

“KEPT PURE”

... A CASE FOR

VERBAL PRESERVATION

“KEPT PURE”

Published by the
NEW ZEALAND FELLOWSHIP
OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES

First Edition
1991

2nd Edition
2011

3rd Edition
2015

Dedicated to :-

The Vic McLeans
Of this world ...

FOREWORD

No longer today is the doctrine of providential preservation articulated as a necessary corollary to divine inspiration, as was the case in the 16th and 17th century. As a result, the jealous regard for an existential Bible is all but lost.

Even in many conservative circles an emphasis of importance is placed on an unseen, unsubstantial form of authority. The sense of the Canon being lost, along with the influence of a Germany-imported “Enlightenment”, churchmen since the last 18th century have sought to demonstrate their own Enlightenment prowess in ‘reconstructing’ the text of Holy Writ ...

Over against this slide into apostasy, the Board of Editors of the New Zealand Fellowship of Christian Churches has taken the courageous initiative to ‘turn God’s Light on’, setting forth in these last days the authoritative declarations from God’s faithfully and providentially preserved Word, and published these in their book “KEPT PURE”.

It is their prayer that the Lord’s people “search the Scriptures” as these are they which testify of Him Whose vesture is “kipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God.” Rev. 19:13.

It is Him to Whom we reverently dedicate this book.

A. van Ecthen,
President, NZFCC.

The Word Preserved

1. Words from GOD,
Priceless Treasure?
Given by the breath of God,
For the fitting of His People
And to light the Path they tread.

CHORUS

Not a Jot nor Tittle missing,
Nor a single word a'lost;
All protected by His Promise,
By What More, His People blest?

2. Every Word Refined and Pure
Gathered all within THE BOOK,
Kept by His Own love and power,
There for All to pause and look.
3. Just as sure His saints preserving,
None of them to e'er be lost,
So those Words, His care receiving,
Are His Churches' present boast.
4. Tho' the Adversary question,
Tho' he add and take away;
God Himself, the hand withholding,
Keeps His Words unto this Day.
5. Preach them! STUDY, and divide them
Rightly, and Desire as babes,
That Sincere and Rich Provision,
Change not, nor explain away.

R.D.P.

CONTENTS :-

Preface	i
Introduction	ii

SECTION ONE :-

The Father's Words	1
The Adversary's Work	8
The Promise of Preservation	10
Two Texts	14
Which is Which?	21
That's Far Enough	26

SECTION TWO :-

An Important Question	28
Some Questions Answered	31
More Questions	37
Archaisms and More	39
A "Byte" of History	44
Confusion not of God	48

Appendices	
Notes	

PREFACE :-

When the Saviour was tempted of the Devil in the wilderness, as recorded in Matthew chapter 4, we read that he thrice said the following words :-

“IT IS WRITTEN”

He then went on to quote from the Scriptures of the Hebrew Old Testament.

Not being given either to fabrication or exaggeration, he must, we are assured, have believed that the Scriptures written down centuries, even millennia before, were still available and authoritative in the days in which he dwelt among men.

Not once, in all the “oracles of God”, do we find the Saviour correcting those writings, or suggesting that in any way they had to be amended, but rather stated that not even the smallest letter or marking had been lost.

Is it possible for the Christian today to be able to say, without mental reservation, those same words “IT IS WRITTEN”?

If so , WHERE is it written?

To what, EXACTLY, do we refer when we state “The Bible says”, then go onto QUOTE SOMETHING?

Do we believe, like the Saviour, that the words we go on to quote are, in FACT, the words of God?

“KEPT PURE” demonstrates from the Scriptures themselves, that not only has God GIVEN words, every one of which is PURE, but that his promise to PRESERVE those words is TRUE. As a consequence those words, being preserved, are AVAILABLE to his people TODAY.

INTRODUCTION

“Why the dogged insistence on the King James Bible?” asks a correspondent, “This attitude I regard as obscurantist and misinformed”.

And this writer is not the only Christian I have heard ask this question and make similar statements.

Is it important to use the Authorised Version, as opposed to other of the more ‘modern and accurate’ versions available to the public today? And if so, why?

No true Christian will deny that the Bible is God’s word, nor will he deny that the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, gave the Holy Scriptures to his people in a PERFECT form, i.e. as an infallible, inerrant and inspired Deposit.

But more than this, every child of God, born of the Holy Ghost and translated into the kingdom of his dear Son, knows that God has also promised to PRESERVE those words.

It is this point, the preservation of those inspired words, that will be the subject of this booklet, and will provide the answer to our questions.

R.D.P.

Chapter 1.

THE FATHER'S WORDS

God has COMMUNICATED with His creatures.

He has not remained silent in His Heaven, but has revealed Himself to man.

He has spoken DIRECTLY, as in the Garden ;-

“... God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply ..”
Gen. 1:28

And He has spoken INDIRECTLY through messengers.

His messengers have been heavenly beings ;-

“Gabriel ... being caused to fly swiftly ... talked with me ..”
Dan. 9:21,22

As well as human beings especially chosen by God to speak for him on earth :-

“God...spake through the prophet”
Heb. 1:1

“Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost”
2 Pet. 1:21

“the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David SPAKE...”
Acts 1:16

Thus we have this great mystery and privilege of the High and Lofty One who inhabitest Eternity, speaking, at ‘sundry times and in divers manners’, with his creature Man.

SPOKEN WORDS TO WRITTEN WORDS

But God then commanded some of his messengers to write down those messages in a book or scroll ;-

book ..”

“Write this for a memorial in a
Exodus 17:14

“Write thou these words ..”
Exodus 34:27

write”

“.. the rest of the acts .. did Isaiah the prophet ...
2 Chron. 26:22

“Thus speaketh the LORD God of Israel, saying, Write thee all the words that I have spoken unto thee in a book”
Jer. 30:2

He even wrote some of the words Himself (Ex.31: 18). These holy writings from God became known as the “Holy Scriptures” of which we read ;-

God”

“All scripture is given by inspiration of
2 Tim. 3:16

And which were, even to heavenly beings :-

truth”

“. the scripture of
Daniel 10:21

These Writings were then placed under the guardianship of the nation of Israel as their chief treasure :-

“What advantage then hath the Jew? Chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God or the words of God.”
Romans 3:1,2

These Holy Writings, the Old Testament, were still available when the gracious Son of God came unto this own and walked among men.

There is no hint that the Lord Jesus considered that any of those messages, or any of those words, were other than the true words of God ;-

“Search the scriptures ...”

Jn. 5:39

“.. read in the scriptures ..”

Mt. 21:42

“Ye err, not knowing the scriptures”

Mt. 22:29

“ .. how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled ..”

Mt. 26:54

“this day is this scripture fulfilled ...”

Lk. 4:21

These, and other references, show plainly that those Holy Writings were quoted freely, and with all their unquestioned authority, by the Saviour Himself.

He said that not even one “jot or tittle” had passed from those God-given writings (Matt. 5:18). And when he was shortly to ascend to Glory, he upbraided his disciples for their unbelief of all those words ;-

“O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken”

Lk. 24:25

Then, from the beginning to the end of those writings, He gave the meaning of the things that were written there :-

“beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures”

Lk. 24:27

Finally, He was to say ;-

“All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms ...”

Lk. 24:44

He could never have spoken this way if there was any question as to the authority of those written words, and their AVAILABILITY to his people.

There is no uncertainty in Scripture that the words by which is pleased the Father to communicate with His people, and which were reduced to writing, ever failed to reach the hands of the One who bears that special name upon himself, The Word of God.

WORDS FROM THE SON

But He who had communicated words through His messengers and through holy books, was to give a further revelation of himself ;-

“God who ... spake in time past ... by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us BY HIS SON”
Heb. 1:1,2

And this Son was to bring WORDS from the Father.

God” “.. he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of
John 3:34

“.. the Father .. gave me commandment what I should say, and what I should speak”
John 12:49

...” “..the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father’s
John 14:24

These precious words were to be passed on to his disciples ;-

me” “I have given unto them the words which thou gavest
John 17:8

“I have given them thy word...”
John 17:14

This was verbally, as we have no record of the Saviour writing anything, other than the cryptic message in the dust of the earth (Jn. 8:6,8).

And the world was not to be at the mercy of the disciples' frail memories, for we are informed that they were to be REMINDED of all those very words by the Spirit of God himself ;-

“.. the Holy Ghost .. shall .. bring all things to your remembrance WHATSOEVER I have SAID unto you”

John 14:26

They were then to WRITE those words down. What was true of John ;-

“.. this is the disciple which testified of these things, and WROTE these things ...”

Ibid 21:24

Was equally true of Luke and the other writers ;-

“.. it seemed good to me .. to WRITE unto thee in order .. those things wherein thou hast been instructed”

Lk. 1:3, 4

“.. the things that I WRITE unto you are the commandments of the Lord”

1 Cor. 14:37

That is, inspiration was at the WORD-LEVEL, and not concepts or ideas for which the writers were to select their OWN words.

INSPIRATION was VERBAL.

As a consequence then, every word was exactly that word the Author wanted; and all of them, of course, perfect and holy ;-

“Every word of God is pure”	Prov. 30:5
“The words of the Lord are pure words”	Psalm 12:6
“The commandment of the Lord is PURE ..”	Psalm 19:8
“Thy word is VERY pure”	Psalm 119:14

THE CANON

Subsequently, the Christian believes, the Holy Spirit of God oversaw the gathering together of all those Holy Writings into the TOTAL COLLECTION (the Canon) of God’s Holy Scripture, as well as ensuring the rejection of all the false books that paraded themselves before the churches of God in the following years.

Thus three separate works were done by the Holy Ghost according to the will of the Father; the INSPIRATION of the writings; the RECORDING of the writings; and the COLLECTION of those writings.

Every word breathed of God.
Every word PURE.
Every word deposited safely in writing.

Making the Evil Seem the Good

In all he did, in all he taught,
He kept this aim in sight;
To get the deeds of darkness done,
Disguised as works of light.

He spread his poison, slow and sure,
Through many a specious sect,
And made the evil seem the good,
Bamboozling God's elect.

- Selected

Chapter 2.

THE ADVERSARY'S WORK

But Satan was also at work. And the malignity that was heaped upon the Living Word Himself, was transferred, after the resurrection and ascension, to the WRITTEN word.

Evil men were firstly to DENY that those words were in fact the words of God ;-

“(who) consent not to ... the words of our Lord Jesus Christ ..
doting about questions and strifes of words ..
1 Tim. 6:3, 4

And were to go on and ALTER and POLLUTE those words ;-

God” “..(there) are .. many which corrupt the word of
2 Cor. 2:17

And they performed this deadly work notwithstanding the clear and solemn warnings given throughout the Scriptures, against tampering with that precious Deposit ;-

“Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither
shall ye diminish ought from it”
Deut. 4:2

it” “.... Thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from
Duet. 12:32

thee” “Add thou not unto his words lest he reprove
Prov. 30:6

“If any man shall add unto these things ... 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”
Rev. 22:18, 19

From the earliest days then, we have been warned against altering even one of those inspired words, and also, told to expect to meet texts that display such alternations.

Not human ERROR, notice, but deliberate and malicious tampering. And this a matter of revelation, not of opinion of paranoia.

Chapter 3.

THE PROMISE OF PRESERVATION

There is no doubt that our great God and Saviour not only GAVE us his words, but also promised to PRESERVE them for us, down through the centuries.

And this belief of the Lord's people has been enshrined in Statements of Faith like the Westminster Confession, where we are told (concerning those words) ;-

“.. being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentical”

This promise to preserve his words is also plainly taught in a number of Scriptures ;-

“Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away”

Matt. 24:35

(repeated twice in Mk. 13:31 and Luke 21:33)

“Though shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation forever”

Psa. 12:7

“Thy word is true from the beginning and every one of thy righteous judgements endureth forever”

Psa. 119:160

“But the word of the Lord endureth forever”

1 Pet. 1: 25

And o make this so very sure for His people, the Lord referred to several most important things that would endure in exactly the same way as his “words” ;-

His own PERSON	Psa. 9:7
His own NAME	Psa. 72:17
His RIGHTEOUSNESS	Psa. 111:3
His TRUTH	Psa. 117:2
His MERCY	Psa. 136:26

It is surely most significant that all of these wondrous things are said to “endure forever” EQUALLY with this “words”.

LOSE A WORD AND LOSE A SAINT

Furthermore, the Lord promises to preserve his words in exactly the same way he promises to preserve his elect ;-

“The Lord preserveth all them that love him: but all the wicked will he destroy”
Psa. 145:20

“He preserveth the souls of his saints”
Psa. 97:10

What properly instructed Christian does not rejoice in this PRESERVATION of his blood-bought through?

And let us think for a moment; on the most conservation of estimates, the chosen of God must number, in just this one generation, some MILLIONS of souls. Now multiply that by ALL the generations of Redemption’s long history, and we have the amazing figure of many HUNDREDS of MILLIONS of ransomed souls.

Yet he promises that he will not lose ONE of them, rather, will preserve them, EVERY ONE, unto the eternal kingdom of glory.

Now, in our English Bible, we have a total of 810,677 words; less than one million.

That same mighty God, who faithfully promised to preserve every one of his saints, ALSO promised to preserve every one of his words.

And we can see that it is much 'harder' for him to preserve hundreds of millions of straying and stumbling saints, than it is to care for inanimate words, only a fraction of that number.

But even if the numbers were REVERSED, the believer would rightly respond, "GOD has promised, and that is good enough for me".

ONLY IN HEAVEN?

"forever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven"

Psa. 119:89

"But that is in HEAVEN" retorts someone, "it doesn't say settled in EARTH".

But such passages as Matt. 4:4 cannot be satisfied with this, for there we are instructed to 'live by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God', and this would not be possible if those words were only to be found in heaven.

Nor would it be possible to obey the following instructions ;-

"Preach the word"	2 Tim. 4:2
"Study .. the word"	2 Tim. 2:15
"Desire .. the word"	1 Pet. 2:2

It is clear then, that these words must be AVAILABLE to God's people otherwise he would not give such commands to us.

Thus the precious Deposit from the Father, through the Son and Holy Ghost, was recorded and collected into the Canon in pristine perfection, and has been preserved down through the ages for the instruction and furnishing of his elect. And though the Adversary and his ministers have attacked that Deposit through questionings and corruptions, so that alongside the Holy Scriptures we will meet another diverse text, our gracious God and Father has given his own PROMISE that not one of those priceless words will ever be lost.

**Thy Word is like a garden, Lord,
With flowers bright and fair;
And ev'ryone who seeks may pluck
A lovely cluster there.
Thy Word is like a deep, deep mine,
And jewels rich and rare,
Are hidden in its mighty depths
For ev'ry searcher there.**

Chapter 4.

TWO TEXTS

Running alongside the inspired, inerrant and pure Holy Scriptures, we have a pseudo-Bible, a text that has been polluted by the deliberate malice of the enemy of Christ. The words of God 'corrupted', we are told.

And any who have made a study of the history of the Holy Scriptures know that we are looking at just two texts ;-

"After all research, it cannot be denied, I think, that there are two great schools of readings" 1.

This is, in fact, the scenario that History presents to the investigator. Into whichever language we look, we meet essentially TWO types of text, and while there may be variation in degree within a text, there were just two KINDS of text. (Appendix 1.)

Even as striking as this, we find that one of the texts is that which has been, and still is, routinely held by the Roman Catholic church. The other text is that which has been historically the text of the true churches of Christ.

Now at this point we need to be perfectly clear, and perfectly frank.

It is incontrovertible that the Roman Church has always held to its own text, with its additional books and distinctive readings in thousands of laces, while the true churches have always held to THEIR text, with its typical readings and just 66 books.

And it was not just the different Bible TEXTS that separated the two groups, but also their different attitudes TO their text. Rome had her text PLUS other authorities such as tradition and the dogmas of Mother church; the true churches of Christ held that their BIBLE ITSELF was their only authority - ie "SOLA SCRIPTURA".

Furthermore, Rome does not consider her text to be without error, but to contain a collection of myth and legend along with God's truth.

This position is made plain in a recent statement by the authoritative Pontifical Academy of Science which stated :- (2)

"we are convinced that masses of evidence render the application of the concept of Evolution to Man and other primates beyond serious dispute"

Going on to state in their Catholic Encyclopaedia :-

"the literal interpretation of the opening chapters of the book of Genesis" (is unacceptable) .. "for that would lead us to think that God, for example, actually made two grown adults suddenly from clay and a rib"

And further stating concerning any of their faith who chose to believe the Genesis record in the manner of the true churches :-

"their church views it with great disfavour".

Finally stating :-

"the myth used by the Genesis authors .." is a communication tool.

For all of its existence, the Roman church has always kept to the text-type which is exhibited in Jerome's Vulgate (Latin), in the Vaticanus manuscript (Greek), and in the Rheims-Douay version (English).

This type of text is that of the later printed editions of the Greek New Testament, notably and principally, that of Westcott and Hort, two English churchmen. From this Westcott and Hort Greek NT has come more recent editions of the Greek NT, those of Nestles and the United Bible Societies (UBS). There have been other editors such as Tischendorf, Tregelles, Griesbach, Lachmann, von Soden et al, but these have all admittedly been of the same text as that of Westcott and Hort, and thus of the Roman Catholic church.

The current UBS text, in wide use by translators around the world has Carlo CARDINAL Martini as one of its editors. This may easily be verified.

Now from the type of text represented by the UBS Greek NT, many other language versions (translations) have com. In the English tongue we have the following well-known versions ;-

American Standard (ASV)	1901	
Weymouth Version	1903	
Montgomery Version	1924	
Moffatts Translation	1926	
Goodspeed Translation		1923
Revised Standard (RSV)	1952	
Todays English Version		1966
New English Bible	1970	
New American Standard (NASV)	1971	
Living Bible	1971	
New International (NIV)		1973

All of these English versions have for their source, the same type of text as the Roman Catholic versions, eg Douay, Jerusalem, Confraternity etc. They are all 'water from the same well'.

It is important to remember that this is not 'Protestant accusations', much less fabrications, for the Publishers themselves supply us with this information about their own editions, translations and sources.

For example, the Westcott and Hort Greek NT informs us that it gave 'precedence to the Vaticanus manuscript' whenever a variation in the texts occurred.

Nestles then advises us that HIS Greek NT is based upon, principally, Westcott and Hort.

The UBS then informs its readers that their text is founded upon the 'great critical editions' of Nestles and Westcott and Hort.

Finally, the translators of the modern versions in turn, allow that the UBS editions are their source.

Thus we may draw an unbroken line from, say, the NIV back to the Roman text.

Now on the other hand, we find the text of the Reformation and the Bible-believing churches that go back centuries before the Reformation, to be the other of the TWO texts discernible throughout the history of the scriptures; a text characterised by a host of different readings throughout all the Bible, readings that are specific to this type of text.

This text is called the RECEIVED TEXT, and comes to us not via the Roman church, but through the Greek church and its manuscripts.

The very first published printed Greek NT came from this text-type. Erasmus, a Dutch scholar, was responsible for five separate editions of this text; a number of other editors followed with their own editions of the same text-type. Stephens, Colinaeus, Beza and the Elzevir brothers all produced printed Greek NTs of this text, some of which are still available today in modern reprints.

It was from one of the editions of the Elzevirs (in the foreword of their 1633 edition) that the well-known name "Textus Receptus" was coined. This has now become the general name for this type of text, being "Received Text" in English.

Now from this text-type came many other language versions also, as had done with the Roman text.

Well-known amongst such versions are Luther's GERMAN, the Italian DIODATI, the French OLIVETAN, the Dutch STATENBIJBEL and several ENGLISH versions. Tyndale's version of 1525 was the first of these, being followed during the succeeding century, by Coverdale, Matthews, the Great Bible, the Geneva Bible and the Bishops Bible. All these versions were drawn from the "Received Text" type; by far the most well-known exhibition of this text being the Authorised Bible of 1611.

All these versions are practically identical to each other (the Authorised Bible is 9/10ths that of Tyndale) and yet essentially and characteristically different from the Roman versions.

It was the Authorised Bible in particular, whatever its friends or foes may think of it, that went into the New World and on around the globe in the providence of God, to such an amazing extent that the vast British Empire, upon which 'the sun never set', became known as the 'nation of the Book, and that Book was the Bible', the Authorised Bible.

And it is a striking coincidence incidentally, that while England held to her Book, she prospered; when she turned from that Book her greatness waned.

In 1881 a most significant even occurred in England; she 'revised' her Book.

The 'Revision' of the Authorised Bible proved to be, rather, a SUBSTITUTION. The revised Version was in fact, a product of the ROMAN text; the text of two of the Revisers; the text of Westcott and Hort who had built their Greek New Testament upon the Roman Catholic Vaticanus manuscript.

It was this text of these two English Professors, which, through the two decades of the Revision Committee's meetings, was introduced, page by page, by its two editors, without the knowledge of either the English church or the nation.

England commenced then, what is almost complete now, her return to that type of text that had been vigorously resisted by the true churches for nearly two millennia. The subsequent 100 years has seen Britain plunged into two world wars (plus 'minor' ones) and the disintegration of the greatest Empire the world has ever know, culminating in the final degradation of receiving a Roman pontiff to worship with the dignitaries of the English church in that symbol of world-wide Protestantism, St. Paul's cathedral.

O May I love Thy precious Word,
May I explore the mine;
May I its fragrant flowers glean,
May light upon me shine.
O may I find my armour there,
Thy Word my trusty sword!
I'll learn to fight with ev'y foe
The battle of the Lord!

Chapter 5.

WHICH IS WHICH?

THERE Is a major factor that will aid in the identification of the TRUE text, ie the CHARACTER of the text, or more exactly, the character of the DIFFERENCES between the Roman text and the Received text.

When a change is made to the words of Scripture that introduces, say, an ERROR into the text, then that plainly cannot be the pure word of God. Or if a text has a reading that makes the Lord Jesus Christ into a guilty SINNER, then the Christian would rightly recoil from such a 'Bible' in disgust, just as he would if other differences served to conceal the DEITY of Christ or to lower his place in the Godhead. The very NATURE, or CHARACTER of such changes instantly alert the spiritual mind and heart to be vigilant; the adversary is at hand.

And there is a surer guide than this 'spiritual understanding', the Scriptures themselves, for we are told that the true words of God, given by the Holy Host, will always GLORIFY the Lord Jesus ;-

“...when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will ... glorify me
...”

John 16:13,14

Therefore anything that downgrades the person or work of the Lord Jesus Christ, CANNOT be the work of the Holy Ghost, and thus cannot be the true, pure and preserved word of God. That much is plain.

But is this what we find when we investigate the two texts? Is there evidence of one of them derogating the Son of God? Yes, on almost every page.

Between the two GREEK texts there are 5788 differences (while in the English texts derived from them the variations increase in number to 36,191), and while not every difference appears sinister, an overwhelming number do display a wicked and systematic attack upon our gracious Saviour and his work.

“But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and every”

Hebrews 1:8

Becomes in the Roman text ;-

“the throne of God is forever and ever”

A clear reference to the DEITY of Christ is obliterated.

“Christ... Who is over all, God blessed forever”
Romans 9:5

Becomes in Roman text ;-

“Christ is over all. God be blessed forever”

Another plain statement of the DEITY OF CHRIST removed.

Then in Philippians 2:6 ;-

“Christ Jesus ... thought it not robbery to be EQUAL WITH
GOD”

Becomes in the Roman text ;-

“... thought it not a thing to be grasped at to be equal with
God ..”

These three references are, in reality, enough to prove that the Roman text cannot be the production of the Holy Ghost, whose work is to GLORIFY the Lord Jesus. Each of these readings stand self-condemned.

And this is but the tip of the iceberg.

“there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the
Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.”

Becomes in the Roman text ;-

“there are three witnesses on earth”,

In fact, on closer investigation we find that this verse (1 John 5:7) has been completely excised from the text; verse 8 has been split in two with the first half being renumbered ‘verse 7;’, almost as if to deceive the reader, who may notice a whole verse missing.

And let us remember that this is the most DEFINITIVE verse in the entire Canon for the place of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Godhead.

And we are not convinced when we are told that the verse has only two Greek witnesses to its integrity, for that is precisely the situation for many of the readings retained by the Roman text. In spite of the consentient voices of a multitude of witnesses against a given reading, and only one or two raised in support, it is nevertheless frequently retained by that corrupt text.

More evidence of attack upon the person of the Saviour is found in Matt. 5:22. Here, in the corrupted texts, the words "without a cause" are removed from the verse. The effect is not immediately obvious, but when we compare Mark 3:5 with the different reading, we see that the Lord Jesus Christ has become in danger of judgement, in effect, has become a guilty sinner. It is not 'anger' per se, but anger without a cause that is being condemned by the Scriptures ;-

"..whosoever is angry with this brother WITHOUT A CAUSE .."

Is the true reading, and thus when Mark 3:5 states ;-

"and when he (Jesus) had looked round about on them WITH ANGER ..."

He has very good cause, therefore was not in danger of the 'judgement' of Matt. 5:22.

Such is the CHARACTER of many of the changes the Roman text makes to the true word of God.

Is it a coincidence that the words "Get thee behind me, Satan" are missing from Luke 4:8? Or that the precious words "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God" is absent from Acts 8:37? Or "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last", from Rev. 1:11?

But not to weary the reader, one final example will be submitted, this time a clear and plain ERROR in the Roman text.

"As it is written in the prophets ..,"

Says Mark 1:2, going on to quote a reference from Malachi and then a reference from Isaiah. This is the reading in the Authorised Bible.

Two prophets are quoted and hence the accurate statement 'as it is written in the PROPHETS (plural)'.

"As it is written in Isaiah the prophet"

reads the Roman text, then promptly quotes Malachi. The quote is NOT from Isaiah. Nowhere in Isaiah can those words be found, nor any words likely to be them. It is an error (see App. 4).

But on closer inspection the alternation has a more sinister implication.

By directly the reader to "Isaiah", the correct cross reference to Malachi is obscured.

But what is wrong with that?

By comparing the Malachi wording with the Mark quotation of that wording, we are presented with that profound truth that the "LORD" (Jehovah) of the Old Testament is the very "Jesus" of the New.

"... he shall prepare the way before ME ..."

Says the LORD of himself (Malachi 3:2), while in Mark 1:2 the messenger (John the Baptist),

".... Shall prepare thy way before three ..."

And John was prepared the way before none other than JESUS CHRIST. The corrupt reading "as it is written in Isaiah the prophet" effectively sidetracks the reader from this notable statement of the Deity of the Lord Jesus.

Not only is the Roman reading inaccurate, but it is another attack upon the Person of the Son of God. (see Appendix 5).

Chapter 6.

THAT'S FAR ENOUGH

For many now, we have travelled far enough in our enquiry. Certainly many Protestant people 'get the message' when realising that this matter is ESSENTIALLY one of a choice between a Romish text, and the text received, believed, preached, and died for, by the true churches of Christ throughout history.

More complicated issues of Textual Criticism, Manuscript Evidence, Intrinsic Probability, Text Families, Recensions and the like, hold no interest for them. If the versions are ROMAN, and the King James is PROTESTANT, then out go the versions and in comes the Authorised Bible.

They have a 'sense' that a Romish text cannot be the right one of the two. And when they hear that the technical name for that text is "Alexandrian" (from Egypt), that just adds to their apprehension; for was not EGYPT the country from which God called his Son, and to which the ancient church of God was forbidden to return, as a type of the world from which they had been REDEEMED?

And was it not, they ask, a ROMAN cross upon which the Saviour died? And in ROMAN catacombs that thousands, 'of whom the world was not worthy', met their cruel deaths?

And with SPIRITUAL DISCERNMENT, many have turned from such a text, and gone to the one called the "Antiochan" text, from the place where the disciples first bore the name "Christian", and from whence the first missionary journeys commenced; to the text of the Reformers and the Reformation; the text whose history can be traced by scarlet thread back through the Waldensian martyrs to the pens of the writers 'moved by the Holy Ghost' himself.

But for others it is not enough; for them it is helpful to submit further information, and answer the fresh questions raised by our advance to this stage of the enquiry.

Chapter 7.

AN IMPORTANT QUESTION

Before proceeding on, the believer must answer, for himself, a most important and crucial question; 'If God promised to preserve his words, and every one of them is pure, and I am commanded to live by every one of them, to study them, to desire them, and to preach them, WHERE ARE THEY?'

Do I REALLY believe that God has kept his promise?

Has he REALLY preserved his every word? The very WORDS?

We must put aside all questions for the moment as to HOW or WHERE or WHICH, and humbly decide whether or not God means what he has said. And if he DID preserve them, did he do it in a sloppy fashion, or PERFECTLY?

"His work is PERFECT" say Deuteronomy 32:4.

DOES THIS APPLY TO HIS WORK OF PRESERVATION?

For the true believer, no matter how many questions may still remain unanswered, there is no other course to take but to say, in faith, "I believe God. He will always keep his promises; none of them will fail". Then from that vantage point of faith, the only proper position for the child of God, we are able to proceed. Let me say, here and now, it is simply INADMISSABLE that God could mislead his people ;-

"...God that CANNOT lie, promised..."

Titus 1:2

And every true saint KNOWS that God will not only preserve his every CHILD, but will likewise preserve his every WORD. He has so promised and he will so do.

The question is, 'WHERE ARE THEY TO BE FOUND?'

The answer is :-"in that text of Scripture that God's people have known and used and lived for and died for since it was received from God's hand; the text that GLORIFIES his blessed Son Jesus; NOT in the text which has ever belonged to the ENEMY of Christ and his precious redeemed, the text that contains ERRORS, the text which INSULTS the Lord of Glory, our Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ'.

You say, 'that is not PROOF'. Of course it is not, but the believer knows that he is also unable to PROVE even the greatest fundamental of his salvation, and here I refer to the fact that even with the help of a time-machine to convey him to the foot of the Cross of Calvary, the Christian is still wholly unable to prove that his SINS are upon the bleeding Form before his eyes. THAT is the province of faith. And so it MUST be for ;-

"The just shall live by FAITH"
(Rom. 1:17)

And

"we walk by FAITH, not by sight"

(2 Cor. 5:7).

The believer is quite at home in that position, he is content to accept God's word regardless of what learning or even logic tells him, for ;-

"Without FAITH it is impossible to please him
...."

Hebrew 11:6

And all the believer is concerned with is to please the One for whose pleasure we are
and were created.

Last eve I paused beside a blacksmith's door
And hear the anvil ring the vesper chime;
Then looking, I saw upon the floor
Old hammers worn with beating years to time.

"How many anvils have you had?" said I,
"To wear and batter all these hammers so?"
"Just one," said he, and then with twinkling eyes,
"The anvil wears the hammers out you know."

And so, I thought, "The anvil of God's Word
For ages skeptic blows have beat upon;
Yet, though the noise of falling blows was heard,
The Anvil is unharmed, the hammers GONE."

Picture is shown in book here

Chapter 8.

SOME QUESTIONS ANSWERED

Believing God's promise to preserve his words does not remove every single questions from our minds, and the last section of this booklet is devoted to providing answers to a number of frequently asked questions.

"I personally know men who worked on the NIV and they knew what they were doing, and were good, godly, conservative Christians".

It is a common misconception that because a translator is, himself, a true Christian, that the translation will therefore be a good and reliable one. Think for a moment, if a well is polluted at its source, does it matter how nice and gentle the old lady is who draw the water? Of course not, and how talented and godly a translator may be has little or no bearing on the type of translation that is produced, for that depends upon the source TEXT and not on the abilities of the translator. No matter how well-intentioned or endowed he may be, he can only reproduce what is in front of him. It is the water from the well that is corrupted; it is the TEXT that is corrupted, and the corruptions in the source must manifest themselves in anything faithfully produced from it.

"But have we not discovered many more manuscripts since the time of the King James Bible?"

True, but the great majority of them only reinforce the Textus Receptus and confirm its readings.

“No, but I mean that many of the manuscript discoveries were very ancient documents which were much nearer the originals, therefore more likely to be accurate’.

But then is this really true? Is it necessary that because a particular manuscript is OLDER, it is therefore purer? We have already seen that even as Paul the apostle was writing the autograph of 2 Corinthians, there were MANY corruptions and corruptors around. Age is thus no guarantee that the text of an old manuscript is pure. And then, what does the age of the PAPER or SKIN have to do with the accuracy of the text ON that paper? Nothing at all. Because the vellum is in good condition, and the printing is neat and legible, this has no bearing on the purity or corruptness of the words themselves. In fact, a manuscript in GOOD condition could even be a mark AGAINST the purity of a text, because Christians tend to read their Bibles to bits rather than the opposite. But in any event, the age of the paper or leather has no bearing on the purity of the text ON that paper.

NO DOCTRINES ARE MISSING

“But I can get the doctrines out of ANY version, so does it really matter which one I use?”

Because one can find, from time to time, something of value in a rubbish dump, it is not reasonable to do all your shopping there; it is equally true that because the corrupt text has many of the pure words in it, that is no reason to use such a text. And really the question before us is greater and deeper than this. If God has preserved his every pure and inspired word for his people then THAT is what we should be feeding upon. If it was impossible to obtain a copy of the true text then one could perhaps be excused for reasoning that a corrupted text is better than no text, but this is surely a rare occurrence. Nevertheless it is important to remember that there are many portions of the corrupted versions that are identical in wording to that of the true text, and this explains how a person may be born again through the Roman text. And it is simply not true that we can find all the doctrines in the perverted versions, for by the simple alignment of two or three corrupt readings, the entire narrative description of the Ascension as an observable incident (i.e. a physical, visible transfer from earth to heaven) can be eradicated from Scripture; while the doctrine of the DEITY of Jesus Christ can be, and is, almost totally obscured (6). But this is not the point, as serious as it is. It is a matter of whether God has preserved his words or not.

“But how can a TRANSLATION be inspired? Surely only the autographs can claim this distinction?”

If God WANTED to translate, would that translation be perfect? Deuteronomy 32:4 makes it plain that such would certainly be the case. But not only is God ABLE to produce a perfect translation, but the Old and New Testaments both contain this very phenomenon. No less than 391 verses in the NT are God’s TRANSLATIONS of OT portions (7).

“It is written again, THOU SHALT NOT TEMPT THE LORD THY GOD”

The capitalised words in this verse (Matt. 4:7) are an inspired TRANSLATION of Duet. 6:16 (which was in Hebrew not Greek).

“... for it is written, THOU SHALT WORSHIP THE LORD THY LORD AND HIM ONLY SHALT THOU SERVE.”

There again the capitalised words in our text (Matt. 4:10) are an inspired translation by Almighty God himself, of Duet. 6:13. And this proceeds on throughout the NT for another 389 verses involving no less than 4009 words. And this is not all, for there are numerous verses where the Holy Ghost produces an inspired and inerrant translation before our very eyes on the pages of Holy Writ.

“Eloi, Eloi, Ima abachthani? Which is, being interpreted, MY GOD, MY GOD, WHY HAS THOU FORSAKEN ME?”

Here in Mark 15:34 we have Aramaic words rendered into 10 Greek words (Appendix 2), and is it not certain that no Christian would argue that the Divine TRANSLATION into those ten words was at all inferior to the Aramaic original?

Example are multiplied throughout the Scriptures but one more will suffice us ;-

“... and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, GOD WITH US.”

Here in Matt. 1:23 we have displayed the inspired and inerrant translation of the one Hebrew word ‘Emmanuel’ into no less than four Greek words (showing us that God knows all about dynamic equivalence!).

Clearly then, translating is no problem to the Lord, and equally clearly, the resultant TRANSLATION is as much inspired as the source or donor language original.

We can safely conclude that should the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ wish to use TRANSLATION in the process of keeping his promise of PRESERVATION, then we should have no difficulty in accepting that.

It is necessary also to note that, in the very verse of Scripture which refers to "inspiration" (2 Tim. 3:16), the thing 'inspired' is NOT the originals! Proof for this is found in the preceding verse where we discover that that 'Scriptures' of verse 16 were the very Scriptures that were read to young Timothy as a child. It is highly unlikely that Timothy's mother had in her possession the autographs of Moses' Pentateuch, or Isaiah's prophecy;

"... from a child thou has known the holy scriptures, ... All scripture is given by inspiration of God"

Thus reads 2 Timothy 3:15,16, and a careful consideration of every passage where the Holy Spirit speaks of the 'scriptures', reveals the fact that he is NEVER referring to the Autographs, but rather to copies, or more likely copies of copies or even translations.

"... they ... search THE SCRIPTURES daily whether those things were so",

Reads Acts 17:11. Surely the noble Bereans never had the Originals?

And of Apollos we read in Acts 18:28 ;-

"For he mightily convinced the Jews Shewing BY THE SCRIPTURES that Jesus was Christ."

Neither should we think that this servant of God travelled about with the Autographs of the Law and the Prophets. They were plainly COPIES or TRANSLATIONS, yet in the inspired Record of Acts, the HOLY SPIRIT refers to them as "scripture". Furthermore, COPIES are as authoritative as the originals, according to Deut. 17:18 ;-

".... He shall write him a COPY of this law in a book ... to keep all the words of this law ... TO DO THEM"

And Joshua 8:32 also confirms that a copy is just as binding upon the church of God as any original.

AN ASIDE :-

It should be clear to the reader at this point, that it is the considered opinion of this booklet that God has not only PROMISED to preserve his words., but that he HAS DONE SO, and that, perfectly.

And more than this, those words are preserved in the text-type of the Received Text, the present FORM of those inspired, inerrant and preserved words, being the ENGLISH text of the Authorised King James Bible 1611.

**Thy Word is like a starry host
A thousand rays of light
Are seen to guide the traveller,
And make his pathway bright.
Thy Word is like an armoury
Where soldiers may repair
And find, for life's long battle day,
All needful weapons there.**

Chapter 9.

MORE QUESTIONS ANSWERED

“But this confines the word of God to ENGLISH-speaking people, surely it seems unlike a loving God to do such a thing?”

The 2nd verse of Romans chapter 3, informs us that the OT originals were in Hebrew, for it is unlikely that God would commit the ‘oracles’ unto his ancient people in a tongue foreign to them.

Did then only ISRAEL have the word of God? Was the word of God only in the HEBREW tongue? On both accounts we must answer ‘Yes’. And this being so, did this call into question the lover of God for his elect? Of course not, for thus was the will of God, and he has neither promised, nor is obliged, to present his oracles to every nation on the face of the earth. But, should a faithful translation of those oracles be made into any number of languages, those peoples would truly have the words of God, for the Queen’s Christmas message is as much her speech whether in Urdu or Maori.

Therefore if it should please God to preserve his words in just ONE language, we should have no difficulty with that. No one is being ‘deprived’; in fact, by the turn of the 20th century there were over 800 nations with the true text translated into their own language.

Is it that unreasonable or unspiritual to believe that, in the preservation of his pure words, it pleased God to render them into the English tongue, knowing that this language was to become the ‘universal’ language? That England was to be the reference point for GLOBAL Time and GLOBAL Position? That England would become the greatest and most widespread Empire the world had ever seen? That English would be the language of the Reformation and this Holy Book would be produced under a KING?

“Where the word of a King is, there is power.”

Eccles. 8:4.

Is it THAT unreasonable?

Notwithstanding all the vicious attacks upon the Authorised English Bible itself, it is a certain fact that not ONE PROVABLE ERROR has been indentified in that English text. If this is so, how can we account for such a phenomenon unless it was the work of God?

Chapter 10.

ARCHAISMS and more

“Why should people have to struggle with the THEES and THOUS of the KJB when they can have the word of God in everyday speech?”

It is quite incorrect to say that the “these and thous” represent the usage of 1611 period English, and as that usage is out of date it should be rejected for that reason. The KJB usage is neither Jacobean nor 17th century English (a comparison of the Preface to the Authorised Version will demonstrate this) but is BIBLICAL English. The Greek of the NT (like the Hebrew of the OT) distinguishes between the singular and the plural forms of the second person, and the KJB makes these distinctions simply because the donor languages do, and that is the only way to translate correctly.

When the Greek is referring to MORE THAN ONE person, the KJB correctly renders it either “ye”, “you” or “yours”; when just ONE person, it uses the singular “thee”, “thou” or “thine”. This has nothing to do with “archaisms” but is simply translating the original language ACCURATELY.

In fact, in EVERY case of singular Nouns (1,159), plural Nouns (1,886), singular Verbs (851) and plural Verbs (1,554), making a grand total of 5,450 occasions in the Greek N.T., the KJB renders the originals with routing precision (8). Such cannot be said of the versions, where the NIV for example must supply a footnote to inform the reader that “the Greek is plural”. But in the 2,010 occasions of the singular (above) this is often not done, therefore the reader is given the plural “YOU” when in fact it should be SINGULAR. That this detrimentally affects our understanding of many passages of Scripture is demonstrated by the example of Luke 22:31 where the Authorised Bible says “Satan hath desired to have you (ALL of the apostles) but I have prayed for thee (singular - Peter) that thy (singular again - Peter) faith fail not”.

This distinction is not made in the text of all those versions that have jettisoned fidelity to the original languages.

It seems significant that in the Preface to the REVISED STANDARD VERSION’S early editions, we are informed that the “archaic forms of ‘thee’ and ‘thou’ have been dropped except when DEITY is being addressed,” then in some places the Lord Jesus is addressed as “you”, while the Mother of Harlots in Revelations receives “thou”.

No sensitive Christian heart can fail to feel affront as such treatment of the Lord of Glory; none fail to see the cloven hoof print of the enemy of Christ and his words.

The whole question of archaisms has been greatly over-emphasised. The Bible is the Bible; we feel no compulsion to update Shakespeare’s works and should much less need to ‘modernise’ God’s Holy Writ. And it is not valid to labour the change of

meaning of words, as it has been shown in studies that as few as 17 words (3) have serious changes. The overall difficulty of the KJB English is also a popular fallacy as it has also been shown by leading authorities on 'readable writing' that it is mainly the number of affixes per hundred words that determines the difficulty of reading material (37 per hundred is average); literary writing tends to be fairly difficult, while scientific prose is rated very difficult having greater than the average number, but the King James Bible is "the best example of very easy prose' having only 20 affixes per hundred words (9) (Appendix 3).

"But no translators ever claim to be inspired, certainly the KJB translators didn't, as is obvious from the wording of their Preface".

This presents no problem at all for even of the ORIGINALS, the writers did not claim inspiration for themselves of their work. IN fact, the closest thing to such a claim could be Paul's words in 1 Corinthians 14:37 where those which are 'spiritual' are called upon to acknowledge that this words were 'the commandments of the Lord'. This is surely a far cry from a claim for inspiration from the apostle, especially when, in the same letter, he admits that he speaks 'by permission' and NOT by commandment (ch. 7:6). In verse 25 of the same chapter he plainly confesses that he had 'no such commandment' but only gave his 'judgement', finally removing all doubt by allowing that he 'thought' he had the Spirit's mind on the matter treated of in verse 40. Such is hardly a claim for verbal inspiration. Furthermore, his letter to the Laodicean church seems, in the apostle's eyes at least, to bear as much authority as that addressed to the believers in Colosse (Col. 4:16), nevertheless, it was excluded from the Canon by the Spirit as not being of those "words" from the Father. We will search the Scriptures high and low for any sign of a claim of verbal inspiration by the Bible autographers.

The fact then, that the KJB translators did not much such a claim either, is of little consequence.

"Now that we have found the right Greek text, why not stick with the language of the originals?"

It's not as simple as that. The Textus Receptus, or the 'right Greek text' is not actually a Greek New Testament, but rather, a 'type' of text. There are many editions of this type of 'Received Text' in the Greek and while being of the same TYPE, they still have differences in wording. Erasmus' five editions are all the "Textus Receptus" but his two earlier editions did not have 1 John 5:7 in them, this finally finding a place in the text of his third edition in 1522. Besides Erasmus, there were other editors, a number of which had multiple editions, these also having minor differences of wording according to the editors' judgement. Stephen had four separate editions, his 1550 edition being particularly famous, becoming known as the "Royal Edition"; it is still freely available in the bookshops today, 450 years later. Beza produced nine separate editions (5 of them reprints) and Colinaeus also produced a single edition. All were of the 16th and 17th century. In the 19th century, Prebendary Scrivener of the English church and a member of the 1881 Revision Committee was commissioned to produce the Greek NT behind the Authorised Version. He used as a base text the 1598 edition of Beza's Greek NT and made only a handful of changes to it (less than 100). The resultant text was printed by the Trinitarian Bible Society and is still available from them. It is loosely referred to as 'Beza's 1598' edition but is, in fact, not an exact reproduction of that text.

What does all this mean?

Simply this. Even though the differences between these editions are few and minor, while those between the ROMAN and the RECEIVED Text are 5788, nevertheless they are still differences.

Which edition will you choose?

Why will you choose THAT one?

Thus, we still have no absolute assurance of the words that the Father gave to the Son and that the Son passed onto the disciples for them to record, and for the Holy Spirit to preserve. So while the “TR” camp is infinitely better than being in the corrupt camp of the Roman text, it still leaves us without absolute certainty as to which are God’s pure and preserved words.

Chapter 11.

A BYTE OF HISTORY

It may be useful to submit a little historical information at this time, for it will give a hint to the reason for these variations that seemed to have entered into the Received Text editions of the Greek New Testament.

In the 1530’s the Society of Jesus was formed in the Roman Catholic church to counteract the Reformation; destroy the Protestant’s “sola Scriptura” was their brief, for there lay the strength of the movement that was sweeping the world.

It was impossible to succeed in introducing the Roman Text into liberated England, as their attempt with the Rheims–Douay version had proved. The method chosen to destroy the Protestant Bible was to introduce, from any and everywhere, variant readings. Whether the variant was a flagrant and acknowledged corruption was irrelevant; just get it inserted in a FOOTNOTE in the Textus Receptus and the Protestant “sola Scriptura” was doomed. (10)

“Which reading is the real word of God?” was again the question being asked, and who could decide for you if you felt unwilling or unable to make a decision of such great consequence? Well, there was always the infallible pope of Mother Church to turn to. By this simply but effective method, the enemy of the Lord’s people and the cause of Christ, succeeded, via these doubt–inducing apparatus, in weakening the Protestant position. Thus the Greek text became impossible to determine with certainty, and many PROTESTANT scholars had been, as so often today, used to do the dirty work.

Where the Spanish Armada and Gunpowder Plot failed (both Roman inspired and perpetrated) the seeds of the Enemy’s success were sown in those footnotes.

It was at this precise point in time that the Authorised Bible was being produced under God’s providential care and guidance. And just a few short years later it was carried into the New World and on throughout the globe, becoming the true SOLA SCRIPTURA for hundreds of millions of human beings who believed it to be God’s inspired and preserved word.

But the only lesson men learn through History is that men never learn through History, and although it took three centuries to bear fruit, eventually the counter–reformers, the Society of Jesus, through Oxford and Cambridge, brought the Roman text into England and thus into the Empire and the world. Protestantism is, if not dead, a dirty word along with its despised text, the Authorised Bible.

A FURTHER WORD ON THE GREEK ...

There is a further point to be given consideration when looking to the ‘original Greek’ for the final authority of God’s people today; the fact that we are not certain that Greek was the language of the NT autographs anyway.

That this is STATED to be the case is, of course, well-known. But there is a little that needs to be said before making a judgement on this matter. While not taking the Roman position that Aramaic was the language of inspiration, it is wise to note that Acts 1:19 indicates that such was the 'proper tongue' of the dwellers in Jerusalem, for the word "Aceldama" in the verse, is an Aramaic word.

We realise the vested interest that Rome has for that particular language, for in Matthew 16:18, the Aramaic word for 'Peter' is KEPHA, and so is the word for 'rock'; this is most convenient for Rome. However, it is most likely, in the light of Matt. 27:46, that Matthew at least was NOT in that language for then there would have been no requirement for the Holy Spirit to TRANSLATE the Aramaic expression "Eli, lama sabachthani?".

While there is evidence to suggest that some portions of the originals may have been in Aramaic, there are several passages (as in Matt. 27:46 above) that seem to deny it.

But GREEK? Would JEWISH writers use a Gentile tongue for such a task as this? Possibly, for we only need the inscription on the Saviour's cross to inform us of the prominence of the language in that era.

But then, in Acts 21:40 the apostle stood to speak, and addressed the gathered throng in 'the Hebrew tongue saying ...', and there is no mention of any subsequent translation or 'interpretation' taking place for the discourse that fills the 21 verses that follow in chapter 22.

A similar occurrence is found in 26:14 of the same book. Yet when we turn to Revelation 9:11 and 16:16, it seems a translation IS taking place, suggesting that at least THAT book is not in Hebrew.

One thing becomes clear out of all this; it is difficult to fix with any certainty the language(s) of the autographs of the NT. And this being the case, it seems incautious to emphasise the Greek at all, for in some, if not in a number of books, we may be looking in quite the wrong direction. While it MAY be true that Greek was one of "golden conduits" through which the inspired words have come to the churches, it is also true that there is no certainty at all on this important point. Surely then, it is unwise to correct our English Bible with text with that language?

AND IF NOT WITH GREEK, THEN WHICH?

A new minister came to a certain church. He was full of sophisticated knowledge and taught little from the Bible. At the end of two years he was told that one of the leading men of his church was ill. He went to see him. There was no chance of recovery' the man was dying. After a little talk the minister said, "Shall I read to you and pray with you?"

"Yes," replied the man, and beckoned to his wife to bring the Bible. A Bible was brought, and the minister opened and it saw a strange sight. Some books were taken out of it, some pages were torn away, some chapters gone, and some verses cut out; it was a shamefully mangled Bible.

The minister said, "Have you got no better Bible than this?"

The dying man said, "When you came to our church I had a whole Bible. But as soon as you told me that one book was fiction I tore it out; and that one chapter was not true, I removed it; and that some verses were unauthentic, I cut them out. And if I had had another year under you, I think I should have had the two covers, and nothing else.

Chapter 12.

CONFUSION NOT OF GOD

A final word.

If we use modern versions, there is no logical reason why we can refuse or condemn the Roman Catholic, or even the Jehovah Witness, versions, as they are drawn from exactly the same text type as the NIV, NASV, RSV, GN etc. We may prefer one for personal reasons, but is that really the right attitude to God's revelation from Heaven?

How do we know we have made the right choice? Or, more importantly, that GOD is as pleased with our choice as we are?

In fact, we do not really have the word of God but rather man's or committee's OPINIONS of it, and even then, with no guarantee that we have been handed the preserved words as promised. And it must be this way, for if we do not possess the originals, how will our textual critics, no matter how well-meaning and well-endowed, know whether they are close to the inspired words of God or not? Aren't we, after all, just GUESSING?

And would God, after producing those pristine pure words of the autographs, go and LOSE them? Why would he do that? And doesn't that mean also that NOBODY has actually ever read or held a Bible in their hands? No child of God has ever read, with certainty, the words given by the Father. And in view of his commands to live by, read, preach, desire etc those words, and not add to or subtract from those words, it seems a most unusual thing to do, having so carefully and perfectly produced that amazing and important Deposit, to allow them to be almost immediately unavailable to his people except in a rather shoddy condition.

On the other hand, if we BELIEVE God's promise of preservation, and accept the Authorised Bible as his Holy Scriptures (for by his providence, none of the earlier Textus Receptus English versions are freely available, and the modern ones only re-introduce Roman corruptions again (NKJV NSRB), then we are immediately in a vastly different and superior position).

Firstly, we actually HAVE IN OUR HANDS a final authority for all matters of faith and practice (as we routinely say in our Statement of Faith) and instead of expending vast amounts of energy on trying to FIND the words of God, we can concentrate on STUDYING them as commanded.

Secondly, all the confusion caused amongst the Lord's people through different versions and wording, is immediately removed.

How many times I have been told by other Christians, of occasions where the minister is reading from a version different from that of the hearers, who have had to CLOSE their Bibles to better be able to follow. This has many disadvantages because he may not be reading an accurate version and the ability of the individual to "see whether those things were so" is reduced. More than once I have seen young people close their Bibles because they can't find the words that are being read out. This all disappears when the church believes God's promise of preservation.

Thirdly, Our memorisation of the Scriptures would return to those great days when our minds could follow every verse and instantly recognise, by memory, when any variation, intentional or not, occurred. And it has long been recognised the ease with which even the very young can memorise the Authorised Bible.

Fourthly, divisions over the issue of WHICH version to use would be removed; it is sadly true that much division and heartache has been caused by the introduction of the new versions; many precious old saints have had to suffer in silence to remain in churches they have known for years, while others, more outspoken, have resisted those that “(doted) about questions and strifes of words’ (1 Tim. 6:4) – ‘the Authorised is not correct here, the word should be ...’ etc, and have been ostracised for simply wanting to hold to the Book that saved them and kept them for a lifetime. “We are not the ones that are dividing the church’, they rightly state, ‘it is those that are bringing in the new versions”. This division amongst Christ’s redeemed is not present when the saved hold to the promise of God’s preservation of his words.

Fifthly, Islam, growing so rapidly in many countries, uses as its main platform for the ridiculing of the Christian Faith, the fact that we don’t actually have a Bible, but rather, many and varied versions of our so-called Holy Book. Those who have dealt with Muslim know the power of this argument which has been given world-wide coverage by the free booklet “Is The Bible God’s Word?” (produced by the Islamic Propagation Centre in South Africa). Much is made of the contradictions between the versions and the allegations by the Watchtower Society of the “thousands” of mistakes in the Authorised Version. This platform is entirely and immediately removed when we return to the Reformation Bible. Their “errors” have been refuted many times in many works by Christians over the centuries, and one book currently available gives Scriptural Bible-believing answers to over 400 so-called mistakes (4). The Islamic platform is thus demolished.

Sixthly, God’s promise to preserve his words would be truly fulfilled, as will all his other promises, and this is a wonderful encouragement to the believer. No longer does one say with ‘tongue-in-cheek’, “the Bible is God’s Word”, or “the Word of God says”, but can speak “as the oracles of God” and with authority and sincerity.

Seventhly, instead of bringing the words of God down to the level of the factory floor and street language, thereby making common man the standard of authority who decides everything, and everything has to be brought down to him; rather, both in this country and foreign lands the ignorant and unlearned (as in the past) will be educated up to the Book and begin to understand it, to be enriched by it, to glorify it and to praise God for it.

That is what we need again in this present time. Or as Professor Skilton puts it, “the Authorised Version had a remarkable sense of appropriateness, felicity, and effectiveness of expression. It had the instinct and feeling for music and rhythm. It could discover the ‘inevitable’ word or phrase for a given context. Its style admirably reflected the dignity, majesty, and sub-limity of the original; is it then too much effort to adjust to English of such an eminent masterpiece of the English language as the King James Version?” (5).

And finally, the deadly issue of Romanism would again be polarised; the ecumenical movement of compromise with idolatry and blasphemy would be struck a fatal blow, as the Protestant sword of ‘SOLA SCRIPTURA’ was unsheathed and wielded once more.

WHY THE DOGGED INSISTENCE ON THE KING JAMES BIBLE?

Because it is God’s inspired and preserved word, the inerrant HOLY BIBLE.

Obscurantism and ignorance?

I think rather the answer of faith to a promise of Almighty God; the promise of the PRESERVATION of his precious, pure and perfect words; a promise as certain and real as that promise of the preservation of his blood-bought elect.

What is your alternative?

Appendix 1 (page 14)

Shown below are the two types of Greek text. Type 1. is the Roman type (UBS 3rd edition 1975). Type 2. is that of the Received Text ('Textus Receptus' – "The N.T. in the Original Greek according to the text followed in the Authorised Version" F.H.A. Scrivener, Cambridge University Press 1902, and available from the Trinitarian Bible Society, U.K.).

The passage (below) is chosen from a total of 5788 differences between the two text types in the New Testament.

Mark 1:1, 2 ;-

Text 1.

TEXT TO BE ADDED

Text 2.

TEXT TO BE ADDED

The two texts are now placed one under the other (Text 1 on the top), line by line by line, to enable the differences to be more easily detected by those unable to read the Greek language.

Text 1. _____ TEXT TO BE ADDED

Text 2. _____ TEXT TO BE ADDED

Text 1. _____ TEXT TO BE ADDED

Text 2. _____ TEXT TO BE ADDED

Every translation (in WHATEVER language) that comes from Text 1 will, or course, reflect the error 'Isaiah the prophet' (pp. 24,25).

Thus the Jehovah's Witness New World Translation, the Brethren ('Exclusive') J.N. Darby's New Translation, the NIV, the NASV and also the R.C. versions ALL have the same reading because they are ALL drawn from the same Text type, Text 1 above.

APPENDIX 2 (page 34)

We do not know whether GREEK was the language that the Holy Spirit used for the original N.T. writings (pp. 46,47), but IF IT WAS, then the passage in Mark 15:34 would look as follows (the Greek text is that of the Trinitarian Bible Society, U.K.)

TEXT TO BE ADDED

The Spirit himself TRANSLATES the four Aramaic words (underlined) into the ten Greek words (in brackets), the three Greek words in between are the English 'which being interpreted'.

The other passage (Matthew 1:23) would appear as follows ;-

TEXT TO BE ADDED

Here the one Hebrew word (underlined) is translated by the Spirit into the four Greek words (bracketed).

APPENDIX 3

The Trinitarian Bible Society has a list of words at the back of their editions of the King James Bible which gives the meanings of any words that may present difficulty to readers of less than average reading ability or comprehension. This is a spiritual and sensible approach to the Bible text.

The new versions unfairly criticise the KJB for its archaisms, but have numerous occasions where they themselves use more difficult and unusual words and phrases than the Authorised Version. E.g. ;-

- 'machinations' for KJB 'lying in wait'
- 'anxious to ingratiate' for 'willing to do the Jews pleasure'
- 'beneficent work' for KJB 'grace'
- 'indefatigable in confuting' for KJB 'mightily convinced'
- 'arrogates' for KJB 'takes'
- 'inscribed' for KJB 'written'
- 'extirpate' for KJV 'destroy'

While the KJB 'forbidding to marry' becomes the difficult 'inculcating abstinence' (1 Tim. 4:3) and 'proud, knowing nothing' (KJB) becomes 'a pompous ignoramus'.

The notions that the AV is difficult because it is old, and the new versions are easy because they are contemporary, are both false.

I am often reminded of an occasion when conversing with a philologist in a NZ University; he expressed his scorn of the KJB word 'without' giving the example of Jn. 18:16 'and Peter stood at the door without'. "Without what?" he derided, "his coat? His hat? That is archaic".

On checking the word in a currently available economy edition of an Oxford dictionary (Concise Oxford 7th Edition 1982) I found the word listed with its 4 separate listed meanings, the FIRST of which read, 'outside, to or at or on the outside'.

T.S. Eliot says ;-

"we are told that the language of the Authorised Version is even more definitely archaic, and less generally understood, than it was 80 years ago (when the Revised Version was being prepared) for the rate of change in English usage has accelerated."

And goes onto add ;-

"no attempt is made to substantiate the assertion that the rate of change of English usage has accelerated, or to inform us in what respects English usage is changing. It does not seem to have occurred to the mind of the anonymous author of this introduction THAT CHANGE CAN SOMETIMES BE FOR THE WORSE, and that it is as much our business to attempt to arrest deterioration and combat corruption of our language, as to accept change Nor are we given any definition of 'contemporaneity'. Is it to be found in the writing of the best contemporary writings of English prose, and if so, who are they and who is to decide who they are? Or is it to be found in colloquial speech, and if so, at what level of literacy?"

-T.S. Eliot, "A Scholar finds Beauty Wrung Out of New English Bible's Verses" in Literary Style of the Old Bible and the New, ed.D.Kehl pg. 56.

Trench says ;-

“The same worship of the fleeting present, of the transient fashions of the our in language, with the same contempt of that stable past which will in all likelihood be the enduring future, long after these fashions have been forgotten”

‘On The Authorised Version’ pp. 51, 52.

Appendix 4 (pg. 25)

Another glaring error in the Roman text is demonstrated below.

The proof that Luke wrote ;-

TEXT TO BE ADDED

(‘and the sun was darkened’ – pass.indicative) is, to quote Dean Burgon, ‘the most obvious and conclusive possible’ (Revision Revised, pg. 61), and this is the reading of the Authorised Bible.

The alternate reading adopted by the Roman text

TEXT TO BE ADDED

Admits of only one true rendering. “Let them ask any Scholar in Europe And see if he does not tell them ‘the sun having becoming eclipsed’” (ibid pg 65).

No doubt recognising the ASTRONOMICAL IMPOSSIBILITY of an eclipse at full moon, the Revisers, as well the RSV, NEB etc, never had the manliness to translate the words faithfully, opting for the fabricated ‘the sun’s light failing (failed) ...’, or the NIV ‘the sun stopped shining’.

Appendix 5. (page 25)

Bernard Ramm is obviously ‘fudging’ when he says regarding Mark 1:1, 2 and it is “The Jewish custom in citing two or three prophets in a brief catena of Scripture .. to name only the leading prophet.” (‘Protestant Biblical Interpretation’ pg. 203) as he is unable to unwilling to favour his reader with even a shred of evidence.

His ‘slip is showing’ well and truly in his use of Matthew 27:9 to protest against an ‘abstract or artificial notion of inerrancy’ – ‘a verse from Zechariah is cited as coming from Jeremiah. The Jewish tradition was that the spirit of Jeremiah was in Zechariah ..’ (ibid pg. 203).

Even a cursory glance at the passage reveals that the words were “SPOKEN by Jeremiah the prophet”, not written by him as they were by Zechariah. Ramm’s ignorance is as glaring as it is sad.

We were forewarned when we read his admission that ‘a corrupt text’ is a better way to account for ‘some problems’, and that ‘there is nothing inherently contradictory in the notion of an inspired text imperfectly transmitted’ (ibid pg. 208).

In fact, for the ‘evangelical Protestant’ Ramm, it is inherently HERETICAL so to assert in the face of God’s explicit and repeated promise of verbal PRESERVATION.

NOTES

1. J.N. Darby Revised Preface to 2nd Edition page xvi of the New Testament
pg. xvi 1871.
“A New Translation from the Original Languages’
2. Fr. Edward Daschbach, Sunday Visitor October 21 1984, pg.3.
The New Catholic Encyclopaedia (1967, Vol. 5, pg. 689)
3. Dr. E.F. Hills, pg 212, The King James Version Defended
4. Dr. P.S. Ruckman, ‘Problem Texts’ 1980
Pensacola Institute Press, Box 7135, Pensacola, Florida
5. Professor Skilton, ‘The King James Version’ pg. 106
6. E.J. Epp, “The Ascension in the Textual Criticism of Luke and Acts”
pp. 131–145, Oxford U.P. 1881
7. U.B.S. Gk. N.T. 3rd Edition pp. 897 – 903
8. R.D. Pearce, “Aspects of Accuracy in the KJB” SPS Publications 1984
9. Rudolf Flesch, “The Art of Plain Talk”, pg. 43
10. J. Owen, “Integrity” pg. 363