuracy proved to be an impossibility because of their choice of a faulty Greek manuscript.

While The Amplified New Testament includes many of the passages omitted from most modern translations, it places them in italics. The reader is informed that the words placed in italics are those which, although attributed in former times to Scripture, have been discovered by recent scholarship to be later additions to the Word of God, unapproved by the writer of the sacred message. If the reader accepts such a view, he will ignore as worthless all passages presented in italics.

In the use of italics the translators of The Amplified New Testament have adopted a similar procedure to that of some other translators, including some who translated into languages other than English. These have placed those passages which they deny to be part of Holy Writ in parentheses.

In addition to including many of the defects inherent in other modern versions, the translators alter Scripture in other ways. One example is cited:

We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. Romans 14:10, KJV

For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God. Romans 14:10, The Amplified New Testament

This translation diminishes Christ's authority as Judge of this world, for most readers would interpret "God" to mean in this passage "God the Father."

We question the right of the authors to amplify the Word of God. Is that not the duty of the Holy Spirit rather than of man?

Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth. John 16:13, KJV

On the other hand, translators of The Amplified New Testament indicated that rather than preparing a literal translation, they have prepared one in which hidden meanings which they have deemed to lie behind some words, are brought out. We believe it is the prerogative of the Holy Spirit to enlighten the minds of sincere students of God's Word if such hidden meanings exist. We have confidence that our God permitted words to be written which possessed a plain meaning which could be understood by God's earnest servants without the "wisdom" of others. There is a very real danger that the altruistic

aim of clarifying "mysterious" words could, in fact, open the way for the translator, however unwittingly, to insert his own presuppositions and biases into the Book of God.

Chapter 37

The New World Bible

The Jehovah's Witnesses faith has been very active in the printing of Bibles. Indeed, the versions they have published have been various. Among these has been the King James Version with marginal references.

The Jehovah's Witnesses first embarked upon Bible printing in 1927 when the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society printed the Emphatic Diaglott. This version had first been published in 1865 by its translator, a Yorkshireman, B.F. Wilson, who migrated from England to the United States in 1844 at the age of twenty-seven.

Although Wilson had attended the Baptist Church in his home town of Halifax, he had later taken an interest in Campbell's Restoration Movement and subsequently joined the Disciples of God.

Wilson fellowshipped with this group of believers in Illinois where he settled in the town of Geneva. The Disciples of Christ in this town had come under the influence of the teachings of John Thomas, who broke from the Disciples of Christ to form the Christadelphian Church. While the Genevan Disciples of Christ chose not to align themselves with the Christadelphian faith, they too broke away from the Disciples of Christ and adopted the name of the Restitution Church of God.

Wilson's translation was faulted from its very inception. He erroneously believed that the versions of Tyndale, Matthew, Coverdale, and Geneva (no relationship to Geneva, Illinois, but rather to the Swiss city of that name) were all translated from the Latin Vulgate. Adding error to error, Wilson described his version as follows:

The Emphatic Diaglott, containing the original Greek Text of what is Commonly Styled the New Testament (According to the Recension of Dr. J.J. Griesbach), with an Interlineary Word-for-Word English Translation; A New Emphatic Translation, based on the Interlineary Translation, on the Renderings of Eminent Critics, and on the various readings of the Vatican Library. Title page of The Emphatic Diaglott, 1865 Edition

It will be noted that Wilson's work was greatly influenced by the Codex Vaticanus. Since it had been altered by the Gnostics to more closely conform to their view that Christ was a created being, this manuscript quite naturally attracted the attention of the Jehovah's Witnesses, who shared a similar doctrinal viewpoint.

Thus in 1902 the Jehovah's Witnesses arranged a reprinting of the Emphatic Diaglott for their own use. Its translator, B.F. Wilson, claimed that

Scrupulous fidelity has been maintained throughout this version in giving the true rendering of the original text into English, no regard whatever being paid to the prevailing doctrines or prejudices of sects, or the peculiar tenets of theologians. B.F. Wilson, Emphatic Diaglott

But his very use of the Codex Vaticanus suggested otherwise, and led to his misapprehension of the origin of the translations of William Tyndale and others.

In 1950 the Jehovah's Witnesses produced their New World Translation. Their confession that they used as a basis for this translation

the widely accepted Westcott and Hort text (1881), by reason of its admitted excellence. Foreword, New World Bible, 1950

will not arouse confidence in the astute Bible student. Furthermore, they took into account the text of Eberhard Nestlé, a text closely aligned with the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus, and also gave credence to the Greek texts of Bover (1943) and Merk (1948), both of whom were Jesuit priests.

In 1961, this version was completed by the addition of the Old Testament, and in 1970 a revision was produced. The version has been translated into at least four other languages—Dutch, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish. Associated with the 1970 revision, the Jehovah's Witnesses produced a literal translation of Westcott and Hort's Greek text in 1969.

In addition to the Emphatic Diaglott and the New World Bible, the Jehovah's Witnesses published The Bible in Living English (unrelated to the Living Bible) in 1972. This translation was prepared by Steven T. Byington (1868-1957), a member of the Congregational Church. The Watchtower Bible and Tract Society purchased Byington's manuscript after his death.

As the various versions printed by the Watchtower Organization are closely examined, it is apparent that care has been taken to utilize versions supporting their hypothesis that Christ is not God. Thus John 1:1 ("The Word was God") is translated as "the Word was a God"; Colossians 1:16 (By him were all things created") is translated "by means of him all other things were created"; Romans 9:5 ("Christ . . . who is over all, God blessed forever") is mistranslated "He who is over everything, God blessed forever," and naturally in 1 Timothy 3:16 "God was manifest in the flesh" is reduced to "He was manifest in the flesh."

With its mixture of Westcott-Hort theory and its use of the Codex Vaticanus and Greek texts prepared by Jesuits, The New World Bible surely forfeits the confidence of any true Protestant Bible student.

Chapter 38

Paraphrases of Scripture

It has now become popular in some Christian circles to use a form of the Bible which is no longer a translation of the original manuscripts but rather a paraphrase. The most popular of these is The Living Bible, paraphrased by K.N. Taylor. He claims that in using the paraphrase technique

We can be much more accurate than verbal translation. *Evangelism Today*, December 1972

In this claim he seriously errs.

The use of paraphrases of Holy Writ has no place in the worship of sincere Christians. They are totally without value, for they replace inspired testimony with man's foolishness.

Not the least offensive feature of The Living Bible (TLB) is the use of coarse language, at times bordering on the vulgar. To represent the Word of God in such language is blasphemous. One example of the use of vulgarities may be seen in Isaiah 5:11 (American Edition). We will not reproduce it here.

Many crude expressions are included in this paraphrase. Among such are the following examples:

Mark 10:50: Bartimaeus yanked off his old coat. (TLB, American Edition) — And he, casting away his garment (KJV)

Ecclesiastes 5:3: Blabbermouth (TLB) — A fool's voice (KJV)

Ezekiel 22:12: Loan racketeers (TLB) — thou has taken usury and increase (KJV)

Proverbs 27:15: A cranky woman (TLB) — a contentious woman (KJV)

Isaiah 5:14: Hell is licking its chops in anticipation of this delicious morsel (TLB) — Therefore hell hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure (KJV)

Mark 2:16: How can he stand it, to eat with such scum? (TLB) — How is it that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? (KJV)

Mark 12:17: They scratched their heads in bafflement (TLB) — And they marvelled at him (KJV)

Luke 10:40: Martha was the jittery type (TLB) — But Martha was cumbered about with much serving (KJV)

Isaiah 41:24: Anyone who chooses you needs to have his head examined (TLB) — An abomination is he that chooses you (KJV)

James 1:4: Don't try to squirm out of your problems (TLB) This passage is not in the original Greek, hence there is no comparable text in the KJV.

Jonah 1:2: Your wickedness . . . smells to highest heavens (TLB) — For their wickedness is come up before me (KJV)

Genesis 13:17: Hike in all directions (TLB, American Edition) — Walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it (KJV)

John 11:49: You stupid idiots (TLB) — Ye know nothing at all (KJV)

Jude 16: These men are constant gripers. . . . Loud-mouthed "show-offs" (TLB) — These are murmurers, complainers . . . and their mouth speaketh great swelling words (KJV)

Nahum 1:14: How you stink with sin! (TLB) — for thou art vile (KJV)

Zechariah 9:7: I will yank her idolatry out of her mouth (TLB) — I will take away . . . his abominations from between his teeth (KJV)

Distressing as is the use of coarse language to convey the message of the Word of God, The Living Bible may be faulted on the even more serious ground of mistranslation of God's messages. On occasion the paraphraser takes it upon himself to add words of his own for which there is no basis in the original manuscripts. One example is:

Moses gave us only the Law with its rigid demands and merciless justice, while Jesus Christ brought us loving forgiveness as well. John 1:17, TLB

This travesty of scriptural truth can be discerned by comparison with the translation in the Authorized Version which closely follows the original Greek.

For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. John 1:17, KJV

It will be promptly observed that John wrote nothing whatsoever concerning the law containing rigid demands and merciless justice. Had John so written he would have contradicted Scripture, for God has declared that

Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Romans 7:12, KJV

To charge God's law with the characteristic of rigidity, and to state that it operates on the principle of merciless justice, is rank blasphemy; for God's law is a transcript of His character. Only the archdeceiver and his agents would dare to charge our merciful heavenly Father so falsely. This major affront to our God's character highlights the perils of the paraphrase method of presenting Scripture. Not only does it devalue Scripture, but it is liable to contradict divine revelation. At the very least it affords numerous opportunities for the paraphraser to interweave his human biases into Holy Writ, a most serious defect.

Some additions may appear to be "minor," but God has warned of a most terrible anathema upon those who add to the sacred Word.

If any man shall add unto these things [those written in Scripture] God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. Revelation 22:18, KJV

Ignoring this fearful prospect, the paraphraser of The Living Bible frequently adds his own material. Let us look at one apparently innocuous addition.

Whoredom and wine and new wine take away the heart. Hosea 4:11, KJV

Clearly this passage warns against loose women and alcoholic wine. But Taylor sees fit to add a further word when he refers in this passage to "Wine, women and song." The paraphraser also adds modern-day conclusions to some of the epistles, when no such concluding greetings appear in the originals. Thus The Living Bible completes the first epistle of John with the words, "Sincerely, John" (1 John 5:21, TLB), while Peter's second epistle has a "Good-bye" added to its conclusion (2 Peter 3:18, TLB).

Further, in attempting to make The Living Bible relevant to the twentieth century, K.N. Taylor has introduced terms unrelated to the period of which Scripture tells. This may appear to be a reasonable technique to attract the contemporary reader, but it does patronize such readers, assuming that they are so lacking in understanding that they cannot comprehend matters and objects of a past era; this strange approach in an age when educated people have never been more numerous. In an era where tertiary education is frequently sought, Taylor presumed that people are less able to comprehend the past than those of yesteryear who were fortunate if they completed the elementary grades of education. Where Habakkuk reported:

And the LORD answered me, and said, Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it. Habakkuk 2:2, KJV

the paraphraser finds it needful to substitute *billboard* (U.S. Edition) and *hording* (British Edition) for *table*. Such use of a modern publicity medium not only disturbs the sense of the original but also sounds ludicrous when placed in a setting of antiquity. Similarly,

My people ask counsel at their stocks, and their staff declareth unto them. Hosea 4:12, KJV
is altered to read,

"Divine Truth" comes to them through tea leaves! Hosea 4:12, TLB

Many other renditions are incongruous with their ancient setting and add absolutely nothing to biblical understanding. Three further instances are cited to evidence this assertion. Speaking of the manna, Moses stated that the Lord had commanded the children of Israel that they

Fill an omer of it to be kept for your generations. Exodus 16:32, KJV

The Living Bible renders this passage,

Take three quarts of it to be kept as a museum specimen forever. Exodus 16:32, TLB (three litres in the Australian edition)

King Solomon's words,

Because of the savour of thy good ointments. Song of Solomon 1:3, KJV

are transformed in The Living Bible to

How fragrant your cologne! Song of Solomon 1:3, TLB

while the report that

The watchmen that go about the city found me. Song of Solomon 3:3, KJV

is paraphrased,

The police stopped me. Song of Solomon 3:3, TLB

Such renditions make a mockery of history. How would we regard a history detailing the military exploits of Alexander the Great which substituted *tanks* for *chariots*, *machine guns* for *spears*, and *bayonets* for *swords*? The historical work would be laughed to scorn. Why anyone would think of the substitutions in The Living Bible in any better light is a profound mystery.

At least one important Messianic prophecy is destroyed by this use of paraphrase.

He keepeth all his bones: not one of them is broken. Psalm 34:20, KJV

The Living Bible translates this prophecy,

God even protects him from accidents. Psalm 34:20, TLB

But the apostle John, referring to the fact that although the shin bones of the two malefactors who were crucified with Jesus were broken, because of Jesus' prior death

they brake not his legs. John 19:33, KJV

asserted

For these things were done, that the scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken.
John 19:36

In relation to the Passover, God had commanded of the paschal lamb,
neither shall ye break a bone thereof. Exodus 12:46, KJV

To mutilate such a significant prophecy is no small matter.

In yet another manner The Living Bible perverts Bible doctrine by introducing the paraphraser's bias. The original Greek of 1 Peter 3:19-20 does leave some ambiguities, but the translators of the King James Version accurately translated the passage,

By which also he [Christ] went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. 1 Peter 3:19-20, KJV

The Living Bible states that between His death and resurrection, Christ preached to
spirits of those who, long before in the days of Noah, had refused to listen. 1 Peter 3:19-20, TLB

Such a paraphrase specifically distorts the biblical teaching that death is a sleep. One commentary upon The Living Bible presentation of this text rightly states the matter.

This is not the true meaning of the text, which is well expressed in the note in the Dutch Bible of 1637:

By spirits here are understood the souls of those persons to whom the spirit or Godhead of Christ formerly caused repentance to be preached by Noah, namely, while they were yet alive . . . who were in *prison* or held when Peter wrote his epistle. The Living Bible, Article no. 18 of the Trinitarian Bible Society

Of course we must remember that the Bible use of the term *hell* is often synonymous with *grave*. This fact is underlined by the record that Jesus was in hell during His death.

Quoting from the prophecy of Psalm 16:10, Peter stated on the Day of Pentecost:

Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. . . . He [David] seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. Acts 2:27, 31, KJV

As with virtually all modern translations, the deity of Christ is weakened. Thus 1 Timothy 3:16 is stated to say:

But the answer lies in Christ, who came to earth as a man. 1 Timothy 3:16, TLB

Christ's creatorship is omitted in the following reduction:

Ephesians 3:9: who created all things by Jesus Christ (KJV). He [God the Father] who made all things (TLB).

Ephesians 3:14-15 testify that God is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. But the Living Bible simply states,

The Father of all the great family of God.

The defects of The Living Bible are manifold. Only a few examples have been cited in evidence. Paraphrases should have no place in private or congregational worship, for they seriously distort the Word of God. It is a matter of serious spiritual danger to utilize a false Scripture, for Satan will certainly seize the opportunity to distort God's truth if we do so.

Chapter 39

Phillips' New Testament

When J.B. Phillips' Letters to Young Churches was first published it met with much acclaim. This semitranslation, semiparaphrase expressed the words of the New Testament Epistles in words which seemed both fresh and understandable. It seemed, at least to some, that at last Peter's assertion was neutralized:

And account that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood. 2 Peter 3:15-16.

Later Phillips completed a translation of the entire New Testament. The Phillips Version suffers from the same defects as others which employ the use of free paraphrase. However, unlike The Living Bible, Phillips does not employ crude language.

The Trinitarian Bible Society has pointed out a number of specific mistranslations (*Trinitarian Bible Society*, Tract No. 28). These include:

Forgive and ye shall be forgiven. Luke 6:37, KJV

Make allowances for others, and people will make allowances for you. Luke 6:37, Phillips

Clearly the latter is an entirely different statement from that of the King James Version, which accurately reflects the Greek original. Christ's message to us is lost.

Judge not, that ye be not judged. Matthew 7:1, KJV

Don't criticize people, and you will not be criticized. Matthew 7:1, Phillips

It will be noticed that the correct translation promises God's grace in *His* judgment to those who are not judgmental. Phillips' Version altered this sublime truth to focus our minds upon our fellow men and their criticism of us. Thus a divine truth is deliberately deleted.

For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith. Romans 1:17, KJV

I see in it God's plan for imparting righteousness to men, a process begun and continued by their faith. Romans 1:17, Phillips

It will be noted that in the correct translation God's righteousness is said to be revealed *from* faith *to* faith. This wording indicates that God's faith imparted to the believer *from* Him generates further faith.

To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. Luke 1:27, KJV

To a young woman who was engaged to a man called Joseph (a descendant of David). The girl's name was Mary. Luke 1:27, Phillips

Twice in this text Phillips has failed to translate the Greek word *parthenos* as *virgin*, rather translating it as *young woman* and *girl*. Although Phillips translates the Greek word as *virgin* elsewhere (Matthew 1:23) his failure to do so in this text is inexcusable. In biology this term is used in parthenogenesis. No biologist would fail to understand that *parthenos* refers to a female who has not had sexual relations.

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. John 1:1, KJV

At the beginning God expressed himself. That personal expression, that word, was with God and was God. John 1:1, Phillips

Once again Phillips has altered the initial words of the text. The use of the word *God* instead of the *Word* in Phillips' first sentence leaves one in doubt whether the reference there is to the Father or to the Son. Indeed the powerful implication is the former, for when *God* is correctly translated in Phillips' second sentence this reference quite clearly is to the Father. But the original Greek refers to the Word and this, the context makes plain, is a reference to Jesus.

Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you. Matthew 6:33, KJV

Set your heart first on his kingdom and his goodness, and all these things shall come to you as a matter of course. Matthew 6:33, Phillips

In attempting a smooth paraphrase, Phillips has virtually removed God's hand from the bestowal of His blessing.

For this is the law and the prophets. Matthew 7:12, KJV

This is the essence of all true religion. Matthew 7:12, Phillips

Christ's words, as recorded by Matthew, were carefully chosen. He intended to convey that the golden rule is the essence of Scripture, which in His day was the Old Testament. In an age when aspersions are frequently cast upon God's first Testament, suggesting a tyrannical, unloving God, the potent affirmation of the gentleness and love of God as expressed in the Old Testament, has been totally forsaken by Phillips' assumption that he is at liberty to place altered words into the mouth of our Saviour.

While we seek to be justified by Christ. . . Galatians 2:17, KJV

If we grasp the real truth about justification. . . Galatians 2:17, Phillips

Once more we note a marked alteration in meaning. Paul's expression to the Galatian believers clearly refers to those who are *seeking* justification. Phillips took license to change that meaning to refer to those who *understand* justification. These are two entirely different matters. Surely, the Bible student is entitled to know what Paul, writing under inspiration, really wrote to God's flock in Galatia.

Two further examples are cited below:

I send the promise of my Father upon you. Luke 24:49, KJV

Now I hand over to you a message of the Father. Luke 24:49, Phillips

When he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. 1 John 3:2, KJV

If reality were to break through, we should reflect his likeness, for we should see him as he really is! 1 John 3:2, Phillips

It is apparent that Phillips introduces his own interpretations quite frequently. He justifies this practice by claiming:

I feel strongly that a translator, although he must make himself as familiar as possible with New Testament Greek usage, must steadfastly refuse to be driven by the bogey of consistency. He must be guided both by the context in which a word appears, and by the sensibilities of modern English readers. J.B. Phillips, Foreword to the New Testament

We suggest that rather should the sensibilities of modern English readers be guided by the Word of God.

These examples, selected from among many, suffice to alert the reader of God's Word that when he reads Phillips' paraphrase, he quite frequently is not reading the inspired Word, but rather the human notions of J.B. Phillips. Thus the version falls far short of the requirements of one diligently desiring to know God's will.

As in almost all of the modern versions, it is not unknown for the reader to be confounded by the adoption of words far more difficult to comprehend, especially by the young or the foreign reader, than the delightfully simple words chosen by the translators of the Authorized Version.

Let us cite one example from Phillips:

For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen. Romans 1:20, KJV

For since the beginning of the world the invisible attributes of God, for example, his eternal power and divinity, have been plainly discernible. Romans 1:20, Phillips

Ignoring that Phillips' examples have been inserted from his mind and are not found in Paul's original letter, we note that he has used the word *attributes* in place of *things* and the word *discernible* as an alternative to *seen*. Now these are perfectly correct translations as are those in the King James Version, and they are good words. The point made here is that they are much more complex than their simple synonyms in the King James Version.

As with other modern translations, Phillips' defective version, because of his use of paraphrase, is further compounded by his reliance on the corrupted manuscripts. We will not elaborate on this matter, for it is well illustrated in other chapters of this work.

While Phillips uses no vulgarities in his paraphrase, his vocabulary is less than elegant at times. Three examples are cited without comment:

Salute one another with an holy kiss. Romans 16:16, KJV

Give each other a hearty handshake all round for my sake. Romans 16:16, Phillips

The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness. Romans 1:18, KJV

Those men who render truth dumb and inoperative by their wickedness. Romans 1:18, Phillips

I speak as a man. Romans 3:5, KJV

I'm using a human tit-for-tat argument. Romans 3:5, Phillips

Even in the headings, Phillips at times uses less than acceptable language. We illustrate by the one preceding Romans 11:30-36.

The whole scheme looks topsy-turvy, until we see the amazing wisdom of God!

Phillips' version would have been greatly improved if he had fully believed one of the texts in his version.

All scripture is inspired by God. 2 Timothy 3:16, Phillips

But it is quite obvious that he did not take that passage to heart, for in his preface he revealed his true attitude to the sacred manuscripts he had chosen to paraphrase. There he wrote,

Paul, for instance, writing in haste and urgency to some of his wayward and difficult Christians, was not tremendously concerned about dotting the "i's" and crossing the "t's" of his message. I doubt very much if he was even concerned about being completely consistent with what he had already written. Consequently, it seems to me quite beside the point to study his writings microscopically, as it were, and deduce hidden meanings of which almost certainly he was unaware.

Could we safely rely on a version prepared by a man with such a cavalier approach to God's Holy Word? How different was Paul's assessment of his inspired writings!

Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth. 1 Corinthians 2:13, KJV

Chapter 40

The Best Modern Version

The New King James Version of Scripture does not suffer from the use of corrupted Greek manuscripts from which the New Testament is translated in other modern versions. This fact sets it above all the best-known recent translations. The translators recognized that

Although the Elizabethan period and our own era share in zeal for the technical advance, the former period was more aggressively devoted to classical learning. Preface of The New King James Version of the Bible

They also appreciated that

The King James translators were committed to producing an English Bible that would be a precise translation and by no means a paraphrase or broadly approximated rendering.

Thus has resulted a modern translation more closely achieving the ideal of precision than the great majority of other modern versions. Another advantage from which this translation benefited was that each participant in the revision testified to the divine Authorship of the total Scriptures. Further, a policy was adopted whereby the alterations in wording from the original King James Version were not made simply for the sake of change. Thus the poetic quality of the Bible and the purity of English are largely maintained. That no Roman Catholics were consulted in the work of translation protected the version from the usual distortions of Holy Writ, designed to support untenable Roman Catholic doctrines.

The translators did remove some words which were regarded as having become archaic. A list of these, prepared by the Trinitarian Bible Society (Article No. 68) will provide examples from the books of Matthew and Mark. For the daily reader of God's Word this list will serve to remind him or her that those words used in the Authorized Version and regarded as archaic are readily understood even in the last decade of the twentieth century. The word used in the Authorized Version is placed first, and its The New King James Version equivalent next.

begat: begot

without: outside

privily: secretly

dureth: endures

wroth: angry

charger: platter

thoroughly: thoroughly

besought: begged

garner: barn

halt: lame

lighting: alighting

platter: dish

an hungered: hungry

bewrayeth: betrays

divers: various

noised: heard

verily: assuredly

straitly: sternly

was wont: accustomed

wist not: did not know

aught: something

winefat: wine vat

twain: two

husbandmen: vinedressers

mote: speck

tore: convulsed

scrip: bag

affrighted: alarmed

Perhaps we are a little nostalgic for the past, but it does seem to us that the removal of these older English words from Scripture in some way reduces the richness of the devout Christian's vocabulary, while adding very little to his comprehension of Scripture.

We do not think that the Bible student is assisted in his understanding of God's Word by the elimination of the little-used second person singular personal pronouns such as thou, thee, thy, and thine. At the very least these words should have been retained out of respect for the Godhead. It is still contemporary usage to thus demonstrate respect for our great God and Holy Father. The use of You and Your lowers respect and awe in an age when such regard for our God was never more required.

One very distressing alteration in The New King James Version is apparent in comparison with its parent version.

The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished. 2 Peter 2:9, KJV

Then the Lord knows how to deliver the godly out of temptation and to reserve the unjust under punishment for the day of judgment. 2 Peter 2:9, NKJV

The translators of The New King James Version have followed virtually all modern translations with this rendering. It is faulty because it implies immediate punishment of the unrighteous after death. But Scripture speaks of death as a sleep, and testifies that the unrighteous will be resurrected after the millennium, and then their punishment will be meted out (see Revelation chapter 20). Thus the King James Version is perfectly in accord with other passages of Scripture when it indicates that the wicked are reserved (in the grave) until the day of judgment (recorded in Revelation 20:12) to be punished (recorded in Revelation 20:13-14). A God who punishes men and women prior to judging them would hardly be seen in the universe as a just God. Such an act would deny elementary justice to those punished.

Another serious mistranslation is seen in Hebrews 9:12, where *holy* is changed to *most holy*, a change which is unjustified by the Greek, and which implies that Christ commenced His work in the Most Holy Place at His ascension. This translation does not accord with other Scriptural passages. Again we emphasize that it is not justified by the Greek *ta hagia*.

Another significant divergence from the King James Version is noted:

That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works. 2 Timothy 3:17, KJV

In substituting *complete* for *perfect*, the new version markedly diminishes the force and impact of the text.

Christ's response to the disciples' question (Matthew 24:3) is rendered as *the end of the age*. This detaches His prophecy from the Second Coming, unless the end of the age and the end of the world coincide.

Confusion arises from the translation "was raised because of our justification" (Romans 4:25, NKJV) instead of the manifestly more suitable statement that Christ "was raised again for our justification" (Romans 4:25, KJV). Clearly Christ was raised *for* our justification, not *because* of it.

Even factual error is introduced. Speaking of the Most Holy Place in Hebrews 9:4, The New King James Version places the altar (of incense) present there. This altar of course was in the Holy Place. The King James Version rightly states that is the golden censer, not the golden altar, that was in the Most Holy Place.

Thus while The New King James Version is superior to the other modern versions, it still does not match the King James Version for faithfulness of translation.

Appendix A

Entire Verses Omitted From Modern Versions of Scripture

1. Matthew 17:21: Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.
2. Matthew 18:11: For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.
3. Matthew 23:14: Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.
4. Mark 7:16: If any man have ears to hear, let him hear.
5. Mark 9:44: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.
6. Mark 9:46: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.
7. Mark 11:26: But if ye do not forgive, neither will your father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses.
8. Mark 15:28: And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.
9. Luke 17:36: Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left.
10. Luke 23:17: (For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast).
11. John 5:4: For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.
12. Acts 8:37: And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.

13. Acts 15.34: Notwithstanding it pleased Silas to abide there still.

14. Acts 24.7: But the chief captain Lysias came upon us, and with great violence took him away out of our hands.

15. Acts 28.29: And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves.

16. Romans 16.24: The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.

17. 1 John 5.7: For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

Appendix B

Portions of 178 Verses Omitted From Most Modern Translations

Matthew 5.27:

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: KJV

You have heard that it was said, "Do not commit adultery." NIV

Matthew 5.44:

But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; KJV

But I tell you: Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you. NIV

Matthew 6.13:

And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen. KJV

And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one. NIV

Matthew 15.6:

And honour not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. KJV

He is not to honor his father with it. Thus you nullify the word of God for the sake of your tradition. NIV

Matthew 15.8:

This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. KJV

These people honor me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me. NIV

Matthew 19.9:

And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery. KJV

I tell you that anyone who divorces his wife, except for marital unfaithfulness, and marries another woman commits adultery. NIV

Matthew 19.20:

The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet? KJV

"All these have I kept," the young man said. "What do I still lack?" NIV

Matthew 20.7:

they say unto him, Because no man hath hired us. He saith unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard; and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive. KJV

"Because no one has hired us," they answered. "He said to them, 'You also go and work in my vineyard.'" NIV

Matthew 20.16:

So the last shall be first, and the first last: for many be called, but few chosen. KJV

So the last will be first, and the first will be last. NIV

Matthew 20.22:

But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, We are able. KJV

You don't know what you are asking, Jesus said to them. "Can you drink the cup I am going to drink?"

"We can," they answered. NIV

Matthew 20.23:

And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with: but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father. KJV

Jesus said to them, "You will indeed drink from my cup, but to sit at my right or left is not for me to grant. These places belong to those for whom they have been prepared by my Father." NIV

Matthew 22.13:

Then said the king to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast him into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. KJV

"Then the king told the attendants, 'Tie him hand and foot, and throw him outside, into the darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.'" NIV

Matthew 23.4:

For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers. KJV

They tie up heavy loads and put them on men's shoulders, but they themselves are not willing to lift a finger to move them. NIV

Matthew 25.13:

Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh. KJV

"Therefore keep watch, because you do not know the day or the hour." NIV

Matthew 26.3:

Then assembled together the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders of the people, unto the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas. KJV

Then the chief priest and the elders of the people assembled in the palace of the high priest, whose name was Caiaphas. NIV

Matthew 26.60:

But found none: yea, though many false witnesses came, yet found they none. At the last came two false witnesses. KJV

But they did not find any, though many false witnesses came forward. NIV

Matthew 27.35:

And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots. KJV

When they had crucified him, they divided up his clothes by casting lots. NIV

Matthew 28.2:

And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. KJV

There was a violent earthquake, for an angel of the Lord came down from heaven and, going to the tomb, rolled back the stone and sat on it. NIV

Matthew 28.9:

And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him. KJV

Suddenly Jesus met them. "Greetings," he said. They came to him, clasped his feet and worshiped him. NIV

Mark 1.14:

Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God. KJV

After John was put in prison, Jesus went into Galilee, proclaiming the good news of God. NIV

Mark 1.42:

And as soon as he had spoken, immediately the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed. KJV

Immediately the leprosy left him and he was cured. NIV

Mark 3.5:

And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts, he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it out: and his hand was restored whole as the other. KJV

He looked around at them in anger and, deeply distressed at their stubborn hearts, said to the man, "Stretch out your hand." He stretched it out and his hand was completely restored. NIV

Mark 3.15:

And to have power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils. KJV

And to have authority to drive out demons. NIV

Mark 6.11:

And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. KJV

And if any place will not welcome you or listen to you, shake the dust off your feet when you leave, as a testimony against them. NIV

Mark 6.33:

And the people saw them departing, and many knew him, and ran afoot thither out of all cities, and outwent them, and came together unto him. KJV

But many who saw them leaving recognized them and ran on foot from all the towns and got there ahead of them. NIV

Mark 6.36:

Send them away, that they may go into the country round about, and into the villages, and buy themselves bread: for they have nothing to eat. KJV

Send the people away so they can go to the surrounding countryside and villages and buy themselves something to eat. NIV

Mark 7.2:

And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say, with unwashen, hands, they found fault. KJV

Saw some of the disciples eating food with "unclean"—that is, ceremonially unwashed—hands. NIV

Mark 7.8:

For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do. KJV

You have let go of the commands of God and are holding on to the traditions of men. NIV

Mark 8.9:

And they that had eaten were about four thousand: and he sent them away. KJV

About four thousand men were present. And having sent them away, NIV

Mark 8.26:

And he sent him away to his house, saying, Neither go into the town, nor tell it to any in the town. KJV

Jesus sent him home, saying, Don't go into the village." NIV

Mark 9.38:

And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us: and we forbid him, because he followeth not us. KJV

"Teacher," said John, "we saw a man driving out demons in your name and we told him to stop, because he was not one of us." NIV

Mark 9.45:

And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched. KJV

And if your foot causes you to sin, cut it off. It is better for you to enter life crippled than to have two feet and be thrown into hell. NIV

Mark 9.49:

For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt. KJV

Everyone will be salted with fire. NIV

Mark 10.7:

For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife. KJV

For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh. So they are no longer two, but one. NIV

Mark 10.21:

Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross, and follow me. KJV

Jesus looked at him and loved him. "One thing you lack," he said. "Go, sell everything you have and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come, follow me." NIV

Mark 10.24:

And the disciples were astonished at his words. But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them, Children, how hard it is for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God! KJV

The disciples were amazed at his words. But Jesus said again, "Children, how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!" NIV

Mark 11.8:

And many spread their garments in the way: and others cut down branches off the trees, and strawed them in the way. KJV

Many people spread their cloaks on the road, while others spread branches they had cut in the fields. NIV

Mark 11.10:

Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest. KJV

"Blessed is the coming kingdom of our father David! Hosanna, in the highest!" NIV

Mark 11.23:

For verily I say unto you, That whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; and shall doubt not in his heart, but shall believe that those things which he saith shall come to pass; he shall have whatsoever he saith. KJV

I tell you the truth, if anyone says to this mountain, "Go, throw yourself into the sea," and does not doubt in his heart but believes that what he says will happen, it will be done for him. NIV

Mark 12.23:

In the resurrection therefore, when they shall rise, whose wife shall she be of them? for the seven had her to wife. KJV

"At the resurrection whose wife will she be, since the seven were married to her?" NIV

Mark 12.29:

And Jesus answered him, The first of all commandments is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord. KJV

"The most important one," answered Jesus, "is this: Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one." NIV

Mark 12.30:

And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. KJV

Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind and with all your strength. NIV

Mark 12.33:

And to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices. KJV

To love him with all your heart, with all your understanding and with all your strength, and to love your neighbor as yourself is more important than all burnt offerings and sacrifices. NIV

Mark 13.11:

But when they shall lead you, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate: but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost. KJV

Whenever you are arrested and brought to trial, do not worry beforehand about what to say. Just say whatever is given you at the time, for it is not you speaking, but the Holy Spirit. NIV

Mark 13.14:

But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing where it ought not, (let him that readeth understand,) then let them that be in Judea flee to the mountains. KJV

When you see "the abomination that causes desolation" standing where it does not belong—let the reader understand—then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains. NIV

Mark 14.19:

And they began to be sorrowful, and to say unto him one by one, Is it I? and another said, Is it I? KJV

They were saddened, and one by one they said to him, "Surely not I?" NIV

Mark 14.27:

And Jesus saith unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered. KJV

"You will all fall away," Jesus told them, "for it is written: 'I will strike the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered.'" NIV

Mark 14.68:

But he denied, saying, I know not, neither understand I what thou sayest. And he went out into the porch; and the cock crew. KJV

But he denied it. "I don't know or understand what you're talking about," he said, and went out into the entryway. NIV

Mark 14.70:

And he denied it again. And a little after, they that stood by said again to Peter, Surely thou art one of them: for thou art a Galilean, and thy speech agreeth thereto. KJV

And he denied it. After a little while, those standing near said to Peter, "Surely you are one of them, for you are a Galilean." NIV

Mark 15.3:

And the chief priests accused him of many things: but he answered nothing. KJV

The chief priests accused him of many things. NIV

Luke 1.28:

And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women. KJV

The angel went to her and said, "Greetings, you who are highly favored! The Lord is with you." NIV

Luke 1.29:

And when she saw him, she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. KJV

Mary was greatly troubled at his words and wondered what kind of greeting this might be. NIV

Luke 2.42:

And when he was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem after the custom of the feast. KJV

When he was twelve years old, they went up to the Feast, according to the custom. NIV

Luke 4.4:

And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God. KJV

Jesus answered, "It is written: 'Man does not live on bread alone.'" NIV

Luke 4.18:

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised. KJV

"The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind, to release the oppressed. NIV

Luke 5.38:

But new wine must be put into new bottles; and both are preserved. KJV

No, new wine must be poured into new wineskins. NIV

Luke 7.31:

And the Lord said, Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this generation? and to what are they like? KJV

To what, then, can I compare the people of this generation? What are they like? NIV

Luke 8.43:

And a woman having an issue of blood twelve years, which had spent all her living upon physicians, neither could be healed of any. KJV

And a woman was there who had been subject to bleeding for twelve years, but no one could heal her. NIV

Luke 8.45:

And Jesus said, Who touched me? When all denied, Peter and they that were with him said, Master, the multitude throng thee and press thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me? KJV

"Who touched me?" Jesus asked. When they all denied it, Peter said, "Master, the people are crowding and pressing against you." NIV

Luke 8.48:

And he said unto her, Daughter, be of good comfort: thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace. KJV

Then he said to her, "Daughter, your faith has healed you. Go in peace." NIV

Luke 8.54:

And he put them all out, and took her by the hand, and called, saying, Maid, arise. KJV

But he took her by the hand and said, "My child, get up!" NIV

Luke 9.10:

And the apostles, when they were returned, told him all that they had done. And he took them, and went aside privately into a desert place belonging to the city called Bethsaida. KJV

When the apostles returned, they reported to Jesus what they had done. Then he took them with him and they withdrew by themselves to a town called Bethsaida. NIV

Luke 9.54:

And when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did? KJV

When the disciples James and John saw this, they asked, "Lord, do you want us to call fire down from heaven to destroy them?" NIV

Luke 9.55:

But he turned, and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. KJV

But Jesus turned and rebuked them. NIV

Luke 9.56:

For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. And they went to another village. KJV

And they went to another village. NIV

Luke 11.2:

And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth. KJV

He said to them, "When you pray, say: 'Father, hallowed be your name, your kingdom come.'" NIV

Luke 11.4:

And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil. KJV

Forgive us our sins, for we also forgive everyone who sins against us. And lead us not into temptation. NIV

Luke 11.11:

If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? KJV

Which of you fathers, if your son asks for a fish, will give him a snake instead? NIV

Luke 11.44:

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are as graves which appear not, and the men that walk over them are not aware of them. KJV

Woe to you, because you are like unmarked graves, which men walk over without knowing it. NIV

Luke 11.54:

Laying wait for him, and seeking to catch something out of his mouth, that they might accuse him. KJV

Waiting to catch him in something he might say. NIV

Luke 12.39:

And this know, that if the goodman of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through. KJV

But understand this: If the owner of the house had known at what hour the thief was coming, he would not have let his house be broken into. NIV

Luke 17.9:

Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not. KJV

Would he thank the servant because he did what he was told to do? NIV

Luke 18.24:

And when Jesus saw that he was very sorrowful, he said, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! KJV

Jesus looked at him and said, "How hard it is for the rich to enter the kingdom of God!" NIV

Luke 19.45:

And he went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold therein, and them that bought; KJV

Then he entered the temple area and began driving out those who were selling. NIV

Luke 20.13:

Then said the lord of the vineyard, what shall I do? I will send my beloved son: it may be they will reverence him when they see him. KJV

Then the owner of the vineyard said, "What shall I do? I will send my son, whom I love; perhaps they will respect him." NIV

Luke 20.23:

But he perceived their craftiness, and said unto them, Why tempt ye me? KJV

He saw through their duplicity and said to them, NIV

Luke 20.30:

And the second took her to wife, and he died childless. KJV

The second NIV

Luke 22.31:

And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. KJV

"Simon, Simon, Satan has asked to sift you as wheat." NIV

Luke 22.64:

And when they had blindfolded him, they struck him on the face, and asked him, saying, Prophecy, who is it that smote thee? KJV

They blindfolded him and demanded, "Prophecy! Who hit you?" NIV

Luke 22.68:

And if I also ask you, ye will not answer me, nor let me go. KJV

And if I asked you, you would not answer. NIV

Luke 23.23:

And they were instant with loud voices, requiring that he might be crucified. And the voices of them and of the chief priests prevailed. KJV

But with loud shouts they insistently demanded that he be crucified, and their shouts prevailed. NIV

Luke 23.38:

And a superscription also was written over him in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS. KJV

There was a written notice above him, which read: THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS. NIV

Luke 24.1:

Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them. KJV

On the first day of the week, very early in the morning, the women took the spices they had prepared and went to the tomb. NIV

Luke 24.42:

And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb. KJV

They gave him a piece of broiled fish. NIV

Luke 24.46:

And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day. KJV

He told them, "This is what is written: The Christ will suffer and rise from the dead on the third day. NIV

John 1.27:

He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose. KJV

He is the one who comes after me, the thongs of whose sandals I am not worthy to untie. NIV

John 3.13:

And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven. KJV

No one has ever gone into heaven except the one who came from heaven—the Son of man. NIV

John 3.15:

That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. KJV

That everyone who believes in him may have eternal life. NIV

John 5.3:

In these lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water. KJV

Here a great number of disabled people used to lie—the blind, the lame, the paralyzed. NIV

John 5.16:

And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath day. KJV

So, because Jesus was doing these things on the Sabbath, the Jews persecuted him. NIV

John 6.11:

And Jesus took the loaves; and when he had given thanks, he distributed to the disciples, and the disciples to them that were set down; and likewise of the fishes as much as they would. KJV

Jesus then took the loaves, gave thanks, and distributed to those who were seated as much as they wanted. He did the same with the fish. NIV

John 6.22:

The day following, when the people which stood on the other side of the sea saw that there was none other boat there, save that one whereinto his disciples were entered, and that Jesus went not with his disciples into the boat, but that his disciples were gone away alone; KJV

The next day the crowd that had stayed on the opposite shore of the lake realized that only one boat had been there, and that Jesus had not entered it with his disciples, but that they had gone away alone. NIV

John 6.47:

Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life. KJV

I tell you the truth, he who believes has everlasting life. NIV

John 8.9:

And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst KJV

At this, those who heard began to go away one at a time, the older ones first, until only Jesus was left, with the woman still standing there. NIV

John 8.10:

When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee? KJV

Jesus straightened up and asked her, "Woman, where are they? Has no one condemned you?" NIV

John 8.59:

Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by. KJV

At this, they picked up stones to stone him, but Jesus hid himself, slipping away from the temple grounds. NIV

John 9.6:

When he had thus spoken, he spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay. KJV

Having said this, he spit on the ground, made some mud with the saliva, and put it on the man's eyes. NIV

John 10.26:

But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. KJV

But you do not believe because you are not my sheep. NIV

John 11.41:

Then they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou has heard me. KJV

So they took away the stone. Then Jesus looked up and said "Father, I thank you that you have heard me." NIV

John 12.1:

Then Jesus six days before the passover came to Bethany, where Lazarus was which had been dead, whom he raised from the dead. KJV

Six days before the Passover, Jesus arrived at Bethany, where Lazarus lived, whom Jesus had raised from the dead. NIV

John 16.16:

A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father. KJV

In a little while you will see me no more, and then after a little while you will see me. NIV

John 17.12:

While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the scripture might be fulfilled. KJV

While I was with them, I protected them and kept them safe by that name you gave me. None has been lost except the one doomed to destruction so that Scripture would be fulfilled. NIV

John 19.16:

Then delivered he him therefore unto them to be crucified. And they took Jesus and led him away. KJV

Finally Pilate handed him over to them to be crucified. So the soldiers took charge of Jesus. NIV

Acts 2.30:

Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne. KJV

But he was a prophet and knew that God had promised him on oath that he would place one of his descendants on his throne. NIV

Acts 3.11:

And as the lame man which was healed held Peter and John, all the people ran together unto them in the porch that is called Solomon's, greatly wondering. KJV

While the beggar held on to Peter and John, all the people were astonished and came running to them in the place called Solomon's Colonnade. NIV

Acts 7.37:

This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear. KJV

This is that Moses who told the Israelites, God will send you a prophet like me from your own people. NIV

Acts 9.5:

And he said, Who art thou, Lord? and the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. KJV

Who are you, Lord? Saul asked. "I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting," he replied. NIV

Acts 9.6:

And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do. KJV

Now get up and go into the city, and you will be told what you must do. NIV

Acts 10.6:

He lodgeth with one Simon a tanner, whose house is by the sea side: he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do. KJV

He is staying with Simon the tanner, whose house is by the sea. NIV

Acts 10.12:

Wherein were all manner of fourfooted beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air. KJV

It contained all kinds of four-footed animals, as well as reptiles of the earth and birds of the air. NIV

Acts 10.21:

Then Peter went down to the men which were sent unto him from Cornelius; and said, Behold, I am he whom ye seek: what is the cause wherefore ye are come? KJV

Peter went down and said to the men, "I'm the one you're looking for. Why have you come?" NIV

Acts 10.32:

Send therefore to Joppa, and call hither Simon, whose surname is Peter; he is lodged in the house of one Simon a tanner by the sea side: who, when he cometh, shall speak unto thee. KJV

Send to Joppa for Simon who is called Peter. He is a guest in the home of Simon the tanner, who lives by the sea. NIV

Acts 13.42:

And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next sabbath. KJV

As Paul and Barnabas were leaving the synagogue, the people invited them to speak further about these things on the next Sabbath. NIV

Acts 15.18:

Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world. KJV

That have been known for ages. NIV

Acts 15.24:

Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law: to whom we gave no such commandment. KJV

We have heard that some went out from us without our authorization and disturbed you, troubling your minds by what they said. NIV

Acts 18.21:

But bade them farewell, saying, I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem: but I will return again unto you, if God will. And he sailed from Ephesus. KJV

But as he left, he promised, "I will come back if it is God's will." Then he set sail from Ephesus. NIV

Acts 20.15:

And we sailed thence, and came the next day over against Chios; and the next day we arrived at Samos, and tarried at Trogyllium; and the next day we came to Miletus. KJV

The next day we set sail from there and arrived off Kios. The day after that we crossed over to Samos, and on the following day arrived at Miletus. NIV

Acts 21.8:

And the next day we that were of Paul's company departed, and came into Caesarea: and we entered into the house of Philip the evangelist, which was one of the seven; and abode with him. KJV

Leaving the next day, we reached Caesarea and stayed at the house of Philip the evangelist, one of the Seven. NIV

Acts 21.22:

What is it therefore? the multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou art come. KJV

What shall we do? They will certainly hear that you have come. NIV

Acts 21.25:

As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing, save only that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from strangled, and from fornication. KJV

As for the Gentile believers, we have written to them our decision that they should abstain from food sacrificed to idols, from blood, from the meat of strangled animals and from sexual immorality. NIV

Acts 22.9:

And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me. KJV

My companions saw the light, but they did not understand the voice of him who was speaking to me. NIV

Acts 22.20:

And when the blood of thy martyr Stephen was shed, I also was standing by, and consenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him. KJV

And when the blood of your martyr Stephen was shed, I stood there giving my approval and guarding the clothes of those who were killing him. NIV

Acts 23.9:

And there arose a great cry: and the scribes that were of the Pharisees' part arose, and strove, saying, We find no evil in this man: but if a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God. KJV

There was a great uproar, and some of the teachers of the law who were Pharisees stood up and argued vigorously. "We find nothing wrong with this man," they said. "What if a spirit or an angel has spoken to him?" NIV

Acts 24.6:

Who also hath gone about to profane the temple: whom we took, and would have judged according to our law. KJV

And even tried to desecrate the temple; so we seized him. NIV

Acts 24.8:

Commanding his accusers to come unto thee: by examining of whom thyself mayest take knowledge of all these things, whereof we accuse him. KJV

By examining him yourself you will be able to learn the truth about all these charges we are bringing against him. NIV

Acts 24.26:

He hoped also that money should have been given him of Paul, that he might loose him: wherefore he sent for him the oftener, and communed with him. KJV

At the same time he was hoping that Paul would offer him a bribe, so he sent for him frequently and talked with him. NIV

Acts 26.30:

And when he had thus spoken, the king rose up, and the governor, and Bernice, and they that sat with them. KJV

The king rose, and with him the governor and Bernice and those sitting with them. NIV

Acts 28.16:

And when we came to Rome, the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard: but Paul was suffered to dwell by himself with a soldier that kept him. KJV

When we got to Rome, Paul was allowed to live by himself, with a soldier to guard him. NIV

Romans 1.16:

For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. KJV

I am not ashamed of the gospel, because it is the power of God for the salvation of everyone who believes: first for the Jew, then for the Gentile. NIV

Romans 8.1:

There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. KJV

Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus. NIV

Romans 9.28:

For he will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness: because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth. KJV

For the Lord will carry out his sentence on earth with speed and finality. NIV

Romans 10.15:

And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things! KJV

And how can they preach unless they are sent? As it is written, "How beautiful are the feet of those who bring good news!" NIV

Romans 11.6:

And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work. KJV

And if by grace, then it is no longer by works; if it were, grace would no longer be grace. NIV

Romans 13.9:

For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. KJV

The commandments, "Do not commit adultery," "Do not murder," "Do not steal," "Do not covet," and whatever other commandment there may be, are summed up in this one rule. "Love your neighbor as yourself." NIV

Romans 14.6:

He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks. KJV

He who regards one day as special, does so to the Lord. He who eats meat, eats to the Lord, for he gives thanks to God; and he who abstains, does so to the Lord and gives thanks to God. NIV

Romans 14.21:

It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak. KJV

It is better not to eat meat or drink wine or to do anything else that will cause your brother to fall. NIV
Romans 15.24:

Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you: for I trust to see you in my journey, and to be brought on my way thitherward by you, if first I be somewhat filled with your company. KJV

I plan to do so when I go to Spain. I hope to visit you while passing through and to have you assist me on my journey there, after I have enjoyed your company for a while. NIV

Romans 15.29:

And I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ. KJV

I know that when I come to you, I will come in the full measure of the blessing of Christ. NIV

1 Corinthians 6.20:

For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's. KJV

You were bought at a price. Therefore honor God with your body. NIV

1 Corinthians 10.28:

But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that shewed it, and for conscience sake: for the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof. KJV

But if anyone says to you, This has been offered in sacrifice," then do not eat it, both for the sake of the man who told you and for conscience' sake. NIV

1 Corinthians 11.24:

And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. KJV

And when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, "This is my body, which is for you; do this in remembrance of me." NIV

Galatians 3.1:

O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? KJV

You foolish Galatians! Who has bewitched you? Before your very eyes Jesus Christ was clearly portrayed as crucified. NIV

Ephesians 3.14:

For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. KJV

For this reason, I kneel before the Father. NIV

Ephesians 5.30:

For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. KJV

For we are members of his body. NIV

Philippians 3.16:

Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing. KJV

Only let us live up to what we have already attained. NIV

Colossians 1.2:

To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse: Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. KJV

To the holy and faithful brothers in Christ at Colosse: Grace and peace to you from God our Father. NIV

Colossians 3.6:

For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience. KJV

Because of these, the wrath of God is coming. NIV

1 Thessalonians 1.1:

Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the church of the Thessalonians which is in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. KJV

Paul, Silas and Timothy, To the church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace and peace to you. NIV

1 Timothy 3.3:

Not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous. KJV

Not given to much wine, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, not a lover of money. NIV

1 Timothy 6.5:

Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself. KJV

And constant friction between men of corrupt mind, who have been robbed of the truth and who think that godliness is a means to financial gain. NIV

1 Timothy 6.7:

For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. KJV

For we brought nothing into the world, and we can take nothing out of it. NIV

1 Timothy 6.19:

Laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life. KJV

In this way they will lay up treasure for themselves as a firm foundation for the coming age, so that they may take hold of the life that is truly life. NIV

2 Timothy 1.11:

Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles. KJV

And of this gospel I was appointed a herald and an apostle and a teacher. NIV

2 Timothy 4.1:

I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; KJV

In the presence of God and of Christ Jesus, who will judge the living and the dead, and in view of his appearing and his kingdom, I give you this charge: NIV

Hebrews 2.7:

Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands. KJV

You made him a little lower than the angels; you crowned him with glory and honor. NIV

Hebrews 3.6:

But Christ as son over his own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end. KJV

But Christ is faithful as a son over God's house. And we are his house, if we hold on to our courage and the hope of which we boast. NIV

Hebrews 7.21:

(For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The lord swear and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek;) KJV

But he became a priest with an oath when God said to him: "The Lord has sworn and will not change his mind: 'You are a priest forever.' " NIV

Hebrews 8.12:

For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. KJV

For I will forgive their wickedness and will remember their sins no more. NIV

Hebrews 10.30:

For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people. KJV

For we know him who said, "It is mine to avenge; I will repay," and again, "The Lord will judge his people." NIV

Hebrews 10.34:

For ye had compassion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance. KJV

You sympathized with those in prison and joyfully accepted the confiscation of your property, because you knew that you yourselves had better and lasting possessions. NIV

Hebrews 11.11:

Through faith also Sara herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age, because she judged him faithful who had promised. KJV

By faith Abraham, even though he was past age—and Sarah herself was barren—was enabled to become a father because he considered him faithful who had made the promise. NIV

Hebrews 11.13:

these all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. KJV

All these people were still living by faith when they died. They did not receive the things promised; they only saw them and welcomed them from a distance. And they admitted that they were aliens and strangers on earth. NIV

Hebrews 12.20:

(For they could not endure that which was commanded, And if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart. KJV

Because they could not bear what was commanded: "If even an animal touches the mountain, it must be stoned." NIV

1 Peter 1.22:

Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently: KJV

Now that you have purified yourselves by obeying the truth so that you have sincere love for your brothers, love one another deeply, from the heart. NIV

1 Peter 4.3:

For the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries. KJV

For you have spent enough time in the past doing what pagans choose to do—living in debauchery, lust, drunkenness, orgies, carousing and detestable idolatry. NIV

1 Peter 4.14:

If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye; for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you; on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified. KJV

If you are insulted because of the name of Christ, you are blessed, for the Spirit of glory and of God rests on you. NIV

2 Peter 3.10:

But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. KJV

But the day of the Lord will come like a thief. The heavens will disappear with a roar; the elements will be destroyed by fire, and the earth and everything in it will be laid bare. NIV

1 John 4.3:

And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world. KJV

But every spirit that does not acknowledge Jesus is not from God. This is the spirit of the antichrist, which ye have heard is coming and even now is already in the world. NIV

1 John 5.13:

These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God. KJV

I write these things to you who believe in the name of the Son of God so that you may know that you have eternal life. NIV

Revelation 1.8:

I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty. KJV

"I am the Alpha and the Omega," says the Lord God, "Who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty." NIV

Revelation 1.11:

Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea. KJV

Which said: Write on a scroll what you see and send it to the seven churches: to Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia and Laodicea. NIV

Revelation 5.14:

And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever. KJV

The four living creatures said, "Amen," and the elders fell down and worshiped. NIV

Revelation 11.1:

And there was given me a reed like unto a rod: and the angel stood, saying, Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein. KJV

I was given a reed like a measuring rod and was told, "Go and measure the temple of God and the altar, and count the worshipers there." NIV

Revelation 11.17:

Saying, we give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou has taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. KJV

Saying: We give thanks to you, Lord God Almighty, who is and who was, because you have taken your great power and have begun to reign. NIV

Revelation 14.5:

And in their mouth was found no guile: for they are without fault before the throne of God. KJV

No lie was found in their mouths; they are blameless. NIV

Revelation 15.2:

And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire: and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. KJV

And I saw what looked like a sea of glass mixed with fire and, standing beside the sea, those who had been victorious over the beast and his image and over the number of his name. They held harps given them by God. NIV

Revelation 21.24:

And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it. KJV

The nations will walk by its light, and the kings of the earth will bring their splendor into it. NIV

Appendix C

The Translators of the Authorized Version

Forty-seven men of highest Christian commitment and a profound knowledge of biblical languages translated the Authorized Version of 1611. Initially fifty-four were chosen, but seven either died or withdrew before the project commenced.

The translators were divided into six groups which consisted of varying numbers ranging from seven to ten. These committees were assigned the following translations:^{[1](#)}

☐ (A) Genesis to 1 Chronicles—the First Westminster Committee consisting of ten men.

☐ (E) 2 Chronicles to the Song of Solomon—the First Cambridge Committee consisting of eight men.

- ☐ (C) Isaiah to Malachi—the Oxford Old Testament Committee consisting of seven men.
- ☐ (F) The Apocrypha—the Second Cambridge Committee consisting of seven men.
- ☐ (D) Matthew to Acts and the Revelation—the Oxford New Testament Committee consisting of eight men.
- ☐ (B) Romans to Jude—the Second Westminster Committee consisting of seven men.

The procedure adopted is of interest. In each group the participants individually translated the Scripture portion assigned. Only then did the group meet, analyze each contribution and finally produce an agreed translation.

When this provisional draft was completed it was distributed to each of the other five groups for careful checking and suggestions. Finally a select committee went through the entire text and two members of this select committee made a final check of each translation.

Thus utmost care was taken to ensure the fullest input of each expert into the translation of the entire Authorized Version.

While space precludes the presentation of even short biographies of all forty-seven translators, we present a few as typical. We are indebted to D.O.Fuller, *Which Bible?*, Chapter One, for the biographies included. But first we will provide an alphabetical list of the translators.²

- ☐ [Dr. George Abbot](#), D.D., Master of University College, Oxford; Vice Chancellor of Oxford, Bishop of Lichfield, Archbishop of Canterbury (D)
- ☐ [Dr. Lancelot Andrewes](#), M.A., D.D., Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge; Bishop of Ely and Winchester, Dean of Westminster (A)
- ☐ Dr. Roger Andrewes, D.D., Fellow of Pembroke College, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge (E)
- ☐ Dr. William Barlow, M.A., D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Bishop of Rochester, Bishop of Lincoln (B)
- ☐ [William Bedwell](#), M.A., St. John's College Cambridge (A)
- ☐ [John Boys](#), Fellow of St. John's College Cambridge; Rector of Boxworth (F)
- ☐ Dr. William Brainthwaite, Fellow of Emmanuel College, Master of Gonville and Gaius College, Deputy Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge (F)
- ☐ [Dr. Richard Brett](#), D.D., Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford (C)
- ☐ Dr. F. Burleigh, D.D., Fellow of King James' College, Chelsea (A)
- ☐ Professor Byng, Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge, Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge (E)
- ☐ Dr. Laurence Chaderton, Fellow of Christ's College, Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge (E)
- ☐ Dr. Richard Clarke, D.D., Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge (A)
- ☐ Professor William Dakins, M.A., B.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Professor of Divinity, Gresham College (B)
- ☐ [Francis Dillingham](#), M.A., B.D., Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge (E)

- ☐ [Professor Andrew Downes](#), M.A., B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; Regius Professor of Greek, Cambridge (F)
- ☐ Dr. John Duport, M.A., D.D., Fellow and Master of Jesus College, Cambridge; Vice-Chancellor Cambridge University (F)
- ☐ Dr. R. Eedes, Dean of Worcester (D)
- ☐ Mr. Fairclowe, Fellow of New College, Oxford (C)
- ☐ Dr. Roger Fenton, D.D., Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge (B)
- ☐ Professor John Harding, President of Magdalen College and Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford (C)
- ☐ [Professor John Harmar](#), M.A., Professor of Greek, Oxford; Headmaster of Winchester, Warden of St. Mary's College (D)
- ☐ [Dr. Thomas Harrison](#), B.A., D.D., Vice-Master of Trinity College, Cambridge (E)
- ☐ [Dr. Thomas Holland](#), M.A., D.D., Regius Professor Divinity, Oxford (C)
- ☐ Dr. Ralph Hutchinson, M.A., D.D., President of St. John's College, Oxford (B)
- ☐ [Dr. Richard Kilbye](#), M.A., D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford (C)
- ☐ Professor Geoffrey King, Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge; Fellow of King's College, Cambridge (A)
- ☐ Dr. John Layfield, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Lecturer in Greek, Cambridge; expert on architecture (A)
- ☐ Professor Edward Lively, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge (E)
- ☐ Dr. John Overall, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge; Bishop of Coventry, Litchfield and Norwich, Dean of St. Paul's (A)
- ☐ Dr. John Perin, Fellow St. John's College, Oxford; Canon of Christ Church, Professor of Greek, Oxford (D)
- ☐ Michael Rabbett, Rector of St. Vedast, Foster Lane (B)
- ☐ Dr. Jeremiah Radcliffe, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge (F)
- ☐ Dr. Ralph Ravens, Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford (D)
- ☐ Dr. Thomas Ravis, M.A., D.D., Vice Chancellor of Oxford, Bishop of Gloucester (D)
- [Dr. John Reynolds](#), D.D., President of Corpus Christi College and Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford; Dean of Lincoln (C)
- ☐ [Dr. John Richardson](#), D.D., Fellow of Emmanuel College, Master of Peterhouse College, Master of Trinity College, Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge (E)
- ☐ Mr. Thomas Sanderson, Rector of All Hallows (B)

- ☐ [Dr. Adrian Saravia](#), Professor of Divinity at Leyden University, Prebendary at Canterbury and Westminster (A)
- ☐ [Sir Henry Saville](#), Fellow of Merton College, Oxford; Provost of Eton, Tutor to Queen Elizabeth I (D)
- ☐ Dr. Miles Smith, M.A., D.D., Bishop of Gloucester (C)
- ☐ Professor Robert Spalding, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge (E)
- ☐ Dr. T. Spenser, President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford (B)
- ☐ Dr. William Teigh, Archdeacon of Middlesex, Rector of All Hallows, Barking-by-the-Tower (A)
- ☐ Dr. Giles Thompson, Dean of Windsor, Bishop of Gloucester (D)
- ☐ [Richard Thomson](#), M.A., Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge (A)
- ☐ Dr. Ward, D.D., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge; Prebendary of Chichester (F)
- ☐ Dr. Samuel Ward, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge; Master of Sidney Sussex College (F)

Brief Biographies

The following brief biographies of a few of the translators will be of interest.

Dr. George Abbott began his university studies at Balliol College, Oxford in 1578 and soon became known for his strong Calvinism and Puritanism. In 1593 he took his B.D., in 1597 his D.D., and in the same year became Master of University College at the age of thirty-five; and a few years later he was Vice Chancellor. He very strongly opposed the Romanizing influence of Laud [Archbishop of Canterbury] and was very severe in his denunciation of anything which savored of "popery." Nevertheless he accepted some high offices in the Church of England and in 1609 became Bishop of Lichfield and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1611. He was regarded as the head of the Puritans within the Church of England, and he vigorously opposed the King's declaration permitting sports and pastimes on [Sunday]. He encouraged James to request the States General to dismiss Vorstius from his professorship at Leyden because of his Arminianism.

Lancelot Andrewes, a member of the Westminster Committee, had his early education at Coopers Free School and Merchant Taylors School, where his rapid progress in the study of the ancient languages was brought to the notice of Dr. Watts, the founder of some scholarships at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. Andrewes was sent to that College, where he took his B.A. degree and soon afterward was elected Fellow. He then took his Master's degree and began to study divinity and achieved great distinction as a lecturer. He was raised to several positions of influence in the Church of England and distinguished himself as a diligent and excellent preacher, and became Chaplain to Queen Elizabeth I. King James I promoted him to be Bishop of Chester in 1605 and also gave him the influential position of Lord Almoner. He later became Bishop of Ely and Privy Counsellor. Toward the end of his life he was made Bishop of Winchester.

It is recorded that Andrewes was a man of deep piety and that King James had such great respect for him that in his presence he refrained from the levity in which he indulged at other times. A sermon

preached at Andrewes' funeral in 1626 paid tribute to his great scholarship—"His knowledge in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac and Arabic, besides fifteen modern languages, was so advanced that he may be ranked as one of the rarest linguists in Christendom.

"A great part of five hours every day he spent in prayer, and in his last illness he spent all his time in prayer—and when both voice and eyes and hands failed in their office, his countenance showed that he still prayed and praised God in his heart, until it pleased God to receive his blessed soul to Himself."

William Bedwell, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge, had established his reputation as an Arabic scholar before 1603 and is recognized as "the Father of Arabic studies in England." He was the author of the "*Lexicon Heptaglotton*" in seven folio volumes, including Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee and Arabic. He also commenced a Persian dictionary and an Arabic translation of the Epistles of John (now among the Laud MSS in the Bodleian Library).

John Boys, (or Bois). Fellow of St. John's, Cambridge, and Greek lecturer there. He was born in 1560 and at a very early age showed an unusual interest in languages. He began to read Hebrew at the age of five years and was admitted to St. John's College, Cambridge, when he was fourteen. There he very soon distinguished himself by his knowledge of the Greek language, which he sometimes studied in the library from 4 a.m. until 8 p.m.

When he was elected Fellow of his college he was suffering from smallpox, but he was so anxious not to delay his career that, at some risk to himself and fellow-scholars, he persuaded his friends to wrap him in blankets and carry him in. After studying medicine for some time he gave up this course and applied himself to the study of Greek. For ten years he was the chief Greek lecturer in his college. At four in the morning he voluntarily gave a Greek lecture in his own room which was frequented by many of his fellows.

After twenty years of university life he became Rector of Boxworth in Cambridgeshire, and while he was there he made an arrangement with twelve other ministers that they should meet each Friday in each other's homes in turn and share the results of their studies.

When the translation of the Bible was begun he was chosen to be one of the Cambridge translators, and eventually he not only undertook his portion but also the part allotted to another member of the committee. When the work was completed John Boys was one of the six translators who met at Stationers' Hall to revise the whole. This task took them about nine months, and during this period the Company of Stationers made them an allowance of thirty shillings each per week. Some of the notes made by John Boys during the final revision were recently discovered in Corpus Christi College Library at Oxford, edited by Professor Ward Allen, and published in 1970 under the title "*Translating for King James*." John Boys' "*Exposition of the Epistles and Gospels Used in the English Liturgy*" furnishes ample evidence of his competent scholarship and doctrinal soundness.

After a long life of profitable study, ministry, translating and writing, he died at the age of eighty-four, "his brow without wrinkles, his sight quick, his hearing sharp, his countenance fresh and his body sound."

Dr. Richard Brett, Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, D.D., well versed in classical and Eastern languages, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, Arabic and Ethiopic.

Dr. John Richardson, Fellow of Emmanuel College, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, 1607, Master of Peterhouse and later Master of Trinity.

Francis Dillingham, Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, M.A. in 1590 and B.D. in 1599. According to Fuller, he was "an excellent linguist and subtle disputant." His works include "A dissuasive from Poperie, containing twelve effectual reasons by which every Papist, not wilfully blinded, may be brought to the truth."

Professor Andrew Downes, St. John's Cambridge, B.A. 1567, Fellow 1571, M.A. 1574, B.D. 1582, Regius Professor of Greek 1585. Downes and Boys revived the study of Greek at St. John's. Downes was professor of Greek for nearly forty years, and was acknowledged to be one of the best Greek scholars of the age. These two men joined Miles Smith on the subcommittee which subjected the whole translation to a final careful process of checking and correction.

John Harmer, M.A., New College, Oxford, Professor of Greek in 1585. Headmaster of Winchester 1588, warden of St. Mary's College 1596. He was well read in patristic and scholastic theology and a noted Latinist and Grecian. His works include translations of Calvin's sermons on the Ten Commandments, several of Beza's sermons, and some of the Homilies of Chrysostom.

Dr. Thomas Harrison, St. John's College, Cambridge, B.A. in 1576. Fellow, Tutor and Vice-Master of Trinity, D.D., noted Hebraist and chief examiner in Hebrew. According to Professor W.F. Moulton (*"History of the English Bible"*) he was also credited with an excellent knowledge of Greek. He was a convinced Puritan.

Dr. Thomas Holland, Balliol and Exeter Colleges, Oxford, B.A. 1571, M.A. 1575, B.D. 1582, D.D. 1584. Master and Regius Professor of Divinity 1589. He achieved so much distinction in many fields of learning that he was not only highly esteemed among English scholars but also had a good reputation in the universities of Europe. Like Apollos, he was mighty in the Scriptures, and like the Apostle, he was faithful in explaining them. His example went hand in hand with his precepts, and he himself lived what he preached to others. Among the translators he was probably the most strongly opposed to Rome, and it is recorded that whenever he went on a journey away from his college he would call the men together and "commend them to the love of God and to the abhorrence of popery."

His biographer writes— "He loved and he longed for God, for the presence of God, and for the full enjoyment of Him. His soul was framed for heaven, and could find no rest till it came there. His dying prayer was— 'Come, O come, Lord Jesus, Thou Morning Star! Come Lord Jesus; I desire to be dissolved, and to be with Thee!'"

Dr. Richard Kilbye, Lincoln College, Oxford, B.A. 1578, M.A. 1582, B.D. and D.D. in 1596 and Regius Professor of Hebrew in 1610. Author of a work on Exodus prepared from Hebrew commentators. An interesting story is found in Walton's biography of Bishop Sanderson illustrating the truth of the old proverb, "a little learning is a dangerous thing." Dr. Kilbye, an excellent Hebrew scholar and Professor of this language in the university, also expert in Greek and chosen as one of the translators, went on a visit with Sanderson, and at church on Sunday they heard a young preacher waste a great amount of the time allotted for his sermon in criticizing several words in the then recent translation. He carefully showed how one particular word should have been translated in a different way. Later that evening the preacher and the learned strangers were invited together to a meal, and Dr. Kilbye took the

opportunity to tell the preacher that he could have used his time more profitably. The Doctor then explained that the translators had very carefully considered the "three reasons" given by the preacher, but they had found another thirteen more weighty reasons for giving the rendering complained of by the young critic.

Dr. John Reynolds, Merton College, Oxford, moved to Corpus Christi and became Fellow in 1566. He took his D.D. in 1585 and became Regius Professor of Divinity. After several years as Dean of Lincoln he was made president of Corpus Christi College in 1598. He represented the Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference at which he suggested that a new translation of the Bible should be undertaken. His reputation as a Hebrew and Greek scholar was sufficient warrant for his inclusion among the translators, and Hall relates that "his memory and reading were near to a miracle." He worked on the translation of the Prophets until his death in 1607. During this period the Oxford translators met at his residence once a week to compare and discuss what they had done.

Dr. Adrian Saravia, Professor of Divinity at Leyden University in 1582, became Prebendary of Canterbury and Westminster. In the controversies of that period he is often referred to as "that learned foreigner." His Spanish descent and his residence in Holland qualified him to assist the translators with his first-hand knowledge of the work of Spanish and Dutch scholars. He was also proficient in Hebrew.

Sir Henry Saville, Brasenose College, Oxford, Fellow of Merton College in 1565 and Warden in 1585, Provost of Eton in 1596, Tutor to Queen Elizabeth I. He was a pioneer in many branches of scholarship and the founder of the Savillian Professorships of Mathematics and Astronomy at Oxford. His works include an eight volume edition of the writings of Chrysostom.

Dr. Miles Smith, M.A., D.D., Corpus Christi, and Brasenose and Christ Church, Oxford, Bishop of Gloucester in 1612. He provided more evidence of his contribution than any of the others, as it was left to him to write the long Translators' Preface— "The Translator to the Reader," which used to be printed at the beginning of most English Bibles. His knowledge of the oriental languages made him well qualified for a place among the translators of the Authorized Version of the Bible. He had Hebrew at his fingers' ends; and he was so conversant with Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic, that he made them as familiar to him as his native tongue. He persisted in this task from its commencement to its completion and was himself the last man engaged in the translation.

The work of the whole company was revised and improved by a small group selected from their number, and was then finally examined by Bilson and Miles Smith. The latter then wrote the famous preface, beginning— "Zeal to promote the common good. . . ."

Richard Thomson, M.A., Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, B.D. 1593, described by Richard Montagu as "a most admirable philologer . . . better known in Italy, France, and Germany than at home."³

When we read these biographies we are struck not only with the learning of the translators but also with the depth of their Christian commitments and their abhorrence of the apostasy which was rampant in the Roman Catholic Church. God could use such noble men. With translators of such firm Protestant convictions, it is little wonder that the Roman Catholics find no use for the King James Version of Scripture.

Although comparisons are said to be odious, there is value in comparing the translators of the King James Version with those of modern versions. The Revised Standard Version is cited as an example.

One of the translators of the Revised Standard Version was H.M. Orlinsky, a Jewish scholar who naturally would not accept the divinity of Christ. Perhaps this fact is a clue as to why the term *virgin* was altered to *young woman* in Isaiah 7:14. It also accounts for the conclusion of Professor R.C. Foster, Professor of Greek and New Testament at the Cincinnati Bible Seminary, when he stated:

The Revised Standard Version is frankly unitarian and offers a very subtle attack upon the deity of Christ. R.C.Foster, *Church News Letter*, July 1946 3

It has further been suggested:

Some of the translators [of the RSV] have written articles which indicate that they do not acknowledge the Bible doctrine of the Deity of Christ, His pre-existence, His Virgin Birth, His Atoning Sacrifice and present intercession in heaven. Trinitarian Bible Society Article No. 13, *The Divine Original*, 9

It is little wonder that the Revised Standard Version reflects the unbelief of some of its translators.

1 The letters at the end of each reference refer to the committee to which each man belonged. A, First Westminster; B, Second Westminster; C, Oxford Old Testament; D, Oxford New Testament; E, First Cambridge; F, Second Cambridge <[BACK](#)>

2. The letters at the end of each reference refer to the committee to which each man belonged. A, First Westminster; B, Second Westminster; C, Oxford Old Testament; D, Oxford New Testament; E, First Cambridge; F, Second Cambridge <[BACK](#)>

Appendix D

Relevance Gone Berserk

In the 1980s the Australian Bible Society proposed to publish a new translation of Scripture to coincide with the bicentenary of white settlement in Australia, which commenced on January 26, 1788, with the arrival of the first convicts and their jailers from Britain. It was proposed that this version use Australian idiom in order to be relevant to Australian readers.

Such a translation is an insult to Australians. It implies that Australians are so uncouth and uneducated that they cannot understand the refined and cultured English into which the Scripture has been translated in earlier times. Thus the version was an affront both to God's Word and to the Australian people.

The proposal led Peter White to write an article, published in Sydney's most prestigious newspaper, lampooning the proposal to the point of diabolical sacrilege. Can we imagine any other world faith, be it Islam, Hinduism, or Buddhism, permitting such blasphemy? Yet in speaking of the Bible, we are referring to the Word of the living God. One can but feel deeply distressed and highly affronted that such blatant sacrilege has become widespread in so-called Christian nations.

The secular world sneers at Bible Societies which attempt relevance in this way, as can be seen from Peter White's disgraceful article which is quoted below.

* * *

Jesus: Prophet or Country Mug?

The Bible Society is to release an Australianised Bible for the Bicentenary. Peter White questions whether the Holy Scriptures are ready for such an encounter with things dinky-di.¹

A "true blue" all-Australian version of the Bible could do wonders for our sense of national identity and may even foster some pride in the unique way we speak the English language. In its announcement at the weekend, the Bible Society promised that this antipodean Good News would not only feature a gum tree on the front cover and an Aboriginal-style depiction of Christ on the cross but, more importantly, that God's holy Word would be translated into the local lingo, "the common language of the Australian people" with special attention to "Australianising certain key expressions."

Now Aussie English has taken a battering from the critics over the years. It has typically been described as slovenly, flat, nasal and whining. One visiting British academic described it as "the most brutal maltreatment inflicted upon the mother tongue of the great English-speaking nations."

It's obvious that such a maligned dialect stands to gain immeasurably by being associated as intimately with the Divine as the Bible Society proposes. A language which was born in the convict stockade, came of age among the riff-raff of the gold fields, and now finds itself most at home on "the Hill" at the Sydney Cricket ground² can only improve its standing by being linked with angels and archangels, miracles and messiahs, prophets, psalms and the Sermon on the Mount.

But will what's great for Australia necessarily be so good for the Holy Scriptures themselves? In its present beleaguered state, Christianity may not cope well with Australianisation.

Consider the possible changes. Presumably the miracle of the loaves and the fishes, for example, will end up something along the lines of an account of how Jesus and the disciples invited over a few mates of a Saturday arvo³ and, because it was hot, they brought all their kids and relatives with them for a swim in the pool. It looked like there wouldn't be enough food to go round until Christ threw another prawn on the barbie [barbecue], and, stone the crows,⁴ if there wasn't more than enough and a whole heap of potato salad left over as well.

Christ walking on water would be out of the question. All Australians know that no self-respecting male goes out on the waves without a surfboard. If Christ's going to perform any oceanic miracles, they're going to have to be of the cut-back, hanging-ten variety.

Psalms 23 would need to be reworked along the lines of:

The Lord is my lifesaver, I shall not drown, He maketh me down to lie on the Bondi sands⁵, the quiet waters by.

The Joseph of the Old Testament will no doubt be described as "flash as a rat with a gold tooth" in his coat of many colours. After Judas has betrayed Jesus he will "shoot through like a Bondi tram" and then commit suicide because he's "as miserable as an orphan bandicoot⁶ on a burnt ridge."

The parable of how it's easier for a rich man to pass through the eye of the needle than to enter the kingdom of heaven would have to be recast as "It's easier for Robert Holmes a'Court, Sir Peter Abeles and Alan Bond⁷ to get across the Harbour Bridge in a hurry during rush hour than to enter God's Kingdom."

St. Paul's encounter with the voice of God on the road to Tarsus [*sic*] would read something like "Stun the mullets, cobber, but don't you think it's time you stopped coming the raw prawn with me."8

Of course, such a God-sent chance to promote the national beverage would be too good to miss.

Jesus won't waste time turning water into wine when it could be Fosters.9

And while on the subject of drinking, the Resurrection would surely make marvelous material for a beer commercial:

"The Pharisees and Sadducees said you'd never make it but after three days in the tomb you finally came through."

* * *

If any doubt remains that such a version could do the Bible immeasurable damage, it is worth bearing in mind that this is not the first time such a project has been undertaken.

The Bicentenary version is to be illustrated by artist Pro Hart.

About five years ago, Pro Hart collaborated with Dr. Norman Habel, then a lecturer in religious studies at a college of advanced education in Adelaide, in publishing a retelling of some key passages from the New Testament in the Australian idiom.

Consider this quote from the book as proof of the possible irreparable harm:

"Who is this bloke called Jesus, with his red prickly beard and his dog, a prophet God sent to the outback or a flam'n country mug?" *Sydney Morning Herald*, October 6, 1987

To add to the blasphemy of this article is an accompanying cartoon making jest of the holy Last Supper. It shows Christ and His disciples looking like country yokels with long beards and wide-brimmed hats with halos hovering over the hats, eating hot dogs and drinking beer. The title of the cartoon is *Detail from the Last Barbecue*. A disgraceful caricature of Christ is seen taking more beer out of an esky10 and passing it to one of the "disciples" with the words, "Get stuck into this in remembrance of me."

While all of this will affront even the most liberal Christian, it is cited to awaken our people to the eventual result of their own acceptance of the Scripture in "relevant" language, language which takes no heed of the high and holy nature of God and His Word. If we take a step down the road to blasphemy we can rest assured that the devil will take those around us and our children further down those perilous steps until at last the Scripture becomes a laughing stock, a book of scorn.

In fairness to the Australian Bible Society it did not descend to the level indicated in Peter White's article. The following types of alteration were undertaken.

The Good News Bible was originally published in two editions, American and British.

The text has now been Australianised for this edition, in the following ways:—

The spelling is Australian preferred spelling, with Macquarie Dictionary as the accepted authority.

Weights and measures are expressed in metric units following official Australian usage.

Publishing style follows Australian conventions.

Changes have been made in the language of the text, so that it will be accepted by Australians as natural to their word usage, idiom and form of expression.

Overall there are some hundreds of changes from the basic American edition, not counting the spelling changes.

The effect of these changes is not dramatic, but it is noticeable.

Three things should be noted carefully about the nature and extent of the textual changes.

(1) The text has not been rewritten; only those expressions that were foreign or unnatural for Australians, or gave the wrong meaning, have been replaced.

(2) The basic meaning of the text has not been changed from what the translators intended.

(3) There has been no change to the level or register of language used in the translation. In particular the language has not been changed to a more colloquial level—at which the uniqueness and peculiarities of Australian English are much more apparent. In general terms the Good News Bible, Australian Edition, uses a formal level of language; and the changes made are those and only those which are required at this level. *Australianising the Good News Bible*, The Bible Society of Australia News Release, 2

It must be said that the Australian Bible Society made a major error in their selection of the Good News Bible for their modifications. Various defects in this version might be pointed out.

Most of the changes made were of a minor nature and somewhat unnecessary. Examples (the Australian usage is given first) include bullock for ox, cent for penny, midday for noonday, removed for erased, underpants for shorts, people for persons, grubs for worms, creek for brook, bush for woods, and wedding reception for wedding party. Since all the replaced words are in common use and well understood in Australia, it seems that the alterations served little purpose.

Appendix E

God's Word Made a Joke

There is a place for humor and there is a place for awe and respect. Surely God's Word is in the latter category, for within its pages is the way of salvation, the story of redemption, the truth of our God. Yet so irreverent has Christian society become that mortals now dare to make light-hearted comments concerning Scripture to arouse the mirth of the godless and careless populace. How far removed is this from the actions of men who rendered up their lives to preserve the Word of God inviolate! It seems that with the explosion of biblical translations and with the introduction of certain paraphrases of God's Word utilizing coarse language to be "relevant" to a society which no longer fears its God, men and women, even within the church, believe they can treat God's Word with the same hilarity that they use for a common work of fiction, devised in the evil minds of men.

One crude jest regarding the Scriptures was in a comic strip appearing worldwide, *The Wizard of Id*, produced by two American cartoonists, Brant Parker and Johnny Hart. The central character in the comic strip is not the Wizard but the pygmy-sized King of Id. He is often seen with his tall, and only weakly intellectual knight, Sir Rodney.

In *The Bangkok Post*, June 24, 1990, the comic strip showed the king and Sir Rodney taking a stroll. They happened to meet a citizen who had a book under her arm. "Hi, Blanch; what's the book under your arm?" the king queried. Blanch replied, "The Good Book." Turning to Sir Rodney, after Blanch had walked on, the king asked, "What's she doing with a copy of the tax laws?"

While it may be that some heads of government see the tax laws as the best book in their country, this rather weak effort to generate mirth at the expense of God's sacred Word, is at very best in poor taste, and at worst plain sacrilege. It will be noted that this comic strip was extracted from a Thai newspaper. Since ninety-four percent of Thais are Buddhists, and five percent are Moslems, this irreverent reference to God's Word would do nothing to raise its status in their eyes. Thais could only conclude that in Christian circles the Bible is of scant religious significance. If a newspaper in Thailand were to similarly treat the Buddhist Scriptures or the Koran in this manner, the perpetrators would be jailed for a number of years under the strict laws of sacrilege enforced in that otherwise freedom-loving country. One can only pray that most Thais would not understand the cartoon.

The cartoon did not conclude at that point. As the king and Sir Rodney roamed farther afield, they met a scribe dressed as an abbot. "Good morning, scribe," greeted Sir Rodney cheerfully. "Morning, Rodney; morning sire," replied the scribe. "How goes the scriptural translations?" questioned Sir Rodney.

Clearly this question, in the presence of the king, was the source of much embarrassment to the scribe, who was rude enough to whisper to Sir Rodney, emphasizing just how reticent he was. Sir Rodney, understandingly, interrupted the scribe's whispered reply with the exclamation "Right!" and a little later, "Yes, how true!"

At last the scribe walked, on jauntily waving as he called, "See you later," to which Rodney responded, "Keep up the good work." Puzzled, the king questioned Sir Rodney. "Okay, what's all the secrecy?" "He's with the KJV," replied Sir Rodney.

Leaving aside the loose mention of God's Word, this cartoon is intriguing. One suspects that the cartoonists have more than a casual knowledge of the disdain presently being heaped throughout Christendom on the King James Version of Scripture. We ponder whether there is an element of the prophetic in this cartoon. Perhaps we will reach the point where those who support the King James Version of Scripture will become objects of scorn and some will be shamefaced when their scriptural preference is discovered. Impossible? Did not once men execute others for preferring a Bible virtually identical to the King James Version? Parker and Hart have, at least, left us with a matter to contemplate.

They are mere secular cartoonists performing their art for mercenary benefits. But what of Christian magazines? Less than one month later the *South Pacific Record* (July 14, 1990) published a cartoon alluding to the controversy over various Bible translations. In a journal which published an article demeaning the King James Version as a T-Model Ford, it came as no great surprise to see God's Word made a lighthearted affair.

The cartoon illustrated a notice behind a very stern-looking woman sitting at a desk. The notice stated, "Give here to support National Bible Sabbath." One church member, wishing to ensure that his donation would be well used, questioned as he searched his inside coat pocket for his wallet, "Will my

contribution fund the KJV or the NIV?" The layman was depicted falling backward in a dead faint when the woman at the desk replied, "Neither—Swahili and Cantonese!" Swahili is the dominant language of East Africa and Cantonese is a prominent language in Southern China and Hong Kong.

Apart from other considerations mentioned above, this cartoon did demonstrate a great misunderstanding of the matter at issue. Russell has made a thorough survey of Bible translations in Southeast Asia including Thai, Vietnamese, Tamil (a common Southern Indian language), Chinese, Malay, Kadazan (a language of Sabah in the Northeastern portion of Borneo). Without exception every one of these translations is based upon perverted Greek manuscripts. Colin discovered the same to be true of the Korean Bible.

Thus the question is not to which foreign language translation the money collected on Bible Sabbath goes, but rather, Is the Bible Society, printing Bibles in Cantonese or Swahili or any other language, using corrupted or uncorrupted Greek manuscripts? In this respect we can recommend the Trinitarian Bible Society alone among the well-known Bible Societies. All of its translations are based upon the *Textus Receptus*.

Again we urge the sacredness of God's Word. It is not to be the object of jest, but rather of deep respect and love, knowing at what price it was preserved, and even more important, at what price the story of salvation, of which it alone is the pure source, was paid.