

EVIDENCE IN FAVOR OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE

BY PASTOR STAN SEIGLER

Table of Contents

I TRUE REVIVAL.....	2
II THE RISE OF CULTS.....	5
III REVIVAL WITH LUTHER.....	7
IV THE TEACHING OF CHRISTOLOGY CHANGED.....	14
V CHECKING THE GREEK MANUSCRIPTS.....	41
VI THE NEW KING JAMES VERSION.....	46
VII THE IMPORTANCE OF “THEE’S” AND “THOU’S”.....	56
VIII AN EXPLANATION FOR I JOHN 5:7 AND “EASTER”.....	58
IX CONCLUSION.....	61

CHAPTER ONE TRUE REVIVAL

How many times have you heard the topic of revival mentioned lately? I have contact with several different Christian groups, and it seems that the topic of revival comes up again and again. There are even concerted efforts and prayer groups that have been organized to address this topic.

But what are we expecting to happen? I remember when I was boy we would have “revivals” in our churches. We would invite a special speaker in for a week. The choir would rehearse and rehearse for a special song each night of that “revival week”. Someone would put up a little sign in the church yard, and we had a “revival.” Or did we?

What is a revival? Is it just a week of meetings, or does anything special happen? I grew up in church. The first thing I joined at church was the nursery. And I was a member of everything from there on up. I came through all of that and thought that what we had were revivals. We even knew when to schedule them. They were always supposed to happen in the fall of each year, after the children had been back in school for a month or so. We had it down to a fine science. Now if I grew up with this concept of revival, having grown up right in the midst of things, I think it’s safe to say that this was and is pretty much the norm for what revivals are supposed to be. I was involved in a church recently in which the revival evangelists have even changed to having their meetings to go for only half a week or only a weekend. Isn’t it amazing how efficient we’ve become!

But what actually happened in our “revivals?” Anything significant? Not that I can remember. It was just a week of meetings. Nothing more than a bunch of Sunday sermons put back to back. Oh yes, we all had a good time. We enjoyed the singing and the fellowship. The sermons were good, too. But was that truly revival?

Let us turn our attention to a well known verse of the Old Testament. II Chronicles 7:14, “If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.” I think we have here a formula for revival just as the verse states, “then will I hear from heaven and will heal their land.” What are the prerequisites laid down here for us?

- 1st - humble ourselves
- 2nd - pray
- 3rd - seek my face
- 4th - turn from their wicked ways

There seems to be more and more groups of Christians who are calling for prayer for revival. This is good, but let us not think that this is all that needs to happen. This verse says that we need to start with the attitude of humility. If we have iniquities in our lives, of which pride is one, the Lord will not hear our prayers. (Psa. 66:18) I know in my own life the watchman on the walls of my heart must keep a constant lookout for this formidable foe.

Our verse shows us that as we come humbly before God in prayer that we must seek his face and then turn from our wicked ways. It’s relatively easy to humble ourselves, also relatively easy to pray, and so to turn from our known sins. But if we notice, the Lord didn’t say that we are to turn from our known sins, but from our sins. We have all kinds of Christians today that condone all kinds of activities (especially in their youth groups)

because they think that we must become like the world to reach the world.

Right here I could just stop and preach a message on separation, but I won't. Let me put it very simply - God can use just about anything to evangelize the lost, but are we to use just anything, or even just good things? What ever happened to doing and using the best for our master? Has he spared anything for us to have His best? Our lives should be open and transparent to Him with whom we have to do, so that He can remove from us or restore to us what ever He chooses. Even the horse bells will be a testimony to God's holiness; should we fervently seek anything else?

I believe there are things we are doing that if we would seek God's face, he would reveal these things as sin to us. But what is seeking God's face? This is the tough part of the verse. Living in an "instant everything" age, I think we have lost the virtue of patience. A casual perusal of scripture or even our lives will quickly show us that God is not all that concerned with a lot of our "deadlines". How many times have we prayed for something that must happen by such and such a time, and God just doesn't seem to mark it down on His calendar or His daily planner? How many times has He adjusted our calendar and daily planners?!

Every great Christian of every age has spent extended time alone with God. It may be in prayer and fasting, it may be in reading the scriptures, or just being still and knowing that God is God. But it takes TIME. Time to get in tune with God, time to get the world purged out of us, time to slow down and stop, time to set our complete attention on Him, time to meditate on scripture. But we are too busy for that aren't we? Then we are TOO busy. The scripture said, "seek my face." That may take a whole day; that may take a whole week. Horrors, my schedule! Is our schedule God's schedule? Do they coincide at all?

But what is true revival? Dr. Martin Lloyd-Jones can enlighten us as to what revivals historically were. He says in his book entitled Revival:

Oh, go and read the history of revivals again. Watch the individuals at the beginning. This is invariably the first thing that happens to them. They begin to see what a terrible, appalling thing sin is in the sight of God. They temporarily even forget the state of the Church, and forget their own anguish. It is the thought of sin in the sight of God. How terrible it must be. Never has there been a revival but that some of the people, especially at the beginning, have had such visions of the holiness of God and the sinfulness of sin, that they have scarcely known what to do with themselves. Some of them have felt it so acutely, as we have seen, that they have even collapsed physically. That does not matter. The thing that matters is the realization of sin in the presence of God.

Then, even further than this, what these people suddenly came to realize was that because of their sin, and because of God's view of sin, God was withholding his presence from them, and was telling them to go up to the land of Canaan without him. He would send an angel, but he was not going himself. The God who had entered among them, as it were, in Egypt, the God whose power they had felt as they were traveling in the direction of the Red Sea, the God who was there among them, with the mountains of Pi-hahiroth, and Baal-zephon, one on each side, and the hosts of Pharaoh behind, and the Red Sea in front, the God who had come down and had divided the Sea; this mighty presence, this holy, glorious God - he was no longer going to be with them. That was the thing that filled them with dismay. That was the thing that alarmed these people and caused them to mourn. 'When the people heard these evil tidings...' - and that was the evil tidings. 'I will not go up in the midst of thee; for thou art a stiff-necked people: lest I consume thee in the way.' What troubled them was not the threat of being consumed but that God had said, 'I am not coming with you. You must go up alone. I am sending an angel, but I am not coming.'

Oh, this is a tremendous thing, this is the heart of the whole matter. Men and women, when they are truly awakened, begin to realize that there is nothing so serious as to be without the presence of God. Do you get its full force? God was sending them to the promised land. God was saying, 'Go up.

I promised you the land of Canaan, I am going to give it to you. You shall go to the land flowing with milk and honey. I will send my angel before you to destroy these enemies, the Amorites, the Hittites and the others. Go on, go up to your promised land. I have brought you out of the captivity of Egypt, and I am sending you on. Go ahead. Lead them, Moses. I will send an angel with you.'

And the people said, 'No. If you are not coming with us, we do not want to go.' Now that is the essence of spiritual understanding. And that is the position that you and I must come to. Here were the people who, suddenly awakened, came to this tremendous, profound realization, that to be given every other blessing is of no value if God is not with you. What is the value of Canaan? What is the value of milk and honey? What is the value of having possessions, if God was not with them? They saw that the realization of the presence of God, having his fellowship and company, was infinitely more important than everything else.

Need I apply this to the Church today? We can have successes over our enemies without this great realization of God in the midst. Oh yes, there are angels who can do that for us, who can destroy certain of our enemies and take us to the land. We are in Canaan, we have got the milk and honey, everything seems to be all right. There is an appalling verse in Psalm 106 where we are told of the Children of Israel, 'God gave them their request; but sent leanness into their soul.' You can have an outward prosperity and affluence, the Church may seem to be doing remarkably well, good finances, good figures, successes, conversion, the enemy is defeated, everything going well, and the Christian newspapers report it. It all seems to be marvelous. But the appalling question I ask is this - is God in the midst? Is he really amongst us? Are we aware, as we should be, of his glorious presence? That is the thing that got these people. And what they said, in effect, was 'Canaan is no use to us, milk and honey are of no value, we are not interested in these enemies. We want you.'¹

Then Dr. Lloyd-Jones continues,

Christian people, I am not asking you whether you are living a good life. I am not asking you whether you are happy. I am not asking you whether you read your Bible, or whether you pray. I am not asking whether you are active in Church work, or some other form of Christian activity. What I am asking you is this - Do you know God? Is he with you? Is he in your life? Is he in the camp? Or are you traveling on, with God, as it were, some where in the distance, giving strength and power by his angel, and by his leader? But the question is - what of you in your personal relationship, and your personal dealings with God? These people repented. And the end of repentance, and the ultimate aim of repentance is just that, to realize that nothing matters except my relationship to God. 'Let nothing please nor pain me apart, Oh Lord, from thee.' They not only faced this situation, they repented.'²

This is a little taste of what revival is- God's mighty presence among His people.

As we seek God and meditate on Him and His word, He will not only show us the sins in our lives, but He will give us His grace and strength to claim the victory over those sins and to live free from them (Psa. 119:11, 19:14).

II Chronicles 7:14 is the key to revival in our hearts. Let's apply it and watch God work.

¹ Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *Revival* (Crossway Books: Westchester, 1987) p.157-158.

² *Ibid.*, p.159.

CHAPTER TWO THE RISE OF CULTS

Do you remember the old cowboy movies when a man would be out in a desert stumbling, alone, about to be overcome by the elements? Then, for dramatic effect, the camera is shifted up into the sky, and there are some ominous buzzards or vultures circling overhead, just patiently waiting for their meal to present itself. Remember? The buzzards are never shown when all is well, and the person has plenty of victuals and provisions - because they wouldn't be there.

I think Christianity today is being attacked by the buzzards of cults. You see, if Christianity, too, were healthy and setting astride her horse with plenty of provisions, there would be no threat from the cults that may occasionally soar overhead; for they would have to learn to eat berries or starve to death.

We have allowed the cults to become strong by not staying strong ourselves. We have not remained healthy and strong by feasting on a pure diet of God's word. There is one cult that boasts itself of increasing its own ranks from ignorant Baptists. I spoke to one Jehovah's Witness who, himself, told me that he was a Baptist before he switched.

I tell my congregation that there are two simple ways to check to see if a group is a cult. Firstly, ask them, "Who is Jesus Christ?" Secondly, ask them, "Is God through with the nation of Israel?" If they do not answer scripturally to both of the questions, they are a cult, because every cult has a warped understanding of Jesus Christ, and they say that they have become heir to the physical blessings that God promised to Israel.

I have recently come across a branch of a cult here in San Diego. A group of men from our church and I went to one of their Bible studies where they were to show from the Bible that Jesus Christ was not God. They say that we have been deceived into believing that Jesus Christ is God. He went through some verses where Jesus Christ showed His position of submission in the Godhead by saying that His Father was greater than He. Then the speaker proceeded to explain salvation. He said (and I have some of their written materials in my possession) that we must become members of the only true church for whom Christ died. Christ is the door of this church, and we must come through Him into this church and remain there until we die. As he then proceeded to show us the name of the church, he sorted quickly through a few English translations that were beside him and came up with the Lamsa Version. And, lo and behold, right there in Acts 20:28 it says that we are to "feed the church of Christ, which he has purchased with his own blood." Reader, are you in the Iglesia Ni Cristo? If not, you're on your way to hell. That preacher just proved it to us all! Right from the Bible! You better change your membership right away. Let me give you their address! STOP! Do you see what he did? He went to some off-beat Bible to prove his points, and he proved it, too. At least to the several hundred of his members present. He didn't prove anything to me because my Bible doesn't say that, and according to Nestle's Greek text and the critical apparatus therein, there is not one single Greek manuscript that says, "the Church of Christ!"

Surely we know how the Jehovah's Witnesses have even written their own Bible translation to prove their doctrines. Now they, too, can prove their heresy right from the Bible. Where did they get their Bible? Look at the chart on page _____. You will see that every time Westcott and Hort leave out a verse, so does the New World Translation. They go farther than that and change some more, but by in large they just translated the Westcott and Hort Greek text into English. That's where they got their Bible, and that's where they get their

doctrines of Jesus Christ not being God manifest in the flesh.

Dr. Martin Lloyd-Jones, in his wonderful work entitled Revival, states that anything that conceals the Lord Jesus Christ in any way is a hindrance to revival. He says:

Clearly, then, this is the work of the Philistines. Anything that in any way conceals the Lord Jesus Christ, anything that in any way takes him out of the center and puts him anywhere else, is the work of the Philistines.³

He also says:

Revival, above everything else, is a glorification of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God. It is the restoration of him to the center of the life of the Church. You find this warm devotion, personal devotion, to him. It leads to our hymns, our anthems of praise: Christ the center of the life of the Church. Do you not see the necessity for getting rid of this work of the Philistines? There is no value in so-called Christianity which does not exalt him, and live for him, and live to testify to him.⁴

Isn't it interesting that the Greek manuscripts that we Christians have made available, are the very weapons that are being thrown back in our faces! The church is sick today, and the buzzards are inflicting their blows. We need to partake of the provisions of God's pure word, gain our strength, and flush these filthy birds out of our hair!

³ Martyn Lloyd-Jones, Revival (Crossway Books: Westchester, 1988) p.46.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p.47.

CHAPTER THREE REVIVAL WITH LUTHER

As I thought upon the topic of revival, I reasoned that it would be good to follow a similar time through history to see what happened there. Was some other time similar to ours when the church had been rocked to sleep or drugged beyond response to the proper leading of the Lord; a time where methods were emphasized rather than the power of God?

My mind came upon the time and life of Martin Luther and the Reformation. We know from our history that this, indeed, was a time of tremendous revival which was accomplished under the influence of basically one man. But did the pattern hold true? The only way to know for sure was to read a biography of his life and see.

What a blessing and a challenge is this man's life. He experienced utter frustration trying to serve God without a proper understanding of even who He was. He was even trying to serve God not knowing the way of salvation which had been completely obscured by the church in which he so fervently labored both day and night with literally blood, sweat, and tears.

As I followed this man's spiritual pilgrimage, it was similar to reading John Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress with Christian's conquest for the celestial city, for Martin Luther also began his journey and seeking of God before he was saved. Also, in reading, I was watching for the direct mention of the importance of the scriptures in this whole process. We know that, according to the introduction to the Westcott and Hort's Greek New Testament, that the Roman Church under Constantine had made 50 copies of the scriptures from Alexandria to introduce into the church around the time of the Council of Nicea in 327 A.D. In Alexandria is where the scriptures had been tampered with by Greek Gnostic-Christian, Origen with his removing the references to the deity of Christ. You see, according to Greek Gnosticism, spirit is good and matter is evil. Therefore, the bringing together of these two opposites in one being is absurd.

The book I read was not an autobiography of Luther, but a biography. Therefore, I was left to the impression of another party as to the events about which he chose to write; and the emphasis upon which he chose to put these events and topics. Nevertheless, the emphasis of the scriptures in Luther's life was so paramount, that this author made many references to the role that they played in Luther's conversion and his life long service. Being once removed from Luther's own writings, I think gives credibility to these observations. My own personal bias was more free not to influence the facts.

Our author is Roland H. Bainton and the book is Here I Stand. A Life of Martin Luther. Bainton says this:

The *Resolutions Concerning the Ninety-Five Theses* contain some new points. Luther had made the discovery that the biblical text from the Latin Vulgate, used to support the sacrament of penance, was a mistranslation. The Latin for Matt. 4:17 read *penitentiam agite*, 'do penance,' but from the Greek New Testament of Erasmus, Luther had learned that the original meant simply 'be penitent.' The literal sense was 'change your mind.' 'Fortified with this passage,' wrote Luther to Staupitz in the dedication of the *Resolutions*, 'I venture to say they are wrong who make more of the act in Latin than of the change of heart in the Greek.' This was what Luther himself called a 'glowing' discovery. In this crucial instance a sacrament of the Church did not rest on the institution of Scripture.

In a very casual way Luther threw off another remark for which he was to be severely pressed. 'Suppose,' said he, 'that the Roman Church were as once it was before the days of Gregory I, when it was not above the other churches, at least not above the Greek.' This was to say that the primacy of the Roman Church was a historical development due rather to the exigencies of history than to divine ordination reaching back to the very founding of the Church.⁵

Did you notice what had given the Roman Church its foundation on which to make its sacrament of penance? Do you know what penance is? If you are not of Catholic background you may not. Let me explain. A sacrament first of all is according to Roman Catholic teaching is a vehicle of grace. That is, the more you do a particular sacrament the more grace you receive from God. You are born with an empty soul, and as you do more and more sacraments, God pours more and more grace into your soul. When you die, the time that you must spend in purgatory is indirectly proportional to the amount of filling your soul has received of grace while you were alive.

Some sacraments can only be done once, such as baptism, marriage, and extreme unction, but others can be repeated over and over. This gives the person plenty of opportunities to really bless his soul with the grace of God. Some of these sacraments are the mass, confession, and penance.

Basically, penance is anything that punishes the physical body. This may be in mild forms such as fasting, or it can take extremely brutal forms of flagellation and even crucifixion. In predominantly Catholic cultures and countries, these last two are practiced, because the more severe the physical torture, the more grace the soul receives. In the Philippines these things can be witnessed. Good "Christians" beat their backs with whips until they bleed profusely. They even have themselves nailed to crosses. Now this is penance at its best!

So you see that there is a great difference between one Bible saying "do penance" and another saying "be penitent." As I said before the thing that makes a Catholic a Catholic is his authority; the thing that makes a Jehovah's Witness a Jehovah's Witness is his authority; the thing that makes a Mormon a Mormon is his authority; and the thing that makes you whatever you are is your AUTHORITY. On what do you base what you believe? Is it pure? Has it been tampered with? I want the purest authority I can get. My Bible says that every word of God is pure, and that He will keep it that way from King David's generation forever. (Psa. 12:6-7) The last time I checked the calendar, we were still in that time frame.

I have an English Bible, which boasts itself as being a translation into English of the Latin Vulgate, and all of the scriptural perversions can be clearly seen within its pages. The reason for this is that Jerome, as brilliant as he was, used the perverted Greek manuscripts from Alexandria to translate his New Testament. Doing this, he picked up the changes of Origen.

This time our author, Bainton, quotes Luther's response to a critic who was trying to discredit him. He said:

I am sorry now that I despised Tetzl. Ridiculous as he was, he was more acute than you. You cite no Scripture. You give no reasons. Like an insidious devil, you pervert the Scriptures. You say that the Church consists virtually in the pope. What abominations will you not have to regard as the deeds of the Church? Look at the ghastly shedding of blood by Julius II. Look at the outrageous tyranny of Boniface VIII, who, as the proverb declared, 'came in as a wolf, reigned as a lion, and died as a dog.' If the Church consists representatively in the cardinals, what do you make of a general council of the whole Church? You call me a leper because I mingle truth with error. I am glad you admit there is some truth. You make the pope into an emperor in power and violence. The Emperor Maximilian and the

⁵ Roland H. Bainton, Here I Stand, A Life of Martin Luther (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press: Nashville, 1950) p.88.

Germans will not tolerate this.⁶

Notice Luther's reference to scripture, and as we saw from his last citing, he is not speaking of the Alexandrian Manuscripts, but of the manuscripts of Erasmus which came from Antioch.

In the next two quotes, we see Luther's belief that the scriptures are our final authority. In response to Eck's calling Luther a follower of John Hus and John Wycliff, this was Luther's reply:

Luther continued. 'As for the article of Hus that 'it is not necessary for salvation to believe the Roman Church superior to all others.' I do not care whether this comes from Wycliff or from Hus. I know that innumerable Greeks have been saved though they never heard this article. It is not in the power of the Roman pontiff or of the Inquisition to construct new articles of faith. No believing Christian can be coerced beyond holy writ. By divine law we are forbidden to believe anything which is not established by divine Scripture or manifest revelation. One of the canon lawyers has said that the opinion of a single private man has more weight than that of a Roman pontiff or an ecclesiastical council if grounded on a better authority or reason. I cannot believe that the Council of Constance would condemn these propositions of Hus. Perhaps this section in the acts has been interpolated.'⁷

Luther continues:

A simple layman armed with Scripture is to be believed above a pope or a council without it. As for the pope's decretal on indulgences I say that neither the Church nor the pope can establish articles of faith. These must come from Scripture. For the sake of Scripture we should reject pope and councils.⁸

Please notice how Luther spoke of the authority upon which he based his beliefs and convictions. Our authority must be and stay pure! These quotes speak volumes. Luther was not trying to destroy the Church of Rome, he was simply trying to purify it. One of the things he greatly regretted was his inability to persuade the leaders of the Church to reform the doctrines of the Roman Church to coincide with the scriptures. This was an incredible disappointment to him.

John Eck asked Luther a question during this debate in Leipzig. Our author says,

On the subject of penance, however, Eck kept pressing Luther with the query, 'Are you the only one that knows anything? Except for you is all the Church in error?''⁹

This is a common question to those of us who "hold these truths to be self evident." Questions like, "Well, I guess you think that you're right and everybody else is wrong?" Or, "How many others believe the way you do?" Or, "Dr. So and So doesn't believe that, and he's a Godly man."

These kinds of questions and statements don't affect the facts. Notice Luther's reply to Eck's question:

'I answer,' replied Luther, 'that God once spoke through the mouth of an ass. I will tell you straight what I think. I am a Christian theologian; and I am bound, not only to assert, but to defend the truth with my blood and death. I want to believe freely and be a slave to the authority of no one, whether council, university, or pope. I will confidently confess what appears to me to be true, whether it

6 Ibid., p.89-90.

7 Ibid., p.116.

8 Ibid., p.117.

9 Ibid., p.119.

has been asserted by a Catholic or a heretic, whether it has been approved or reprov'd by a council.¹⁰

Moving along now we come to the next quote of significance concerning Erasmus of Rotterdam and Martin Luther:

Erasmus was closer to Luther than many another figure of the Renaissance because he was so Christian. The major portion of his literary labors was devoted, not to the classics, but to the New Testament and the Fathers. His ideal, like that of Luther, was to revive the Christian consciousness of Europe through the dissemination of the sacred writings, and to that end Erasmus first made available in print the New Testament in the original Greek. From the press of Froben in 1516 was issued a handsome volume, the Greek translation and illumined by annotations. The volume reached Wittenberg as Luther was lecturing on the ninth chapter of Romans, and thereafter became his working tool. From the accompanying translation he learned the inaccuracy of the Vulgate rendering of 'do penance' instead of 'be penitent.'

Erasmus throughout his life continued to improve the tools of biblical scholarship. Luther prized his efforts and in his lectures on Galatians in 1519 declared that he would have been happier to have waited for a commentary from the pen of Erasmus.¹¹

Notice again the "inaccuracy of the Vulgate." It could be no other. It came from corrupt manuscripts. But please look again at the chart of Biblical Authorities and see how New Testament of Our Lord Jesus Christ Bible agrees with the NIV, NASB, and others against the KJV on matters of MAJOR doctrines. It says on it's title page, "NEWLY TRANSLATED FROM THE VULGATE LATIN AND AUTHORIZED BY THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF ENGLAND AND WALES."

"Am I therefore become your enemy because I tell you the truth?" (Gal. 4:16)

Later Erasmus makes another quotable quote:

"Papal bulls are weighty, but scholars attach more weight to books with good arguments drawn from the testimony of divine Scripture, which does not coerce but instructs."¹²

During Luther's concealment at Worms, among other writings, he translated the entire New Testament into his mother tongue. This, of course, gave his native countrymen the wonderful opportunity to now read and see for themselves the truths of the scriptures. He had placed the scriptures into the vernacular of the people, which Evans says is a prerequisite for reformation to occur in any country.

As we know Luther did not believe in the actual, literal presence of Christ's body and blood in the mass, but he did believe that they were there in some mystical manner.

Ulrich Zwingli took this to the next step. By his reading and study of the scriptures supplied by Erasmus, he was able, "to deny the real presence in the sacrament, which was reduced to a memorial of the death of Christ as the Passover was a commemoration of the escape of Israel from Egypt."¹³

More and more study of the scripture resulted in continual pulling away from the false doctrines of the Roman Church and applying the scriptures to every day living. This was called the "Erasmian program." The Anabaptist applied the scriptures to many areas of their lives.

¹⁰ Ibid., p.119.

¹¹ Ibid., p.157.

¹² Ibid., p.157.

¹³ Ibid .p.266.

These were the Anabaptists. Their point of departure was another aspect of the Erasmian program, dear also to Zwingli. This was the restoration of primitive Christianity, which they took to mean the adoption of the Sermon on the Mount as a literal code for all Christians, who should renounce oaths, the use of the sword whether in war or civil government, private possessions, bodily adornment, reveling and drunkenness. Pacifism, religious communism, simplicity, and temperance marked their communities. The Church should consist only of the twice-born, committed to the covenant of discipline. Here again we meet the concept of the elect, discernible by the two tests of spiritual experience and moral achievement. The Church should rest not on baptism administered in infancy, but on regeneration, symbolized by baptism in mature years. Every member should be a priest, a minister, and a missionary prepared to embark on evangelistic tours. Such a Church, though seeking to convert a world, could never embrace the unconverted community. And if the state comprised all the inhabitants, then Church and state would have to be separated. In any case religion should be free from constraint.¹⁴

Luther's work of the translation of the Bible impressed our author, for he dedicates ten pages to discuss it. I wish I could reproduce it all for you here but that may burden you too much. Suffer me a few pages, though.

Visitation had established the outward form of the Church, but Luther well knew that the Church of the spirit cannot be engendered by the arm of the magistrate. The true Christian Church is the work of the Word communicated by every available means. Early Luther sensed the need for a new translation of the Scriptures from the original tongues into idiomatic German. There must be likewise a body of instructional material for the young. The liturgy would have to be revised to eliminate popish abuses and to enlighten the people. Congregational singing should be cultivated alike to inspire and instruct. The Bible, the catechism, the liturgy, and the hymnbook thus constituted the needs, and all four were to be met by Luther himself.

THE BIBLE TRANSLATION

For the translation of the Bible, Luther availed himself of the enforced leisure at the Wartburg to produce in three months a rendering of the complete New Testament. The Old Testament came later. The German Bible is Luther's noblest achievement, unfortunately untranslatable because every nation has its own direct version. For the Germans, Luther's rendering was incomparable. He leaped beyond the tradition of a thousand years. There had been translations before him of the Scripture into German, reaching back to the earliest transcription of the Gothic tongue by Ulfilas. There were even portions of the Bible translated not from the Latin Vulgate, but from the Hebrew and the Greek. But none had the majesty of diction, the sweep of vocabulary, the native earthiness, and the religious profundity of Luther. 'I endeavored,' said he, 'to make Moses so German that no one would suspect he was a Jew.'

The variety of German chosen as a basis was the court tongue of electoral Saxony, enriched from a number of dialects with which Luther had gained some familiarity in his travels. He went to incredible pains to find words. The initial translation did not satisfy him. His New Testament was first published in September, 1522, but he was revising it to the day of his death in 1546. The last printed page on which he ever looked was the proof of the latest revision. The Old Testament was commenced after his return from the Wartburg. The complete translation of the entire Bible did not appear until 1534. This, again, was subject to constant reworking in collaboration with a committee of colleagues.

Luther on occasion achieved the most felicitous rendering at the first throw. At other times he had to labor. In that case he would first make a literal translation in the word order of the original. Then he would take each word separately and gush forth a freshet of synonyms. From these he would select those which not only best suited the sense but also contributed to balance and rhythm. All of this would then be set aside in favor of a free rendering to catch the spirit. Finally the meticulous and the free

¹⁴ Ibid., p.267.

would be brought together. Sometimes he was at a loss for terms and would set out in quest of words. In order to name the precious stones in the twenty-first chapter of Revelation he examined the court jewels of the elector of Saxony. For the coins of the Bible he consulted the numismatic collections in Wittenberg. When he came to describe the sacrifices of Leviticus and needed terms for the inward parts of goats and bullocks, he made repeated trips to the slaughterhouse and inquired of the butcher. The birds and beasts of the Old Testament proved a hard knot. To Spalatin he wrote:

I am all right on the birds of the night-owl, raven, horned owl, tawny owl, screech owl-and on the birds of prey-vulture, kite, hawk, and sparrow hawk. I can handle the stag, roebuck, and chamois, but what in the Devil am I to do with the ' taragelaphus, pygargus, oryx, and camelopard [names for animals in the Vulgate].

Another problem was the translation of idioms. Here Luther insisted that the idiom of one language must be translated 'into the equivalent idiom of the other. He was scornful of the Vulgate translation, 'Hail, Mary, full of grace.' 'What German would understand that if translated literally? He knows the meaning of a purse full of gold or a keg full of beer, but what is he to make of a girl full of grace? I would prefer to say simply, 'Liebe Maria.' What word is more rich than that word, 'liebe'?'

What the word could not do at this point, the pictures supplied. The Luther Bibles were copiously illustrated, particularly for the earlier portion of the Old Testament and for the book of Revelation in the New Testament. The restriction of illustrations to these portions of the Bible had become a convention in Germany. The Gospels and the epistles were adorned only with initial letters. Why this should have been the case is difficult to see. Certainly there was no objection to illustrating the Gospels; witness Durer's 'Life of Mary,' or the woodcuts of the Passion, or Schongauer's nativities. Within the conventional limits Luther's Bible was richly illustrated. In the various editions to appear during his lifetime there were some five hundred woodcuts. There were not the choicest expressions of the art, but they did Germanize the Bible. Moses and David might almost be mistaken for Frederick the Wise and John Frederick."¹⁵

And we continue:

Luther read the New Testament in the light of the Pauline message that the just shall live by faith and not by works of the law. That this doctrine is not enunciated with equal emphasis throughout the New Testament and appears to be denied in the book of James did not escape Luther, and in his preface to the New Testament of 1522 James was stigmatized as 'an epistle of straw.' Once Luther remarked that he would give his doctor's beret to anyone who could reconcile James and Paul. Yet he did not venture to reject James from the canon of Scripture, and on occasion earned his own beret by effecting a reconciliation. 'Faith,' he wrote, 'is a living, restless thing. It cannot be inoperative. We are not saved by works; but if there be no works, there must be something amiss with faith.' This was simply to put a Pauline construction upon James. The conclusion was a hierarchy of values within the New Testament. First Luther would place the Gospel of John, then the Pauline epistles and First Peter, after them the three other Gospels, and in a subordinate place Hebrews, James, Jude, and Revelation.¹⁶

The final quote of the author shows Luther's heart throb for the future of his country and Christianity.

The Bible, just as it stood in Luther's rendering, was a great educational tool; but more was needed, obviously for children but also for adults, who were almost equally ignorant. The children should be taught at Church, at school, and at home; and to that end pastors, teachers, and parents should receive prior training. Hence Luther's plea that Catholic schools be replaced by municipal schools with a system of compulsory education including religion. 'The Scripture cannot be understood without the languages,' argued Luther, 'and the languages can be learned only in school. If parents

¹⁵ Ibid., pp.326-330.

¹⁶ Ibid., pp.331-332.

cannot spare their children for a full day, let them send them for a part. I would wager that in half of Germany there are not over four thousand pupils in school. I would like to know where we are going to get pastors and teachers three years from now.¹⁷

Notice Luther's concern that the people not stay in the same ignorance that had allowed them to be enslaved to the teachings of the Roman Church. We must learn; we must know the truth. Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free. FREE to worship our Father in the way he wants us to; FREE to know His Son in His complete deity; FREE to allow the Holy Spirit to teach us all of the truths that are contained in His pure scriptures that He has promised to preserve for us. Where will we get our pastors who know these things? Will they come from the normal seminaries of today? Does the average seminary graduate believe that God has preserved His word as He said He would?! No, No, a thousand times, NO!!! Then are we not set up for delusion and spiritual slavery? Or are we already deluded and in spiritual slavery? If we are not then why have we gone for over 100 YEARS without a God sent revival like they used to have about every 5 to 10 years in the early 1800's? Is Nietzsche right? Is God dead? I say, "No." The problem isn't with God; it's with us. There's garbage in the wells. The flow of sweet water has been stopped. We've become accustomed to drinking from the mud holes and have been told by our spiritual "popes" that this is living water. It's living water, alright. It's alive with amoebas, paramecia, bacteria, crawdads and polliwogs! Man, it's crawling - it's alive. Stand back while it evolves into some higher form of life. No, it's just a mud hole that should make us cringe if we see our dog drink from it! Let's get back to the pure. It's here. It's here for us English speaking people in our A.V. 1611. If you say it's not preserved for us in our A.V. 1611, then you had better get busy finding it, because it's here somewhere. God promised He'd keep it for us. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away." (Mat. 24:35)

What's your authority?

It seems evident to me that the problems that Martin Luther faced are the same basic problems that we face today. That is that Christianity has accepted lies or a lie that has come through the hierarchy of the church, taught as fact, and has been perpetrated for so long that one who opposes is deemed ridiculous. When his position agrees with the former corner stones of the faith. I once saw a statement that goes something like this:

All error goes through three stages.

1. It is promoted by some daring individual.
2. It is laughed at as being utterly absurd.
3. It is finally accepted as a fact that should have always been obvious.

The fictitious teachings of Westcott and Hort have now been accepted as fact by most Bible scholars. Let's not sip from the mudhole of anemic writings, but let's drink abundantly from the living waters of God's Word, preserved for us as English speaking people in the A.V. 1611, King James Bible.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 335.

CHAPTER FOUR THE TEACHING OF CHRISTOLOGY CHANGED

This next section is an incredibly important section because I believe it reveals why our nation has succumbed to the apostasy that we see, and why so many Christians don't even perceive it as apostasy.

When I went through my Bible studies in seminary, we studied christology as part of our theology course. In that study, one of the sections was entitled "The Deity of Christ". There were a lot of terms and a lot of Bible verses to look up and study, so I naturally believed that these were the best tenants or at least the main tenants for the doctrine of Jesus Christ being God in the flesh. I realize that this book The Great Doctrines of the Bible by William Evans is not a graduate level text book, but, none the less, he should have had the best information presented and left some of the more difficult information for graduate level study. By the best information, I mean the most straight forward and most simple to comprehend and remember, such as scripture verses which we are to hide in our hearts anyhow. (Psa. 119:11)

Also in my school, we went into relatively great depth studying manuscript evidence learning about the extant Greek manuscripts. We learned a lot of impressive names like Textus Receptus, Alexandrinas, Siniaticus, Codex Catebrigenus and others. We learned how to read the critical apparatus at the bottom of Nestle's Novum Testamentum Graece. We learned about the church fathers, like Philo of Alexandria and his great school of Divinity there in Alexandria. We learned about Origen, his successor and how he allegorically interpreted the New Testament. We were taught how that Origen was a Greek Gnostic before his conversion to Christianity, and how he carried that Greek philosophy over into his Bible manipulation and mutilation of verses.

But it wasn't until years later as I pondered the question of why so many cults are on the rise, why so many Christians are so weak and can be drawn off into these cults, and why we don't even know what true revival is in modern Christianity, that the mystery began to unfold.

As I have stated before, Dr. Martin Lloyd-Jones said that "anything that conceals the Lord Jesus Christ is a hindrance to revival."¹⁸ I then was able to hypothesize why all these things have been able to take place right under the Christian's noses and a lot of times being done by Christians. I began checking as to how theology used to be taught in the early 1800's and mapped out it's changes throughout the 1800's and on into the 1900's. I was able to find four of five theology books written in the 1800's and, of course many more written in the 1900's. But the evidence is very plain to see that the theology that was once taught in this country that produced the great Christians of the past and gave us the country that once feared God and didn't murder babies, was the product of the preaching from pulpits of pastors who were taught entirely differently from the pastors of today. In this section I plan to take you on a similar journey through the old books, some of which I will have to quote volumnously because they probably would not be available, or at least readily available to any of my readers. We will see that a certain part of their theology went through a metamorphosis in the 1870 - 1880 and has not been the same ever since: We will also show what this change was and why it took place.

Before we get into the actual evidence in the books themselves, let me map out very briefly what the part of theology is that was once taught but is now avoided like the Bubonic plague. In the section of these

¹⁸ Martyn Lloyd-Jones, Revival (Crossway Books: Westchester, 1987), p.46.

theology books on christology, the section on the deity of Christ is the place where our attention will be centered.

As we pick up our first text Evan's Great Doctrines of the Bible and turn to the section on the deity of Christ, we see the following outline for the proof of the deity of Christ:

II. The Deity of Jesus Christ

1. Divine names are given to Him
2. Divine worship is ascribed to Him
3. Divine qualities and properties are possessed of Him
4. Divine offices are ascribed to Him
5. Divine attributes are possessed by Him
6. Christ's name is coupled with that of the Father
7. The self-conscienceness of Jesus Christ as manifested
 - a) in His visit to the temple
 - b) in His Baptism
 - c) in His temptation
 - d) in the calling of the twelve and the seventy
 - e) in the sermon on the mount ¹⁹

Before I go any farther, let me take a brief aside. I have recently attended a Bible study taught by a cult that does not believe the deity of Christ. I listened to these men quote the verses where Christ says that His Father is greater than He, and others where the people glorify God because He has given such power unto men. There are many verses that quote Christ showing his voluntary submission to His Father in the Godhead, and they use these verses very skillfully to build their case. These verses rule supreme in their doctrine of Jesus Christ and all others are interpreted in light of them. Take the passage in Mat. 1:23 which says, "Behold, a virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name, Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us." We say that this is a powerful verse for the deity of Christ, for it states emphatically that Jesus Christ is God with us. But these guys are too clever for that. Watch carefully what they do. Notice the verse says that, "they shall call his name Emmanuel." not, "he shall be Emmanuel." Their point of argument is that no matter how many people call him "Emmanuel" that doesn't make Him Emmanuel. They could have been mistaken. And since Christ said his Father was greater than He was, then He could not have been God in the flesh.

Take another passage, Isa. 9:6, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Did you see it that time? The verse said, "...and his name shall be called..." not that it shall be! These people do not shy away from these verses. These are more of their proof texts to show that Jesus Christ was just a man empowered by God.

Now let's watch Dr. Evans teach us the deity of Christ, and you see if what he says would stand up against scrutiny like this.

a) HE IS CALLED GOD.

John 1:1 - 'The Word was God.' Heb. 1:8 - 'But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever.' John 1:18- 'The only begotten Son [or better 'only begotten God']'. Absolute deity is here ascribed to Christ. 20:28- "My Lord and my God." Not an expression of amazement, but a confession of faith. This confession accepted by Christ, hence equivalent to the acceptance of deity, and an assertion of it on Christ's part. Rom. 9:5- 'God blessed forever.' Tit. 2:13- 'The great God and our Savior

¹⁹ William Evans, The Great Doctrines of the Bible (Chicago: Moody Press, 1912), p.51.

Jesus Christ.' 1 John 5:20-His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God." In all these passages Christ is called God.

It may be argued that while Christ is here called God, yet that does not argue for nor prove His deity, for human judges are also called 'gods' in John 10:35- 'If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came.' True, but it is then used in a secondary and relative sense, and not in the absolute sense when used of the Son." ²⁰

Please notice in paragraph two, Dr. Evans starts out, "It may be argued that while Christ...." That is a very gross understatement. Not, "It may be..", "IT IS ARGUED," and they can match his argument blow for blow.

Watch his section on "He is called the Lord."

c) HE IS CALLED THE LORD.

Acts 4:33; 16:31; Luke 2:11; Acts 9:17; Matt. 22:43-45. It is true that this term is used of men, e. g., Acts 16:30- 'Sirs [Lords], what must I do to be saved?' John 12:21- 'Sir [Lord], we would see Jesus.' It is not used, however, in this unique sense, as the connection will clearly show. In our Lord's day, the title "Lord" as used of Christ was applicable only to the Deity, to God. 'The Ptolemies and the Roman Emperors would allow the name to be applied to them only when they permitted themselves to be deified. The archaeological discoveries at Oxyrhynchus put this fact beyond a doubt. So when the New Testament writers speak of Jesus as Lord, there can be no question as to what they mean.'-Wood" ²¹

Notice how rather laboriously and a bit awkwardly he has defended the explanation of these verses. Again I could take the arguments of this cult and match this "proof" of the deity of Christ blow for blow. We have not yet given anything that will shake our opponents to their very foundation. No shot has been fired that cannot very neatly be countered by them. These people are very sure of themselves even to the extent of challenging Christians to debates, and they love it. How can we be humiliated like this, and the doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ be put to an open shame? I'll tell you how. Because this is the standard No. 8 bird shot used to teach the deity of Christ that Christianity uses to try to bring down a bull moose. It won't work, it hasn't worked, and it never will work.

Another section is entitled, "Divine worship is ascribed to Jesus Christ." ²² This is not proof, not even to say that our Lord accepted worship and didn't reprimand or correct others who worshiped Him. Does not even the pope today do the same thing?

Notice other qualities and properties of deity. John. 1:1 - "In the beginning"; cf. Gen. 1:1 and John. 8:58 - "Before Abraham was, I am..." ²³ This could be said of the angels, or Lucifer, himself. (Job 28)

Another quoted is "Life-giving power" ²⁴ Will not the false prophet be able to give life unto the image of the beast and cause all to worship him? Surely he will. All these things and discussions no doubt show that Jesus Christ is a powerful individual and can even be called a god. But NONE of them state purely and simply that He is God, Jehovah God, The Almighty One. If this is all the ammunition we have, and notice this was my text book on theology, and it is a very popular one among seminaries, then we had better throw down our twelve gauge and high tail it back out of the woods to some place nice and safe. Maybe a children's Sunday

²⁰ Ibid., p.58.

²¹ Ibid., p.60.

²² Ibid., p.60.

²³ Ibid., p.61.

²⁴ Ibid., p.61.

School class would be a safe place to hide.

But unless someone thinks I am not being accurate here, let me take you down the path that I took that revealed to me that something is extremely lacking in most theology books.

As I said before, we were taught some tremendous verses on the deity of Christ, but they did not come from our theology books; they came from our manuscript evidence class. We studied how the so-called great theologian, Origen of Alexandria, Egypt, had taken liberties to make many changes in the Greek New Testament, and how a majority of the verses which give direct validity to the deity of Christ were changed by him. Therefore, by studying these verses, not in theology class, but in manuscript evidence class, I had been given some tremendous verses for the proof of our Lord's deity. These are the verses that I began watching for as I read theology book after theology book and saw how that the older theology books quoted these verses and built their cases steadfastly on the rock of "thus saith the Lord" while the newer theology books build their cases on the sand of "thus saith modern theologians."

Let me now list and quote some of these verses for you without any exposition of them. I will let the theologians who quote them give their explanations why they used them. Later I will give the manuscript evidence for them in another section. I will quote them as they appear in the Authorized Version of 1611; more commonly known as the King James Version.

1.) Matt. 20:28

"Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

2.) Mark 1:2

"As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee."

3.) Luke 24:51

"And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven."

4.) John 1:14

"And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth."

5.) John 1:18

"No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

6.) 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."

7.) Acts 20:28

"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

8.) I Cor. 16:22

“If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha.”

9.) I Cor. 16:23

“The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.”

10.) II Cor. 4:6

“For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the sight of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.”

11.) Eph. 3:9

“And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ:”

12.) Col. 1:14

“In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins:”

13.) I Tim. 1:17

“Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen.”

14.) I Tim. 3:16

“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.”

15.) II Tim. 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;”

16.) II Tim. 4:22

“The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit. Grace be with you. Amen.”

17.) Heb. 1:3

“Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;”

18.) Heb. 2:7

“Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownest him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands:”

19.) I Jn. 4:3

“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.”

20.) I Jn. 4:9

“In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him.”

21.) Jude 4

“For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.”

22.) Rev. 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.”

These are all very good verses on the deity of Jesus Christ, but I am only going to pick fourteen of these to illustrate my point. We will now take a look at the theology books to see these verses being used for the deity of Christ. The oldest theology book I could find was by Richard Watson entitled Theological Institutes or a View of the Evidences, Doctrines, Morals, and Institutions of Christianity. This volume does not give us any credentials of Mr. Watson. It was printed in 1823 in London, England and in another edition in 1850 in New York.

The next volume is entitled Lectures on Theology by Rev. John Dick. It was printed in 1837 at Philadelphia in two volumes. Dr. Dick was the minister of the United Associate Congregation, Greyfriars, Glasgow, and the professor of theology to the United Session Church.

The third volume is by Charles Hodge D.D. in the year 1871 and is entitled Systematic Theology. This is the American printing of this English publication. Dr. Hodge was the professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey.

The next has probably been the main stay in theology text books for many years. Originally published in 1886, this is the seventh edition. For sake of placement in our line up, we can use either the date of 1886 or its copyright date of 1907 because none of the other books fall within this time span. This is Augustus Hopkins Strong’s work entitled Systematic Theology. Dr. Strong was the president and professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary.

The fifth text is The Great Doctrines of the Bible by William Evans Ph. D., D.D., printed first in 1912 with its fifth printing in 1978. Dr. Evans was the director of the Department of Bible of Moody Bible Institute for fifteen years and served as dean for three years at the Bible Institute of Los Angeles. We will take it’s original date for its placement.

The sixth work is The Christian Religion in it’s Doctrinal Expression by Edgar Young Mullins, D.D., LL.D. president and professor of Theology in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. The copyright date is 1917.

The seventh and last work which I considered is Lectures in Systematic Theology by Henry C. Thiessen. Mr. Thiessen taught at Dallas Theological Seminary and served as chairman of the faculty of the graduate School at Wheaton College. The date for this work is 1949.

Another volume that is not a theology book, per se, I found to give another facet to the sources available

to preachers during this time is entitled Hitchcock's New & Complete Analysis of the Holy Bible, or the Whole of the Old & New Testaments Arranged According to Subjects in Twenty-seven Books. Just the length of the title should suggest to you the size of this volume. (It has 1159 pages.) It quotes every verse in the Bible once and classifies each in one of twenty-seven topics. It contains four indexes of these verses, a complete Cruden's Concordance, and a system of cross reference. According to the authors preface, he was the third person to put out a work attempting this exhaustive feat. The preface is dated June 5th, 1869 and the volume has a publishing date of 1874. For comparison to the theology books, I will refer to this work's section on the deity of Christ.

As you can see these seven books span the time of the last revivals in the U.S.A. until now. I was just following a hunch, if you will, to see if there has been any change in the theological training of our pastors over these years of "revival" to "no revival." The result has been astounding, and I plan to show you as well as I can without the necessity of your personal reading of each of these books. By all means, if you should choose to do so, be my guest.

To treat this as accurately as I can and as objectively as I can, I have devised a chart to show you these authors' use of the previously mentioned and listed verses. The chart shows these fourteen verses and which authors used which ones. But I had to devise some way to communicate to you not only how many times they were used but to what extent they were used. So I went through the books again and counted how many lines of a page that each verse was allotted and dealt with. Sometimes the author would simply quote the verse and more often than not would simply give the reference for the reader to look up himself (We all know how well that system works, don't we?)

In finally arriving at this method to convey the information to the reader, I have gone over each work in great detail once or twice and perused each work three or more times trying to give you the facts of the matter.

As I first worked through the chart, I watched for these 14 verses to be in each text in the sections discussing the deity of Christ. These are the numbers that are in the row named "REFERENCES CITED." As you see, they vary from 13 to 0. As I began looking in other topics and chapters, I found that these verses were used in other places to support other doctrines often with the "important" part of the verse left out. Where the verses were used directly to support the doctrine of the deity of Christ, I have indicated that by the numbers in the individual columns beside each verse. These are the number of lines on the pages that each author allotted to that particular verse. The next row is a total of all the lines dedicated to these verses used to teach the deity of Christ.

Now let us try to make sense of this chart and see how each author used or did not use these fourteen verses in their proofs of the deity of Christ.

In Mr. Watson's work of 1823, we see him make direct reference to 12 of these 14 verses. Not only does he make reference to them, but he develops them quite extensively. On Mat. 28:20, he uses thirty-four (34) lines to explain the significance of the very part of the verse that the new Bibles like to change. Let's quote it first in the A.V. 1611 and then in the New International Version.

Mat. 28:20 (A.V. 16:11) "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

Mat. 28:20 (N.I.V.) "and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age."

The N.I.V. is joined in this ending “end of the age” by the New World Translation of the Watch Tower Society, the Revised Standard Version, and the New American Standard Version. Mr. Watson does such a superb treatment of these verses that I am going to include his application of these verses to the deity of Christ for you to enjoy.

Throughout his work, Mr. Watson is defending our orthodox doctrines against a group called the Socinians. These Socinians did not believe many of our doctrines, even to the extent of writing a “New Version,” as Mr. Watson calls it, of the Bible.

Let’s watch him defend the ending of this verse “...even to the end of the world. Amen.”

“At the very moment, too, of his ascension, that is, just when, as to his bodily presence, he was leaving his disciples, he promises still to be with them, and calls their attention to this promise by an emphatic article, ‘And, LO, I AM WITH YOU ALWAYS, even unto the end of the world,’ Matt. xxviii., 20. The Socinians render ‘to the end of the age,’ that is, ‘the Jewish dispensation, till the destruction of Jerusalem.’ All that can be said in favour of this is, that the words may be so translated, if no regard is paid to their import. But it is certain, that, in several passages, ‘the end of the world,’ *a sunteleia tou aionos*, must be understood in its popular sense. That this is its sense here, appears, first, from the clause ‘Lo, I am with you ALWAYS,’ *pasas tas ameras*, ‘at all times;’ secondly, because spiritual presence stands, by an evidently implied antithesis, opposed to bodily absence; thirdly, because that presence of Christ was as necessary to his disciples after the destruction of Jerusalem as till that period. But even were the promise to be so restricted, it would still be in proof of the omnipresence of our Lord, for, if he were present with all his disciples in all places, ‘always,’ to the destruction of Jerusalem, it could only be by virtue of a property which would render him present to his disciples in all ages. The Socinian Version intimates, that the presence meant is the gift of miraculous powers. Let even that be allowed, though it is a very partial view of the promise; then, if till the destruction of Jerusalem the apostles were ‘always,’ ‘at all times,’ able to work miracles, the power to enable them to effect these wonders must ‘always’ and in all places have been present with them; and if that were not a human endowment, if a power superior to that of man were requisite for the performance of the miracles, and that power was the power of Christ, then he was really, though spiritually, present with them, unless the attribute of power can be separated from its subject, and the power of Christ be where he himself is not. This, however, is a low view of the import of the promise, ‘Lo I am with you,’ which, both in the Old and New Testament, signifies to be present with any one, to help, comfort, and succour him. *‘einai meta tinos, alicui adesse, juvare aliquem, curare res alicujus.*’ (Rosenmuller.)²⁵

It is a comfort to know that the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ is not limited to some “age” or dispensation but to the end of the world. We’ll know for sure when that happens.

I think that you will agree that Mr. Watson’s treatment of this phrase is a wonderful defense and explanation for the importance of the ending of this verse.

Let’s take Mat. 28:20 and go down the chart of authors to see how many of them used this verse to support the deity of Christ and to what extent they used it. The next author chronologically is Dr. Dick of 1837. He, too, uses this verse to support the deity argument, and he says this:

“Once more, when he gave his Apostles a commission to teach and baptize all nations, he said, ‘Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.’ *ews tas sunteleias tou aiwnos*. Some translate, to the end of the age, or the end of the Jewish dispensation. It is certain, however, that the phrase occurs where it must signify the end of the world, and I can see no good reason for giving it here a different sense. In particular, I am at a loss to conceive what Unitarians would gain by the new version, and their efforts to establish it are a waste of criticism; for if, according to their hypothesis,

²⁵ Richard Watson, Theological Institutes (New York: Philips and Hunts, 1882), p.580.

Christ could be with his disciples to the end of that age, he could as well be with them to the end of the world; and we may, with perfect safety, admit the one interpretation as well as the other. But the truth is, that if lie had been a mere man, lie could not have performed his promise even for a short period, as we have shown above; and it is a mere imagination to think that the difficulty is lessened, by abbreviating the time. How could Christ, if he was not a Divine person, be present with his followers in all places of the world, in the plain import of the promise? It would have availed them little that they had his authority and approbation, or even that lie knew what they were doing, if he had not been near to direct, assist and defend them.”²⁶

We see that Dr. Dick in 1837 uses basically the same argument that this verse should say, “...the end of the world.” So, we see two witnesses early in the 19th century who emphatically use Mat. 28:20 for their proof-texts for the deity our Lord Jesus Christ because of its ending.

The next author is Dr. Hodge of 1871. Nowhere does he refer to this verse as having merit for our Lord, but Dr. Hitchcock in his analytical Bible says in 1874 that this verse should be used to support the deity of Christ. I would like to remind you that Dr. Hitchcock placed every verse of the Bible under only one category, and he decided that the category of the deity of Christ was the best category for Mat. 28:20. I think it is very interesting to note that from our chart we can see that of the total fourteen (14) verses under our consideration, he places thirteen (13) of these fourteen (14) primarily under the heading of “deity” verses.

Notice by 1871 we have an author who doesn’t choose to use Mat. 28:20 as a “deity” verse. In 1907, Dr. Strong, our first 20th century author, completely ignores the verse also, but Dr. Evans in 1912 picks it up in a parenthesis for the student to look up. In 1917, Dr. Mullins ignores the verse, with Dr. Theissen in 1949 again choosing to ignore the verse. So we see that some draw our attention to Mat. 28:20, and some pretend it doesn’t even exist as a good solid “deity” verse.

Mark 1:2

The next verse that Mr. Watson uses in his discussions on the deity of Christ is Mark 1:2. A brief glance at the chart shows that every new English translation on our chart agrees against the reading of our A.V. 1611 on this verse. It’s a complete wash.

Evidently Mr. Watson thought this verse was quite significant, for he devoted one hundred, twenty-three (123) lines of print to this verse. So what’s the problem here? Let’s first quote this verse from the A.V. 1611, and then let’s let the New American Standard Bible represent the other eleven versions on our chart.

Mark 1:2 (A.V. 1611) “As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.”

Mark 1:2 (NASB) “As it is written in Isaiah the prophet...”

One says Isaiah the prophet wrote the next quotes, the other says that more than one prophet wrote the following quotes. They cannot both be right. Things that are different are not equal. So now let’s look at the quote and see if we can determine which rendering is accurate. The quotes are:

1. v. 2. “Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.
2. v. 3. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.”

As we find the cross references for these verses, we see that indeed, there is not one quote here, but two.

²⁶ John Dick, Lectures on Theology (Philadelphia: Edward C. Biddle, 1837), p.322.

In defense of our new versions, you could say that they were only referring to the quote immediately following their statement of “Isaiah the prophet,” but the problem is in the first quote. Even if we look in the side reference in the NASB, it says that the cross reference is Malachi 3:1. This is a textural error. We see that the Greek texts behind these English versions support the reading of “Isaiah the prophet.” In defense, again one could argue that the English versions are only preserving the accuracy of the Greek texts. Let's hold that argument for later.

I wonder why such great pains have been taken to change the wording of Mark 1:2. Maybe the answer will be found in the verse in Malachi. Let's take a look.

Malachi 3:1, “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, ...saith the LORD of hosts.”

Now let's let Mr. Watson in 1823 develop this just a bit.

“Equally striking is the celebrated prediction in Malachi, the last of the prophets. ‘Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare my way before me; and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in; behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts.’

The characters under which the person who is the subject of this prophecy is described, are, the Lord, a sovereign Ruler, (3) the owner of the temple, and therefore a Divine prince or governor, he ‘shall come to his temple.’ ‘The temple,’ says Bishop Horsley, ‘in the writings of a Jewish prophet, cannot be otherwise understood, according to the literal meaning, than of the temple at Jerusalem. Of this temple, therefore, the person to come is here expressly called the Lord. The meaning of the phrase, is the divinity to whose worship it is consecrated, To no other divinity the temple of Jerusalem was consecrated than the true and everlasting God, the Lord Jehovah, the Maker of heaven and earth. Here, then, we have the express testimony of Malachi, that the Christ, the Deliverer, whose coming he announces, was no other than the Jehovah of the Old Testament. Jehovah had delivered the Israelites from the Egyptian bondage; and the same Jehovah was to come in person to his temple, to effect the greater and more general deliverance of which the former was but an imperfect type.’

He bears also the same title, angel or messenger, as he whose appearances in the Old Testament have been enumerated.

‘The Messenger of the Covenant, therefore, is Jehovah’s messenger; -- if his messenger, his servant; for a message is a service: it implies a person sending, and a person sent. In the person who sendeth there must be authority to send, -- submission to that authority in the person sent. The Messenger, therefore, of the Covenant, is the servant of the Lord Jehovah: but the same person who is the Messenger, is the Lord Jehovah himself, not the same person with the sender, but bearing the same name; because united in that mysterious nature and undivided substance which the name imports. The same person, therefore, is servant and Lord; and, by uniting these characters in the same person, what does the prophet but describe that great mystery of the Gospel, the union of the nature which governs, and the nature which serves, --the union of the Divine and human nature in the person of the Christ?’ (Horsley’s Sermons.)

Now this prophecy is expressly applied to Christ by St. Mark. -- ‘The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.’ It follows from this, that Jesus is the Lord, the Lord of the temple, the Messenger of the Covenant mentioned in the prophecy; and bearing these exact characters of the appearing Angel Jehovah of the Old Testament, who was the King of the Jews; whose temple was HIS, because he resided in it, and so was called ‘the house of the Lord;’ and who was ‘the Messenger’ of their Covenant; the identity of the persons cannot be mistaken. One coincidence is singularly striking.

It has been proved that the Angel Jehovah had his residence in the Jewish tabernacle and temple, and that he took possession, or came suddenly to both, at their dedication, and filled them with his glory. On one occasion Jesus himself, though in his state of humiliation, comes in public procession to the temple at Jerusalem, and calls it 'his own,' thus at once declaring that he was the ancient and rightful Lord of the temple, and appropriating to himself this eminent prophecy."²⁷

When have you read ANYthing like that before in a theology book? Well, according to my chart, you probably haven't, for it hasn't been quoted or developed in ANY theology text book **since 1823!**

Do you remember in the beginning of this work, I quoted Dr. Lloyd-Jones as saying that any thing that conceals our Lord Jesus Christ in any way is a hindrance to revival? Do you think that not using Mark 1:2-3 and Mal. 3:1 could qualify as something that hides and conceals evidence that shows that Jesus Christ is indeed the Jehovah God of the Old Testament? It may be argued that this is only one thing. Okay, let's consider it "exhibit A."

By the way, Mr. Watson considers it quite a valuable piece of evidence, for he uses one hundred - twenty three (123) lines to develop it.

Luke 24:51

Our third verse to consider is Luke 24:51. A glance at the chart of Bible versions shows us that four English versions choose not to record this as scripture agreeing with Nestle's Greek New Testament, but Westcott and Hort chose to have it in their Greek New Testament!

Quoting the verse from the A.V. 1611 and the New American Standard Bible we have:

Luke 24:51 (A.V. 1611) "And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them and carried up into heaven."

Luke 24:51 (NASB) "And it came about that while he was blessing them, He parted from them."

Wonder where He went? Maybe the Mormons are right, and He did come to America!

Let's see how our authors treated this as a deity verse. Only two chose to classify this as a quality deity verse. They are Mr. Watson of 1823 and Dr. Hitchcock of 1874 who again says that "deity" is the best category for this verse. All the rest discount this verse and do not even mention it.

John 1:14

The fourth verse in our chart is John 1:14. Our new English Bibles again treat this verse with contempt, for five out of ten change it. Watch for the change. Let's let the Revised Standard Version represent "the other side" this time.

John 1:14 (A.V. 1611) "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his

²⁷ Watson, p.493.

glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.”

John 1:14 (RSV) “And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; we have beheld his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father.”

The main word in consideration here is “begotten.” Quoting from Noah Webster’s 1828 American Dictionary of the English Language;

beget - To procreate, as a father or sire; to generate; as, to beget a son.

Down the line of authors, we see, first, that not only does Mr. Watson of 1823 make two references to this verse, but he chooses to develop the importance of the word “begotten.” In fact, he dedicates three hundred, twenty-seven (327) lines to this topic. There is only one other topic or verse that he treats with greater detail than this word “begotten.”

For a real blessing, let’s read a portion of this topic:

“The epithet” ONLY BEGOTTEN,” which several times occurs in the New Testament, affords farther proof of the Sonship of Christ in his Divine nature. One of these instances only need be selected. ‘The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the ONLY BEGOTTEN of the Father, full of grace and truth.’ If the epithet only begotten referred to Christ’s miraculous conception, then the glory ‘as of the only begotten’ must be a glory of the human nature of Christ only, for that alone was capable of being thus conceived. This is, however, clearly contrary to the scope of the passage, which does not speak of the glory of the nature, ‘the flesh,’ which ‘THE WORD’ assumed, but of the glory of the Word HIMSELF, who is here said to be the only begotten of the Father. It is, therefore, the glory of his Divine nature which is here intended. Such, too, was the sense in which the primitive Church and the immediate followers of the apostles understood the title ‘monogenas’, only begotten, or only Son, as Bishop Bull has shown at length, (Judicium Eccles.) and ‘to him and others,’ says Dr. Waterland, ‘I may refer for proof that the title, Son of God, or only begotten Son in Scripture, cannot be reasonably understood either of our Lord’s miraculous conception by the Holy Ghost, or of his Messiahship, or of his being the first begotten from the dead, or of his receiving all power, and his being appointed heir of all things. None of these circumstances, singly considered, nor all together, will be sufficient to account for the title only Son, or only begotten; but it is necessary to look higher up to the pre-existent and Divine nature of the Word, who was in the beginning with God, and was himself very God, before the creation, and from all eternity. Angels and men have been called sons of God, in an improper and metaphorical sense, but they have never been styled ‘only begotten,’ nor indeed, ‘sons,’ in any such distinguishing and emphatic manner as Christ is. They are sons by adoption, or faint resemblance; he is truly, properly, and eminently, Son of God, and, therefore, God, as every son of man is, therefore, truly man.’ The note in the Socinian version tells us, ‘that this expression does not refer to any peculiar mode of derivation or existence; but is used to express merely a higher degree of affection, and is applied to Isaac, though Abraham had other sons.’ Isaac is, however, so called, because he was the only child which Abraham had by his wife Sarah, and this instance is, therefore, against them. The other passages in this Gospel and in St. John’s First Epistle, in which the term is used, give no countenance to this interpretation, and in the only other passages in the New Testament, in which it occurs, it unquestionably means an ‘only son or child.’ Luke vii, 12, ‘Behold there was a dead man carried out, the only son of his mother.’ Luke viii, 42, ‘For he had one only daughter.’ Luke ix, 38, ‘Master, look upon my son, for he is my only child.’ Here, then, on the other hand, there is no passage in which the epithet only begotten occurs, which indicates by any other phrase or circumstance, that it has the force of well beloved; while there are several, which, from the circumstances, oblige us to interpret it literally as expressive of a peculiar relationship of the child to the parent, an only, an only-begotten child. This is, then, the sense in which it is used of Christ, and it must respect either his Divine or human nature. Those who refer it to his human nature, consider it as founded upon his miraculous conception. It is, however, clear, that that could not constitute him as a

son, except as it consisted in the immediate formation of the man-hood of our Lord by the power of God; but, in this respect, he was not the 'only begotten,' not the 'only Son,' because Adam was thus also immediately produced, and for this very reason is called by St. Luke, 'the son of God.' Seeing, then, that 'monogenas', only begotten, does not any where import the affection of a parent, but the peculiar relation of an only son; and that this peculiarity does not apply to the production of the mere human nature of our Lord, the first man being in this sense, and for this very reason, 'a son of God,' thereby excluding Christ, considered as a man, from the relation of ONLY Son, the epithet can only be applied to the Divine nature of our Lord, in which alone, he is at once naturally and exclusively 'the SON OF THE LIVING GOD.'²⁸

So as he says as much as Jesus Christ was man by being the Son of man, so he was God by being the Son of God and the only begotten of the father.

As powerful as this is, Dr. Dick of 1837 chooses not even to mention it. Dr. Hodge picks it up in 1871, (this is his first of his four of the fourteen), and gives it a very sound airing indeed. He dedicates a whopping eighty-one (81) lines to this verse. He also incorporates John 1:18 into this discussion.

Dr. Hitchcock in his Analytical Bible classifies this verse as best placed under the category of deity. But Dr. Strong, by his silence on the verse, must disagree. By the way, Dr. Strong does not use any of these verses under our consideration to give credence to the deity of our Lord.

Dr. Evans of 1912 dedicates a total of 12 lines to this verse. They are scattered and do not really develop anything of significance. Dr. Mullins of 1917 gives no credence to the verse as a deity verse, and Dr. Thiessen refers to the verse four times, but nowhere does he use it in his section on the deity of Christ.

John 3:13

Our next verse to consider is John 3:13. Of our ten other English Bibles, we see from our chart that six out of the ten agree against the reading of the A.V. 1611. Let's quote it now and let the New English Bible represent the other group:

John 3:13 (A.V. 1611) "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven."

John 3:13 (N.E.B.) "No one ever went up into heaven except the one who came down from heaven, the Son of Man whose home is in heaven."

If someone were to ask me, "Where's home?" I would say South Carolina, but I have not lived there for many years. I am in southern California, but my home is in South Carolina. Just ask me and I'll tell you that those two things are definitely not the same! To say that Christ's home is in heaven lends nothing to his deity.

But let's let the New International Version speak this time.

John 3:13 (N.I.V.) "No one has ever gone into heaven except the one who came from heaven - the Son of Man."

28 Watson., p. 542-543.

Notice no reference at all as to where He is or where He came from. Let's just don't mention it. Now let's check our theological authors to see how they handled this verse.

Mr. Watson in 1823 quotes this verse including the last section under consideration, but he does not use that section to build any kind of case. He uses the first part of the verse. Dr. Dick in 1837 uses the passage in a powerful way in confirmation of our Lord's omnipresence. He says,

"In the second place, another divine perfection which is ascribed to Jesus Christ, is omnipresence. I need not say that his is a perfection peculiar to God and of which there is not even a shadow in any creature, because it implies immensity of nature. 'Am I a God at hand, saith the Lord, and not a God afar off? Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord.' We cannot remove from his presence; but whether we ascend to heaven, or descend into hell, or fly on the wings of the morning to the ends of the earth, he is there to meet us. Now, let us observe whether any thing is said in Scripture concerning our Lord, which implies the possession of this perfection; and as there can be no doubt among Christians that he knows his own nature, and is the faithful and true Witness, I shall lay before you his own words. 'No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.' The meaning of the first part of this verse has been differently explained, not being quite obvious, because it refers to an ascension to heaven as a past event. He had said to Nicodemus, who was astonished at the doctrine of the new birth, 'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness. If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?' He adds, that he only was qualified to give information concerning these things, for no man, but himself, had been in heaven to acquire the knowledge of them, by immediate intercourse with God. It is not affirmed that he had ascended to heaven, but that no other man had. Unitarians give a figurative meaning to the whole verse, and express it thus: 'No one has ever been admitted to a participation of the Divine counsels, except the Son of man, Jesus of Nazareth, who has been commissioned to reveal the will of God to man, and is perfectly instructed and qualified for this purpose.' But what strange language do they put into the mouth of our Lord; language calculated to mislead, while it would have been equally easy to express the matter plainly, and much better, as all danger of mistake would have been prevented. He who has no end to serve by perverting the words, will acknowledge that they teach a literal descent from heaven, and, what is more directly to our purpose, his presence in heaven at the time when he was addressing Nicodemus: 'The Son of Man who *is*' not who *was* 'in heaven.' He had descended from it, economically, by assuming our nature; but he had not left it in respect of his essence. He had another nature besides that which was visible, a nature which was not confined to one place. By declaring that he was on earth and in heaven at the same time, he assumed that Divine perfection which is expressed in the words formerly quoted: 'Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord?' The evidence of this passage presses hard upon the opponents of his Divinity; and Dr. Priestley was driven to his last shift, when he ventured to express a suspicion, that either John's amanuensis mistook what he dictated, or that John himself, being old when he wrote his Gospel, had forgotten what his Master said. Surely the man must have spoken against the conviction of his own mind."²⁹

Dr. Hodge in 1871, on the other hand, doesn't mention the verse in his section on deity or any other section. As a matter of fact, neither do Drs. Strong in 1907, Evans in 1912, or Mullins in 1917. All these authors chose another path, even though Dr. Hitchcock in 1874 said that this verse is best classified as a deity verse. Dr. Theissen in 1949 uses the verse as a deity verse, but cannot call attention to the last part of it because he has chosen to be "scholarly" and use as his authority the New American Bible which deletes this part of the verse.

In his "Preface to the Revised Edition," Dr. Theissen says,

"The reader will note the inclusion of many additional Scripture references. Whereas the original work employed the *American Standard Version*, this revision uses the *New American Standard*

²⁹ Dick, p. 321-322.

Bible."³⁰

Just a quick look at our chart on Biblical Affinity will show you that he's sailing a shaky ship. He had better turn around and head back to safer waters.

Acts 20:28

Our next verse to consider is Acts 20:28. Our other English versions do a little better this time with only four out of the ten abandoning the ship. We will quote it in the A.V. 1611 and let the 1901 American Standard Version represent the others.

Acts 20:28 (A.V. 1611) "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

Acts 20:28 (A.S.V.) "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood."

It's pretty easy to see the difference and the significance of retaining "God" as the reading. God's blood was shed on the cross for you; that is maybe only if you are reading the right Bible. There is something else very interesting about the reading in these four particular English Bibles. If you will notice in the chart, that the editors of these Bibles have made a deliberate choice, as they did in John 1:14, to go completely against the Greek text of Nestle and even the text of Drs. Westcott and Hort. Notice in your chart that these two Greek texts that have been followed so closely as "the authorities" have now been totally discounted as unsound in this reading. These editors have made a willful choice to take out of our hands a verse which says that God's blood was shed for us on the cross. I just wonder what kind of thought processes brought them to this conclusion? I will let you guess the motives.

Mr. Watson in 1823 and Dr. Dick in 1837 use this verse without any development and the rest of our chart is clear until Dr. Theissen in 1949 who uses it in passing without development in four places. All of this is done despite Dr. Hitchcock's classification of this verse primarily as a deity verse.

Let's consider the importance of this verse for a while. In Hebrews, the apostle Paul makes an incredible statement concerning Levi and Melchisedec. Chapter 7:9,10 says, "And as I may so say, Levi also who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him."

Levi paid tithes to Melchisedec because he was in his father's loins when Abraham met him. Abraham is the father to whom Paul the apostle is alluding. Here we see an incredible truth; that one who has not even been born yet, partakes of the fruits of the actions of the parent. So the scriptures say, "In Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Dr. Charles Solomon develops this theme quite well in his Handbook to Happiness, so does Bob George in his Classic Christianity and Growing in Grace. The book of Ephesians as in many other of the apostle Paul's epistles makes strong use of this term, "in Christ."

We inherit death from Adam because we were all "in Adam" when he sinned. Notice we were not "in Eve" but were "in Adam." The man has the seed, not the woman. The sin nature of man is passed on from

³⁰ Henry C. Thiessen, Lectures in Systematic Theology (Grand Rapid,: Erdmans, 1949), p. ix.

father to father. This is why the scriptures have to say that Jesus Christ had God's blood and that it was God's blood that was shed on the cross for our sins, not Adam's blood.

In Acts 17 when the apostle Paul was preaching to the philosophers in Athens he said,

“God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; Neither is worshiped with men's hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation;” (Acts 17:24-26)

All men have one blood. That's our common denominator. When he says one blood, what's he talking about? He's not meaning one blood type as the medical profession would refer to it because not all blood is the same type. But there is an element in my blood that is the same as in yours or the President's or Abraham Lincoln's or Gingsu Kahn's for that matter. It's an element that science hasn't discovered yet, but it's there. Surer than you and I breathe air, it's there. It is the element that links me directly with Adam and his sin in the garden of Eden. When he sinned, I sinned. Just as when Abraham paid tithes, so did Levi, his great grandson.

Genesis. 2:7 makes an incredible statement. “And the LORD God formed man man became a living soul.” Notice it did not say “the man” became a living soul: he said, “man.” We would say “mankind.” We have all been partakers of the man, Adam, EXCEPT Jesus Christ. He was of his father, Jehovah God. He got his blood from another source, so that he could be and stay “innocent blood.” Innocent blood was shed for us on the cross, as of a lamb without spot and blemish. It had to be innocent blood to receive the sins of others and therefore die in their place. Now do you see the importance of this verse Acts 20:28 as a deity verse? I hope it has become very clear.

Ephesians 3:9

We will quote the verse from our A.V. 1611 and this time from any others on the list. Just look at it; a complete wash this time. There is complete unanimity. Let's quote:

Eph. 3:9 (A.V. 1611) “And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ;”

Eph. 3:9 (New World Trans.) “and should make men see how the sacred secret is administered which has from the indefinite past been hidden in God, who created all things.”

Notice what's gone. The reference that Jesus Christ is the creator. Some may say, “Well, it says he is the creator in other places.” That's right, but it doesn't say it here. Do we have a PERFECT Bible or don't we? Remember please that Dr. Martin Lloyd-Jones said that any thing that conceals the Lord Jesus Christ in any way is a hindrance to revival. Which way did the new Bibles go on this verse? Did they reveal or conceal?

Now turning to the authors, what do we have? Three authors make reference to this verse in 1837, 1871, and in 1949. I cannot understand why Dr. Thiessen references the verse because remember his Bible of choice is the NASB which omits Jesus Christ from the text. Dr. Hitchcock says in 1874 that this verse is best classified as a deity verse. For it to be a good deity verse it must retain the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Colossians 1:14

The next verse in our study is Col. 1:14. A glance at the Bible chart will show you that eight out of ten Bibles agree that a part should be left out. Let's see what that part is. This time let's pick the first revision of our old Bible from 1881, the Revised Version, for our comparison.

Col. 1:14 (A.V. 1611) "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins:"

Col. 1:14 (Revised Version) "in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins:"

No blood! Surely, I do not have to do a study here on the atonement through the blood of our Lord!!

Our list of authors shows that Mr. Watson in 1823 uses this verse in his conformation of the deity of Christ. He requires thirteen lines of print to this verse. No one else picks it up again until Dr. Thiessen in 1949 just gives it lip service using his NASB which leaves the blood out. Still Mr. Hitchcock in 1874 classifies this verse as a deity verse.

I Tim. 3:16

Our next verse is a classic. Following the previous format, we will first quote the verse in the A.V. 1611, and then in one of the other versions. A quick glance at the chart of versions, shows us that there is a complete unanimity among the new English Bibles. Let's go with the N.I.V.

I Tim. 3:16 (A.V. 1611) "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."

I Tim. 3:16 (N.I.V.) "Beyond all question, the mystery of godliness is great: He appeared in a body, was vindicated by the Spirit, was seen by angels, was preached among the nations, was believed on in the world, was taken up in glory."

Who did? Did God appear in a body; was he manifested in the flesh? Who was the one who appeared or was manifested? I think it makes a difference.

Let's see what our authors say. Dr. Hodge in 1871 is the first to pick up the verse, and does he pick it up. I am going to quote Dr. Hodge in his entirety on this verse.

"The most important passage, however, in these pastoral epistles, is I Tim. 3:16. With regards to that passage it may be remarked, (1.) That it admits of two interpretations. According to the one the Church is declared to be the pillar and ground of truth; according to the other, the pillar and ground of truth is the great mystery of godliness. The latter is greatly to be preferred as equally consistent with ~ the grammatical structure of the passage, and as far more in harmony with the analogy of Scripture. The pillar and ground of truth, the great fundamental doctrine of the manifestation of God in the flesh.

On this doctrine all our hopes of salvation rest. (2.) Whatever reading be adopted, whether “theos”, “os”, or “o”, all of which appear in different manuscripts, the passage must refer to Christ. He it was who was manifest in the flesh, justified by the Spirit, and received up into glory. (3.) Whatever reading be adopted, the passage assumes or asserts the divinity of our Lord. With the apostolic writers, the doctrine of the incarnation is expressed by saying, that the “logos” “became flesh” (John 1:14); or, “Christ is come in the flesh” (1 John 4:2); or, “He who is the brightness of God’s glory “took part of flesh and blood” (Heb. 2:14); or, He that was “equal with God” was “found in fashion as a man.” (Phil. 2:8) The same truth, therefore, is expressed, whether we say, “God was manifest in the flesh;” or, “He who was manifest in the flesh;” or, that “the mystery of godliness was manifest in the flesh.” (4.) The external authorities are so divided that the most competent editors and critics differ as to what is the original text. For “theos” we find the great body of the cursive Greek manuscripts and almost all the Greek Fathers. The authority of the Codex Alexandrinus is claimed on both sides. The question there is, whether the letter is “O” or “Θ”; some say they see distinct traces of the line in the Theta, others say they do not. For “os” C, F, G, of the uncial manuscripts, only two of the cursive manuscripts, and the Coptic and Sahidic versions, are quoted. To this must be added the testimony of the very ancient manuscript recently discovered by Tischendorf, the text of which has been published under his auspices at St. Petersburg. For “o” the uncial manuscript D, the Latin Vulgate and the Latin Fathers are the witnesses. In view of this state of the question, Wetstein, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, among the editors, decide for “Os”. Mill, Matthies, as well as the older editors Erasmus, Beza, the Complutensian, and the later ones, as Knapp and Hahn, retain “Theos”. (5.) The internal evidence, so far as the perspicuity of the passage and the analogy of Scripture are concerned, are decidedly in favor of the common text. There is something remarkable in the passage; it is brought in apparently as a quotation from a hymn, as some think, or from a confession of faith, as others suppose, at least, as a familiar formula in which the leading truths concerning the manifestation of Christ are concisely stated. (1.) He is God. (2.) He was manifest in the flesh, or became man. (3.) He was justified, i.e., his claims to be regarded as God manifest in the flesh were proved to be just, by the Spirit (i.e., either by the Holy Ghost, or by the “pneuma” or divine nature revealing itself in Him. Comp. John 1:14). (4.) He was seen of angels. They recognized and served Him. (5.) He was preached unto the Gentiles, as He came to be the Savior of all men, and not of the Jews only. (6.) He was believed upon as God and Savior; and (7.) He was received up into glory, where He now lives, reigns, and intercedes.³¹

In Dr. Hodges footnote on page 518 he says, “Dr. Henderson has ably vindicated the reading Theos in his *Critical Examination of the Various Readings in 1 Tim. 3:16.*”

Notice the favorable evidence for “God was manifested in the flesh.” Theissen in 1949 quotes this verse in passing, but using the NASV which says “He who.” Dr. Hitchcock in 1874 says that this verse should best be classified as a deity verse.

But let’s take a look at our author of 1907, Dr. Strong. He makes this statement concerning one verse which we have already considered and now this verse:

“Other passages might be here adduced, as Col 2:9- “in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily”; Phil. 2:6- “existing in the form of God”; but we prefer to consider these under other heads as indirectly proving Christ’s divinity. Still other passages once relied upon as direct statements of the doctrine must be given up for textual reasons. Such are Acts 20:28, where the correct reading is in all probability not “ekklasian tou theou”, but “ekklasian tou Kurion” (so ACDE Tregelles and Tischendorf; B and-, however, have “tou Theon.” The Rev. Vers. continues to read “church of God”; Amer. Revisers, however, read “church of the Lord-see Ezra Abbot’s investigation in Bib. Sac., 1876:313-352); and 1 Tim. 3:16, where “os’ is unquestionably to be substituted for “theos”, though even here ‘ephanerotha’ intimates preexistence.”³²

31 Hodge, p. 517-519.

32 Strong, p. 308.

Notice with one fell sweep, he has declared two bastions of the deity of Christ null and void. He has wrenched these verses right out of our hands. He says they "...must be given up for textual reasons..."

I hope something is becoming very clear by now. I have so far been objective in analyzing these two charts, but right before our eyes here, we see the problem. All the new English Bibles have agreed to delete or change in some fashion many of these verses that we have cited strong verses for the deity of our Lord. Dr. Hitchcock in 1874 says that of all categories available that twelve of these fourteen verses are BEST categorized as deity verses.

We are seeing exactly what I suspected, (and we aren't finished, yet) that Christology and the teaching of it has changed. And the time of the change comes between the late 1870's and the turn of the 20th century. What happened that was such a curse to Christianity from which we still have not recovered? To what hideous ploy of Satan have we succumbed? The only thing that church history reveals to us in this area is the emergence of basically four Greek uncial (capital letters) manuscripts, and their use by Drs. Westcott and Hort. The revision committee of 1880 did not use as their authority the Greek texts that had given us our A.V. 1611 as they were instructed to do but were sworn to secrecy to use the "new" Greek text which was derived from the four recently discovered texts.

Concerning I Tim. 3:16, the material to substantiate the validity of this verse is given to us by an author of whom we are all very familiar and have been required to read his works in every seminary in America. This is Dr. John "Dean" Burgon, Dean of Chichester. I say this "tongue in cheek" for I know that if you have only read "main line" theologians that you have probably never heard of Dr. Burgon. He was a contemporary of Drs. Westcott and Hort and wrote concerning their heretical teachings.

In his work, The Revision Revised, he deals in one section on I Tim. 3:16. This topic is covered from page 424 to 528. He takes up the challenge of Bishop Ellicott to defend this verse and does so masterfully. See this discussion in the defense of I Tim. 3:16 in our chapter 5.

How can we expect revival to come among us when our theologians in the seminaries are using Jehudi's pen knife to remove the verses in our sacred text that point to and indeed emphatically teach us that God was manifested in the flesh. Because these verses are not used today, we have been reduced to argue and debate over religious philosophies, and not "thus saith the Lord." Joseph Smith's philosophy and opinions are just as valid as my or your philosophies and opinions if ours are not seated firmly upon the bedrock of the scriptures.

II Tim. 4:22

Let us quote this verse and then compare it to the "grand daddy" of 1881, the Revised Version.

II Tim. 4:22 (A.V. 1611) "The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit. Grace be with you. Amen."

II Tim. 4:22 (R.V.) "The Lord be with thy spirit. Grace be with you."

That's how easy it's done; and seven of the ten versions in our chart do it; just sweep the name of our Lord Jesus Christ right under the rug.

Dr. Watson uses it in 1823 for deity, but it drops completely out of the picture after that. Dr. Hitchcock, in his Analysis says it best categories under God's attributes.

Heb. 1:3

Against the A.V. 1611, we can pick any of the ten on the list this time. This time we will check the reading of the New American Standard Bible.

Heb. 1:3 (A.V. 1611) "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;"

Heb. 1:3 (NASB) "And He is the radiance of His glory and the exact representation of His nature, and upholds all things by the word of his power. When He had made purification of sins, He sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high;"

The words "by himself" were left out. Was our Lord assisted in the purging of our sins? How shall you answer? Without verses like this you wouldn't know, and more importantly, you cannot state it as fact. You have no authority to do so.

This time we get a good showing from our authors in spite of the fact that the new Bibles cannot leave it alone.

Dr. Watson in 1823 says this:

"Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had BY HIMSELF purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high,' Heb. 1:3. To this passage, also, the hypostatical union is the only key. Of whom does the apostle speak, when he says, when he says, 'when he had BY HIMSELF purged our sins,' but of Him who is 'the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person?' HE, by HIMSELF, 'purged our sins;' yet this was done by the shedding of his blood. In that higher nature, however, he could not suffer death; and nothing could make the sufferings of his humanity a purification of sins BY HIMSELF, but such a union as should constitute one person:- for, unless this be allowed, either the characters of Divinity in the preceding verses are characters of a merely human being; or else that higher nature was capable of suffering death; or, if not, the purification was not made by HIMSELF, which yet the text affirms."³³

The capitol emphasis is Dr. Watson's.

Dr. Dick in 1837 quotes the verse two times in passing. Dr. Hodge in 1871 makes one direct reference to the verse. Dr. Evans in 1907 makes two passing remarks with Dr. Theissen referring us to the verse six times. But don't forget Dr. Theissen is using the NASB, so "by himself" doesn't even show up in this Bible, which is his spiritual authority. Dr. Hitchcock in 1874 gives the classification of deity to Heb.1:3.

I John. 4:9

For this verse let's take the A.V. 1611 and the R.S.V.

I John. 4:9 (A.V. 1611) "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten son into the world, that we might live through him."

I John. 4:9 (R.S.V.) In this the love of God was made manifest among us, that God sent his only Son into the world, so that we might live through him."

Here goes that word "begotten" from the text again. Let's quote Dr. Watson of 1823.

"The second reason is, it is certain the charity and love of God is amazingly elevated and extolled, by which he sent his own and only begotten Son into the world, and thus gave him up, even to the death of the cross, to save sinners, who are the sons of God's wrath. - (John iii, 16; Rom. v, 10, and viii, 32; I John iv, 9, 10.) But if *the only begotten Son of God* has no signification *except Jesus with regard to his humanity and his being born of a virgin*, the reason is not so apparent why this love should be so amazingly enhanced, as it is when God's *only begotten Son* signifies *the Son who was begotten of the Father before all ages*. For that Son, who was born of the Virgin Mary, was born of her for this very purpose-that he might be delivered to death for sinners. But what preeminence of love is there in the fact of God delivering this, his Son, to death, whom it was his will to be born of God, who was begotten of his Father before (ante secula) all worlds; whom it was not compulsory to send into the world, and who was under no obligation to become man; whose dignity was greater than allowed him to be involuntarily sent or to come into flesh, much less that he should be delivered to death; nay, who, as the only begotten and sole Son, appeared dearer to the Father than to be thrust out from him into this misery. When you have formed this conception in your mind, then will the splendor and glory of the Divine charity and love toward the human race shine forth with the greater intensity."³⁴

His discussion on the word "begotten" continues for four pages. I would call this significant.

Dr. Evans mentions the verse again in 1912, but then it's gone from the theology books forever.

Dr. Hitchcock again says the best category for this verse is deity.

Notice the chart shows that there are six new English Bibles which chose to leave out the word "begotten." This is very interesting because the very Greek texts that they profess to follow so closely have the word in their texts. I wonder why the word was not translated? What was the motive? You decide!

Rev. 1:8

This verse will conclude our discussion on this topic. We will let the 1901 A.S.V. represent the "other" side.

Rev. 1:8 (A.V. 1611) "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."

³⁴ Watson., p. 557-558.

Rev. 1:8 (1901 A.S.V.) “I am Alpha and Omega, saith the Lord God, who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty.”

Did you see what is changed? “the beginning and the ending” is gone. Notice also how the word “Lord” is changed to “Lord God”. This draws our attention completely away from this verse being a reference to Jesus Christ and makes it a reference to the Father.

Let’s let our authors deal with this verse. Dr. Watson of 1823 says:

“Rev. 1:17,18, ‘I am THE FIRST and THE LAST, I am he that liveth and was dead;’ so also ch. 2, 8; and in both passages the context shows, indisputably, that it is our Lord himself who speaks, and applies these titles to himself. In chap. xxii, 13, also Christ is the speaker, and declares himself to be ‘ALPHA and OMEGA, the BEGINNING and the END, the FIRST and the LAST.’ Now, by these very titles is the eternity of God declared, Isaiah xlv, 6, and xliii, 10 ‘I am the first, and I am the last: and beside me there is no God.’ ‘Before me was there no God formed, neither shall there be after me.’ But they are, in the book of Revelation, assumed by Christ as explicitly and absolutely; and they clearly affirm, that the Being to whom they are applied had no beginning, and will have no end. In Rev. I, 8, after the declaration, ‘I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord,’ it is added, ‘which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.’ Some have referred these words to the Father; but certainly without reason, as the very scope of the passage shows. It is Christ who speaks in the first person, throughout the chapter, when the sublime titles of the former part of the verse are used of the Father would introduce a most abrupt change of persons, which, but for a false theory, would never have been imagined. The words, indeed, do but express the import of the name Jehovah, so often given to Christ; and as, when the Father is spoken of, in verse 4, the same declaration is made concerning his which, in verse 8, our Lord makes of himself, it follows, that if the terms ‘which was, and is, and is to come,’ are descriptive of the eternity of the Father, they are also descriptive of eternity as an attribute also of the Son.”³⁵

“Dr. Dick in 1837 also refers to this verse. He says:

“In the Book of Revelation, he says of himself, ‘I am the First, and the Last, and the Living One.’ ‘I am the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last.’ The same idea is~ here thrice repeated in different terms, and this, added to the solemnity of the language, unavoidably leads us to regard it as an important one. I cannot conceive how any man could persuade himself, that such language might be used of a creature. It does not admit of being explained as signifying any thing less than an eternal duration; and God applies it to himself in the Old Testament: ‘Who hath wrought and done it, calling the generations from the beginning? I JEHOVAH, the First, and with the Last; I am he.’ ‘I am the First, and I am the Last, and besides me there is no God.’ ‘I am he; I am the First, I also am the Last.’ There is another passage in the Revelation, the application of which has been disputed, but in which there is reason to think that Christ is the speaker. ‘I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord,’ or, according to Griesbach’s corrected text, *‘the Lord God, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.’* In the preceding verse, Christ is expressly mentioned; and / after the two next verses, he announces himself in the same words: ‘I am Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last.’ If he is a different being from the Lord God, why does he immediately assume his style? Would it have been dutiful and reverent to proclaim himself by the titles under which the Creator had revealed himself a moment before? At any rate, if the speakers are different, they are both possessed of the absolute eternity which the titles denote.”³⁶

Our third author, Dr. Hodge, in 1871 says this:

³⁵ Ibid., p. 578-579.

³⁶ Dick., p. 320-321.

“The Book of Revelation is one continued hymn of praise to Christ, setting forth the glory of his person and the triumph of his kingdom; representing Him as the ground of confidence to his people, and the object of worship to all the inhabitants of heaven. He is declared to be the ruler of the kings of the earth. He has made us kings and priests unto God. He is the First and the Last, language never used but of God, and true of Him alone. Compare Is. xlv. 6. In the epistles to the seven churches, Christ assumes the titles and prerogatives of God. He calls Himself, He who holds the seven stars in his right hand; the First and the Last; He who has the sharp sword and eyes of fire, from which nothing can be hid. He has the seven spirits. He is the Holy and the True. He has the keys of David; He opens and no man shuts, and shuts and no man opens; his decision on the destiny of men admits of no appeal. He is the supreme arbiter; the faithful and true witness; the *arka tas ktiseos tou theou*, the principle, i. e., both the head and source, of the whole creation He reproves the churches for their sins, or praises them for their fidelity, as their moral ruler against whom sin is committed and to whom obedience is rendered. He threatens punishments and promises blessings which God alone can inflict or bestow. In chapter v. the Apostle represents all the inhabitants of heaven as prostrate at the feet of Christ, ascribing blessings and honor and glory and power to Him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb forever and ever. The New Jerusalem is the seat of his kingdom. He is its light, glory, and blessedness. He again and again declares himself to be the Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last (i.e., the immutable and eternal), the Beginning and the End, for whose second coming the whole Church is in earnest expectation.”³⁷

Notice that these authors make specific reference to “first and last.” That is the link with the Old Testament Jehovah, making it a verse in support of the deity of Christ.

Dr. Evans in 1912 refers once directly and once indirectly to Rev. 1:8. Dr. Theissen in 1949 refers to it three times, but once again he is using the N.A.S.B. which leaves that important phrase out.

Isn't it something for men to sit in judgment on God's Word. I thought it was supposed to be God's Word that sits in judgment on us.

John 1:18

The next verse under consideration is John 1:18. This time we will quote three witnesses for this verse to show you the two different ways that this verse is changed. We will use the A.V. 1611, the Revised Standard Version, and the New American Standard Bible. Would you please take a look at the chart and see how that I could just as well have chosen the Watch Tower version of the Jehovah's Witnesses, The New World Translation. Do you see how this Bible agrees so much with the N.I.V., the R.S.V., the N.A.S.B., the New English Bible, and so many others on so many verses.

This chart shows us that a Jehovah's Witness would much prefer a modern translation to the old A.V. 1611. Does that tell you anything? Have you ever studied the Jehovah's Witnesses' doctrines? They vehemently stand against the deity of Christ. Why they will not even pray with you! Have you ever had problems getting rid of a Jehovah's Witness at your door step? Let me give you a hint. Just tell them that you have given your life to the Lord Jesus Christ, and you don't do anything without praying to Him and asking His grace and guidance. So before we proceed, let's bow our heads and have a word of prayer. Did you know that they will leave before they pray with you?! What's the problem? I'll tell you the PROBLEM. You will end your prayer with, “in Jesus' name, amen.” They don't pray like that because they are taught that Jesus Christ is a lesser god, and He created this world after he was created by the Father. The reason for that is that the Father cannot create evil, so

³⁷ Hodge., p.510-511.

he created a lesser god who could create this world with evil in it. So, therefore, they don't pray like we do through our Lord Jesus Christ!

Now let's quote the verses and see where they get that notion:

John 1:18 (A.V. 1611) "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

John 1:18 (R.S.V.) "No one has seen God; the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known."

John 1:18 (N.A.S.B.) "No man has seen God at any time; the only begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father, He has explained Him."

Now just for fun, in case you don't have a New World Translation handy, let's quote what it says.

John 1:18 (N.W.T.) "No man has seen God at any time; the only-begotten god who is in the bosom position with the Father is the one that has explained him."

Mighty strange bed fellows, wouldn't you say? So the next time there's a knock at your door and two of the Watch Tower representatives are there, ask them to wait just a minute until you get your N.A.S.B., so you can read along with them (almost).

Now let's turn to our authors to see their treatment of this verse. Evidently they saw the sufficiency of John 1:14 and used it predominantly for their deity verse, for only three of them use it to the positive in their deity sections and Dr. Hitchcock says it's primary category is not deity.

But something interesting surfaces here. Three of our authors are agreeing with "only begotten God." All three of these authors are 20th century authors. Drs. Evans, 1912, and Thiessen, 1949, "correct" the verse to "the only begotten God," but Dr. Strong gives a stronger treatment of this rendering. He says:

"In John 1:18, monogenas theos 'the only begotten God' -must be regarded as the correct reading, and as a plain ascription of absolute Deity to Christ. He is not simply the only revealer of God, but he is himself God revealed. John 1:18 - "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." In this passage, although Tischendorf (8th ed.) has 'monogenas ouios', Westcott and Hort (with ALEPH,B,C,L,Pesh. Syr.,) read 'monogenas theos' and the Rev. Vers. puts 'the only begotten God' in the margin, though it retains 'the only begotten Son' in the text. Westcott, Bib. Corn, on John, pages 32,33. Here then we have a new and unmistakable assertion of the deity of Christ."³⁸

Do we really have a new and unmistakable assertion of the deity of Christ? Do you know that this is one of the "proof-texts" against the deity of Christ used by the Jehovah's Witnesses?

They put this with Col. 1:15 and Rev. 3:14. Let's quote them.

Col. 1:15 (A.V. 1611) "who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature:"

38 Augustus Hopkin Strong, Systematic Theology (Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1907), p. 306.

Rev. 3:14 (A.V. 1611) “And unto the angel of the church of the Laodiceans write; These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God;”

Coupled with John 1:18 “the only begotten God,” they have a very interesting case.

I have dealt with this in the section on “Manuscript Evidence” as to why this verse should read “only begotten Son.”

But let’s deal with the English and this verse for a moment. None of these 20th century authors do that. They simply state it “as fact,” and say, “Boy, that sure is good proof for the deity of Christ,” and move along. It’s not good proof of the deity of Christ. It’s against the deity of Christ.

Our Lord was not begotten as a god. He was God already when He was begotten. He had been God before the beginning of time. He was even “as a Lamb, slain from the foundation of the world.” (Rev. 13:8)

Isa. 9:6 says, “For unto us a CHILD is born, unto us a SON is given....” A child was born, but a Son was given! He was not a begotten God.

So now we don’t just see a neutral approach to a verse on deity, but we see changed and picked up by cults to teach otherwise. Do you think this could be a hindrance to revival? I think so. With your permission, I will submit this as “exhibit ‘B’.”

This has been quite a laborious subject, but I hope this written explanation of the “authors” chart has shown the reader that christology in the early 1800’s is not the same christology in the 1900’s. Verses which were deemed absolutely imperative to the doctrine of the deity of Our Lord Jesus Christ have virtually disappeared leaving no trace what so ever. In fact, some of the verses are not just ignored but dealt with very harshly. Is there any wonder why the Lord is not pleased with our actions? Is there any wonder why the cults, who challenge the deity of Christ, are growing and indeed mushrooming before our very eyes? No wonder that cult pastor likes to debate main-line Christian pastors! They have lost their ammunition with which to fight. Someone has switched their sword for a butterknife. Theologians, give the young men in seminaries back their swords. Equip them with the best available, a sharp two edged sword - one that has all it’s metal.

Chart of Biblical Affinity

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
Mathew 28:20	X	X	X			X		X	X	X	
Mark 1:2	X					X					
Luke 24:51	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	
John 1:14	X	X	X				X		X		
John 1:18	X	X	X						X		
John 3:13	X	X	X							X	
Acts 20:28	X	X		X		X	X		X	X	
Ephesians 3:9	X										
Colossians 1:14	X								X		
I Timothy 3:16	X										
II Timothy 4:22	X								X		
Hebrews 1:3	X					X					
I John 4:9	X	X	X				X		X		X
Revelation 1:8	X										
TOTALS	14	7	6	2	1	4	3	1	5	4	1

(X - indicates that the verse is there)

- A.) A.V. 1611 King James Bible
- B.) Revised Version (1881)
- C.) American Standard Version (1901)
- D.) New Testament in Modern English, Weymouth (1924)
- E.) Revised Standard Version (1946)
- F.) New Testament in Modern English, Phillips (1958)
- G.) New American Standard Bible (1960)
- H.) New English Bible (1961)
- I.) New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ (1946)
- J.) New American Bible (1970)
- K.) New World Translation (1971)
- L.) Novuni Testamentum Graece, Nestle-Aland (1898)

Chart of Authors Use of Verses

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Mathew 28:20	34	18					1	Yes
Mark 1:2	134							Yes
Luke 24:51								Yes
John 1:14	327		81		12			Yes
John 3:13	2	44						Yes
Acts 20:28	2	2					4	Yes
Ephesians 3:9		2	2				2	Yes
Colossians 1:14	13						2	Yes
I Timothy 3:16	58						3	Yes
II Timothy 4:22	4							Yes
Hebrews 1:3	15	4	2		3			Yes
I John 4:9	25				2		6	Yes
Revelation 1:8	27	23	28		1		6	Yes
References Cited	12	6	4		4		176	13
Number of Lines	644	93	85	0	18	0	17	

- A.) Richard Watson (1823)
- B.) John Dick (1837)
- C.) Charles Hodge (1871)
- D.) Augustus Strong (1886)
- E.) William Evans (1912)
- F.) Edgar Mullins (1917)
- G.) Henry Thiessen (1949)
- H.) Roswell Hitchcock (1874)

CHAPTER FIVE

CHECKING THE GREEK MANUSCRIPTS

This should be considered as an introduction and not even an overview to the subject of Bible revisions. The subject is voluminous, but I believe that it is very important to the proper and fruitful application of God's word in our lives and in the lives of those to whom we minister. If God has promised to preserve His word for us, then why not believe the promises? And if He has kept His promise, then where is His word, and what is it? If God has given me a sword with which to fight Satan, I certainly don't want to find myself in the midst of the battle with a butter knife!

I will show a few of the verses changed in the revisions, and how necessary the verses are to a complete understanding of who Jesus Christ is, and what He had done for us.

We are all praying for revival in our hearts, our churches, our nation, and our world. In his book, Revival, Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones gives us two prerequisites for God's people before revival can take place. He cites for his analogy, Gen. 24:17-18 where Isaac returns to Gerar where Abraham had previously lived there and enjoyed the blessings of God. He had dug wells to supply his family and his flocks with precious life-giving water. Isaac finds, upon his return, that the Philistines have cast dirt and rubbish into the wells stopping them up. Isaac has to remove these obstacles before the sweet water that his father had enjoyed can be reached again. Dr. Lloyd-Jones likens the rubbish of the Philistines to many things that stand between us and the blessings with which God wants to abundantly bless us.

One of the categories of "rubbish" on page 39 is the authority of the Bible. He says:

"If you read the history of all the revivals of the past, you will find that there have been periods when men and women have believed this book to be the word of God. They have believed it literally, they have regarded it as the revelation of God, and the truth concerning him, and man's relationship to him, and all that is involved. And they have believed that this book has been written by men who have been divinely inspired. They have submitted themselves to it, they have not stood above it as judges, and as those who can decide what is right and what is wrong. But the Philistines have been terribly active during the last hundred and fifty years. And conditions are as they are today because people have no authority at all. They have denied the authority of the Scripture, they have set up their own opinions, philosophy, science, learning - all these things. The supernatural element is discounted, miracles are disbelieved, science is supposed to be incompatible with them. All these things have been covered over. Any direct activity on the part of God is suspect because it does not fit into the systems of the philosophers. These are urgent matters, I plead with you, read the history of the past, and I think you will discover that there has never been a revival when men have put their ideas and opinions before the authority of the word of God."³⁹

He mentions "science." How about the category of the science of textual criticism? What does this science do to a person's view of the purity and authority of scripture, and, therefore, his faith in it? What has the multiplicity of modern English versions done to the faith of Christians? Has it lent credibility to the lost world about us? Or is this just another one of those things on which we Christians cannot agree? How many times in your witnessing to a lost person has the question of "so many Bibles" been thrown in your face? Even lost people realize that if God is who he says he is, that surely he should be able to keep his word in one book. When we compare the four Greek manuscripts that are used to change our old English version, we find they disagree

³⁹ Martyn Lloyd-Jones, Revival (Westchester, Ill., Crossway Books, 1987), p. 40.

among themselves over 3,000 places in the gospels alone.

Dr. Lloyd-Jones identifies another type of rubbish of the Philistines. He says:

Clearly, then, this is the work of the Philistines. Anything that in any way conceals the Lord Jesus Christ, anything that in any way takes him out of the center and puts him anywhere else, is the work of the Philistines.⁴⁰

Notice he says anything that “conceals” the Lord Jesus Christ. So anything that would remove from our view or conceal anything of the person, deity, work, atonement, etc., of our Lord Jesus Christ is a hindrance to revival - the rekindling work of the Holy Spirit within our hearts.

My task at hand now is to show just a few of the verses that do conceal qualities of our Lord. Before we look at these verses, let’s be reminded of a few other absolutes of scripture. God’s infallible word says:

In Psalm 12:6,7

“The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.”

In Matt. 24:35,

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

In Matt. 5:18, we see,

“For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.”

No doubt about it, these verses, among others, show us that God not only inspired His word when it was originally written, but He fully intends to keep it pure with or without our help, from this generation forever! So it’s here! So what is it? Does anybody know? Are we depending on some scholar or scholars to continue in the “science” of textural study to recreate it, or get as close as possible to the originals? Do we believe in reliability or infallibility?

Now let’s look at some verses that conceal our Lord Jesus Christ. Let’s look at Mark 1:2 and 3 for a moment. In all of the new versions, in verse two, it says that the quote of verse two and verse three is from Isaiah the prophet. But if you are a serious Bible student and check this quote, you will find it not to be one quote, but two. And in your checking, you will see that the quote from verse two isn’t even from Isaiah but from Malachi. What an error. The IRS wouldn’t let you get by with that kind of mistake on your income tax form. Neither would your freshman English teacher let you get by with an error in a research paper. You see your King James Bible says, “As it is written in the prophets...” Much more accurate. I mean two isn’t one, and one isn’t two. But I thought we were looking for something that is really of importance. This seems so insignificant. Well, let’s explore this passage some more to see if there may be a reason that our attention has been kept away from the reference in Malachi. As we see, Mark is saying under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, that the prophecy of Malachi 3:1 was fulfilled by John introducing the ministry of Jesus Christ. So, let’s turn to Malachi 3:1 and see what it says. “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the LORD of hosts.” Here the Father says that he will send His messenger, and this messenger shall prepare the way before His (The Father’s) face. Well, how was the Father’s way prepared before Him? Mark says John prepared the way before Jesus Christ. A little algebra substitution here, and we

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 46.

have John the Baptist preparing the way before Jehovah God. You may have noticed the two different ways that our old Bible prints the word "Lord." When the translator's wanted to have the word "Lord" denote Jehovah God, they would use "LORD." When they wanted to denote Jesus Christ, they would use "Lord." Understanding this difference can add greatly to your study of scripture.

If you quickly scan through Malachi, you'll notice that the LORD is speaking to Malachi. In fact, at the end of our verse 3:1, it ends with "... saith the LORD of hosts." That's Jehovah God speaking, and He says, "... the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple..." So we see that Jehovah God, the Almighty, is saying that the Lord whom the people of Israel were seeking shall suddenly come to **His** temple. That says that the Lord Jesus Christ shall suddenly come to **His** temple. But whose temple was it, really. Solomon built the temple for Jehovah God in I Kings 6:1 and 2. Please notice the capital letters in that name in these verses! Solomon dedicated the temple to Jehovah God in I Kings 8. In I Kings 9, God the Father said He would put His name there, forever.

Let's put this altogether, now. Jesus Christ came into the temple on Palm Sunday. Malachi 3:1 says it was **His** temple. Again with algebraic substitution, we see that Jesus Christ is being equated with the Jehovah God of the Old Testament, just as He proclaimed to the Pharisees, "Before Abraham was, I am." He was God in the flesh, and Malachi 3:1 is a powerful testimony to that fact. But if our verse in question, Mark 1:2 steers us only to "Isaiah, the prophet" for our cross reference, then we will miss this vital illustration of Christ's deity. This change of words does a very big job of concealing the deity of Christ, and therefore, hinders revival. Can we really expect God to send a refreshing when the Bibles used by most Christians do not give honor to his Son, as they should?

I would say that some one has concealed the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ in this verse. But what about the Greek. Let's look at it. By reading the critical apparatus, we see the overwhelming volume of manuscripts agree with the reading of the King James. Why, even Vaticanus "B" agrees. Look at it. It's on page 84 of Nestle-Aland's Novum Testamentum Graece. Don't just take my word for it.

Let's check another verse concerning the deity of Christ: I Tim. 3:16. It says, "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the flesh..." God was manifest in the flesh! Where can you find a stronger verse on the deity of Christ?

In checking eleven new versions on this verse they all concur against this reading. We see various renditions such as "he who" or "the one who," but none say "God was." I must say as I read the exhaustive material set forth by John Dean Burgon on this verse in The Revision Revised, I am overwhelmed as to what to put forth in a short paper as this. He treats this in great detail from pages 424 to 501. Burgon was a contemporary of Drs. Westcott and Hort and had access to the actual manuscripts they used. He had friends literally all over the world who made available to him virtually every known Greek manuscript. He also checked the old versions of other languages, lectionaries, cursives and uncials.

Beginning his summary, he says:

Behold then the provision which THE AUTHOR of Scripture has made for the effectual conservation in its integrity of the portion of His written Word! Upwards of eighteen hundred years have run their course since the HOLY GHOST by His servant, Paul, rehearsed the 'mystery of Godliness;' declaring this to be the great foundation-fact-namely, that "GOD WAS MANIFEST IN THE FLESH." And lo, out of two hundred and fifty-four copies of S. Paul's Epistles no less than two hundred and fifty-

two are discovered to have preserved that expression. Such 'Consent' amounts to Unanimity; and, (as I explained at pp. 454-5,) unanimity in this subject-matter, is conclusive.

The copies of which we speak, (you are requested to observe,) were produced in every part of ancient Christendom, -being derived in every instance from copies older than themselves; which again were transcripts of copies older still. They have since found their way, without design or contrivance, into the libraries of every country of Europe, -where, for hundreds of years they have been jealously guarded. And, -(I repeat the question already hazarded at pp. 445-6, and now respectfully propose it to you, my lord Bishop; requesting you at your convenience to favour me publicly with an answer;)-For what conceivable reason can this multitude of witnesses be supposed to have entered into a wicked conspiracy to deceive mankind?

"True, that no miracle has guarded the sacred Text in this, or in any other place. On the other hand, for the last 150 years, Unbelief has been carping resolutely at this grand proclamation of the Divinity of CHRIST, -in order to prove that not his but some other thing, it must have been, which the Apostle wrote. And yet (as I have fully shown) the result of all the evidence procurable is to establish that that Apostle must be held to have written no other thing but this."

"To the overwhelming evidence thus furnished by 252 out of 254 cursive Copies of S. Paul's Epistles-is to be added the evidence supplied by the Lectionaries. It has been already explained (viz, at pp. 477-8) that out of 32 copies of the 'Apostolus,' 29 concur in witnessing to "Theos". I have just (May 7th) heard on another in the Vatican. To these 30, should be added the 3 Liturgical codices referred to at pp. 448 and 474, note (1). Now this is emphatically the voice of ancient Ecclesiastical Tradition. The numerical result of our entire enquiry, proves therefore to be briefly this:

(I.) In I Tim. 3:16, the reading "Theos ephanerota en sarki:", is witnessed to by 289 MANUSCRIPTS:-BY 3 VERSIONS:-BY UPWARDS OF 20 GREEK FATHERS.

(II.) The reading "o" (in place of Theos) is supported by a single MS. (D):-by 5 ancient VERSIONS:-by 2 late Greek FATHERS.

(III.) The reading "os" (also in place of Theos) is countenanced by 6 MANUSCRIPTS in all (ALEPH, Paul 17, 73: Apost. 12, 85, 86):- by only one VERSION for certain (viz, the Gothic):-not for certain by a single Greek FATHER."⁴¹

I can tell you emphatically that you or no one you know can duplicate the research done by Dr. Burgon. We cannot have access to the manuscripts that he had. His work was thorough and conclusive.

Those are just two verses. There are hundreds more. Please compare the reading of these verses in all of the versions you can find. Here's another verse to check. In Luke 2:33 where Joseph is called Jesus' father in the new versions. This is not the quote of some person, but is the testimony of the Holy Spirit. He knows who the Lord's father is. God is his father. If Joseph was Jesus' father, then you have no payment for your sins!

Dr. Burgon has another voluminous work on the last verses of Mark 16. But there is no need to quote from Bro. Burgon because he was required reading in the seminaries we went to; wasn't he? Of course he wasn't. If you can find his books, you should read them. I can tell you where you can get them. Consider Acts 8:37, where the testimony of the Ethiopian eunuch was left out. Do your home work in the critical apparatus.

These verses also have shown by the critical apparatus that challenges the deity Christ to be completely untrustworthy in the new versions:

1. I John. 4:3 - "Jesus Christ has come in the flesh."

⁴¹ John William Burgon, The Revision Revised (London: 1883), p. 494.

2. II Cor. 4:6 - "Jesus" left out - the "Watch Tower" would agree heartedly.
3. James. 5:16 - "faults" changed to "sins" - no evidence to support the change - but the Vatican agrees.
4. John. 3:13 "which is in heaven" left out. How could Jesus Christ be both there and in heaven at the same time? Maybe he was God.
5. There are only three references in the New Testament referring to God as the "only wise" one. I Tim. 1:17, Jude 25. You find the third. Does your Bible, in its foot notes tell you that some manuscripts have the word "wise"? Even Nestle cites all the manuscripts as having it and gives not one manuscript that leaves it out!

Well, there are literally hundreds more just like these. Have we been told the truth? These verses show us clearly that someone has done an amazing job of concealing information about the Lord Jesus Christ.

I call to your attention Rev. 22:18,19. We can see that someone either added to what God gave us in the originals to give us our old English version of 1611, or someone has taken away what God preserved for us in that old English version to give us a multiplicity of versions today. I take the position of the latter. If God said He would preserve His word for us in His Holy Bible, then where is it?! When the authors or translators of these new Bibles produce a new one, I wonder if they have ever considered the part of the title that says "Holy"? Do they really believe that adjective?

I believe I have a perfect Bible from a perfect God. Can you say the same thing about your Bible?

CHAPTER SIX

THE NEW KING JAMES VERSION

I have made my case against the new Bibles by showing how they depart from the doctrines set forth in the A.V. 1611. We have shown that the reason they do this most of the time is because they are derived from faulty Greek manuscripts. We have seen a few instances where they made changes which weren't substantiated by their "infallible" manuscripts. The answer then to the Bible problem would seem to be that we need a new translation from the same manuscripts from which the A.V. 1611 came, but that has been done in the New King James Bible. It is interesting to note that when these men decide to "update" or "revise" the A.V. 1611, which all new translations have said they were doing, all of a sudden the A.V. 1611 takes a magnificent place in the halls of literary and spiritual hall of fame. The editors of the other new translations were quick to point out "many" errors in that old Bible,⁴² but now we have decided that those old guys weren't so far off after all. Let us consider some preface notes to the NKJV;

"The New Testament Text"

"There is more manuscript support for the New Testament than for any other body of ancient literature. Over five thousand Greek, eight thousand Latin, and many more manuscripts in other languages attest the integrity of the New Testament. There is only one basic New Testament used by Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Orthodox, by conservatives and liberals. Minor variations in hand copying have appeared through the centuries, before mechanical printing began in AD. 1450."

"Some variations exist in the spelling of Greek words, in word order, and in similar details. These ordinarily do not show up in translation and do not affect the sense of the text in any way.

"Other manuscript differences, regarding the omission or inclusion of a word or a clause, and two paragraphs in the gospels, should not overshadow the overwhelming degree of agreement which exists among the ancient records. Bible readers may be assured that the most important differences in the English New Testament of today are due, not to manuscript divergence, but to the way in which translators view the task of translation: How literally should the text be rendered? How does the translator view the matter of biblical inspiration? Does the translator adopt a paraphrase when a literal rendering would be quite clear and more to the point? The New King James Version follows the historic precedent of the Authorized Version in maintaining a literal approach to translation, except where the idiom of the original language occasionally cannot be translated directly into our tongue."

"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 Siniatic and Vatican Manuscripts, is due to the greater age of these documents. However, in spite of their age, some scholars have reason to doubt their faithfulness to the autographs, since they often disagree with one another and show other signs of unreliability. The Greek text obtained by using these sources and related papyri is known as the Alexandrian Text. "On the other hand, the great majority of existing manuscripts are in substantial agreement. Even though many 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 King James Bible. 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."

"Since the latter nineteenth century the theory has been held by some scholars that this

⁴² The Revised Version of the New Testament, (University Press, Oxford, 1881), preface p. v-vii.

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. In light of these developments, and with the knowledge that most textual variants have no practical effect on translation, the New King James New Testament has been based on this Received Text, thus perpetuating the tradition begun by William Tyndale in 1525 and continued by the 1611 translators in rendering the Authorized Version. Important textual variants are recorded in footnotes.”⁴³

Notice how it has been said that the other new translations depended on Greek texts which “shown signs of unreliability.” I wonder what those “signs of unreliability” are? It sure would have been nice of these men to have added a section in their appendix and show us what the “signs of unreliability” are!

I have had people ask me about the reliability of the NKJV. I really didn’t know, so I went through the book of I Timothy word by word comparing it to the A.V. 1611 to see if there were any difficulties or if I could indeed recommend the NKJV to my friends and members. The following is some of that comparison recorded for your study. You compare as I point out possible problem areas and see how much you trust the NKJV.

Starting right out the chute, the first problem I have with this new translation is it’s not using “thee’s and thou’s.” I will not take time here again to rehearse the importance of these pronouns. You may refer back to section on “thee’s” and “thou’s” for this explanation. I will quote a few more lines from the preface to the NKJV, it says,

“Readers of the Authorized Version will immediately be struck by the absence of several pronouns; “thee”, “thou”, and “ye” are replaced by the simple “you”, while “your” and “yours” are substituted by “thy”, and “thine” as applicable. “Thee”, “thou”, “thy”, and “thine” were once forms of address to express a special relationship to human as well as divine persons. These pronouns are no longer part of our language. However, reverence for God in the present work is preserved by capitalizing pronouns, including “You”, “Your”, and “Yours”, which refer to Him. Additionally, capitalization of these pronouns benefits the reader by clearly distinguishing divine and human persons referred to in a passage. Without such capitalization the distinction is often obscure, because the antecedent of a pronoun is not always clear in the English translation.

“In addition to the pronoun usages of the seventeenth century, the “-eth” and “-est” verb endings so familiar in the earlier King James editions are now obsolete. Unless a speaker is schooled in these verb endings, there is common difficulty in selecting the correct form to be used with a given subject of the verb in vocal prayer. That is, should we use “love”, “loveth”, or “lovest”?; “do”, “doeth”, “doest”, or “dost”?; “have”, “hath”, or “hast”? Because these forms are obsolete, contemporary English usage has been substituted for the previous verb endings.

“The real character of the Authorized Version does not reside in its archaic pronouns or verbs or other grammatical forms of the seventeenth century, but rather in the care taken by its scholars to impart the letter and spirit of the original text in a majestic and reverent style.”⁴⁴

I think this statement was engineered to draw our attention away from the truth. It is only partially true to say that “thee” and “thou” were used in the fashion described. In Mat. 15:21-28 we see the Lord and his disciples dealing with a Gentile woman. I say dealing, they were trying to ignore her or devise some way get her to leave them alone. Remember what Peter said in Acts 10 that it is an unlawful thing for one who is a Jew to keep company with one of another nation? When the Lord finally does address this Gentile “dog,” he says, “O woman, great is THY faith: be it unto THEE even as THOU wilt.” There is certainly no respect or relationship

43 The New King James Bible (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1979), v-vu.

44 Ibid., p. v.

here; this is purely grammatical.

In I Sam 17 when David takes on Goliath, in verse 42 says that the Philistine disdained David and in verses 43 and 44 Goliath uses the pronouns “thy” and “thou.” So what’s the relationship here? What’s the respect here? I don’t think there’s any!

In I Sam. 20 Saul gets angry at Jonathan his son and says some awful things to him. I suggest that you not read this verse in the Living Bible; you may be shocked at the street profanity that is in that Holy Bible. But Saul in his rage says “...Thou son of a perverse rebellious woman, do not I know that thou hast chosen the son of Jesse to thine own shame, and unto the shame of thy mother’s nakedness?” Notice the pronouns again. Any respect or relationship here?

Another example of this occurs when Peter rebukes Simon the converted sorcerer in Acts 8:20-23. The verses say, “But Peter said unto him, ‘Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God. Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee. For I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity.’”

The MAJOR reason for “thee” and “thou” is grammatical, not relationship. When one person is spoken to it is always “thee” and “thou” and when more than one is spoken to it is “you.” This preface statement is misleading, at best, and they are right when they say that it is shocking to remove these pronouns. Maybe the Holy Spirit is trying to tell us something is wrong here, but they just appeased our holy consciences by their explanation. This whole epistle is written to one man and with the “thee’s” and “thou’s” removed we may forget that at one place as we are reading.

Now to the particulars of the verses. There are words used by the NKJV that alter or change the sense of the meaning of the KJV.

KJV I Tim. 1:4

“Neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying which is in faith: so do.”

NKJV I Tim.1:4

“Nor give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which cause disputes rather than godly edification which is in faith.”

I don’t think that “minister questions” is the equivalent of “cause disputes.” I can ask a question, in fact I love asking questions when I don’t understand something, but I can do it in a way that does not cause disputes.

The last two words in the A.V. 1611 is “so do,” an admonition to Timothy to pay heed and do it. Notice it’s completely gone in the NKJV.

KJV 1 Tim. 1:5

“Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned:”

NKJV 1 Tim. 1:5

“Now the purpose of the commandment is love from a pure heart, from a good conscience, and from sincere faith.”

Here the words “the purpose” is used instead of “the end.” The commands and the law are over. The death of Christ on the cross was the death of the law. The next verses discuss this very point. The law and commands did not cause love; that was not their “purpose.” The letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life.

KJV I Tim. 1:13

“Who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief.”

NKJV 1 Tim. 1:13

“Although I was formerly a blasphemer, a persecutor, and an insolent man; but I obtained mercy because I did it ignorantly in unbelief.”

Notice how this verse has been made harder to read by replacing the word “injurious” with “insolent.” Maybe your vocabulary is better than mine, but I’d have to go to a dictionary to figure out the meaning of the word “insolent.” However, I can look at the word “injurious” and know that somebody got hurt.

KJV 1 Tim. 1:19

“Holding faith and a good conscience; which some having put away concerning faith have made shipwreck:”

NKJV 1 Tim. 1:19

“Having faith and a good conscience, which some having rejected, concerning the faith have suffered shipwreck,”

“Holding faith” and “having faith” just don’t communicate the same things to me. “Having faith” tells me that some possess the faith that is being spoken of while “holding faith” informs me that I not only possess this faith, but I should be careful and attentive to keep my grasp firm lest I might lose? or someone may attempt to take from me that which I have. And indeed the last part of the verse shows us that “holding” is the best word because some don’t have the faith that they once possessed.

KJV 1 Tim. 2:7

“Whereunto I am ordained a preacher, and an apostle, (I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not:) a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity.”

NKJV 1 Tim. 2:7

“For which I was appointed a preacher and an apostle - I am speaking the truth in Christ and not lying - a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth.”

Both here and in Titus 1 the word “ordain” has been changed to “appointed.” These two words are not the same. One, beyond a shadow of a doubt is a Bible word. Was your foreman at work appointed or ordained? The President’s cabinet, were they appointed or ordained? We are losing here some of our sanctified language. I’m fearful at that.

KJV 1 Tim. 3:1

“This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work.”

NKJV 1 Tim.3:1

“This is a faithful saying: If a man desires the position of a bishop, he desires a good

work.”

Here again as in the previous verse dealt with, we see that men now don't set apart the ministry as a calling; it's simply another profession that one chooses or chooses not to go into. It's a "position" that one can train for in a professional school called a seminary. That's just the way it is in our professional world. No, it isn't. God calls the man, godly men "ordain" him giving him a "charge," and he serves his God and the people in the office of the pastorate of a church or what ever else God has called him to.

We will also see the word "charge" changed later, but let's take things in order.

KJV 1 Tim. 3:9

"Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience."

NKJV 1 Tim. 3:9

"Holding the mystery of the faith with a pure conscience."

Watch the preposition change form "in" to "with." Now if I happen to be studying the conscience and how it relates to my mind and my spirit and this type of thing, those two words can make a world of difference to the outcome of my research. If I "hold the mystery of the faith with a pure conscience," that could mean either the mystery accompanies my conscience or my conscience is the tool or means by which I am enabled to hold the mystery. But, on the other hand, if I "hold the mystery in a pure conscience," then that means something entirely different. This tells me that my conscience, if it is pure has a capacity for the mystery to occupy. Then I can meditate on the capacity or lack thereof of an impure conscience. Notice what two little words can change. Every word of God is pure (Psa. 12:6, 7).

KJV 1 Tim. 3:16

"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."

NKJV 1 Tim. 3:16

"And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifested in the flesh, Justified in the Spirit, Seen by angels, Preached among the Gentiles, Believed on in the world, Received up in glory."

The wording at this verse in the NKJV genders confusion. I am from the South, and there, in our conversation, we may say that a person is now in glory; equating glory with heaven. But we also know that the word glory can also refer to the condition of taking on the glory that Christ will give us.

This verse then if it is left to read "received up in glory," could mean that the Lord was received up in glorious condition, or he was received up in a glorious place. Which is it? We don't need to guess with the KJV. It says plainly that he was "received up into glory" - a definite place. The old much clearer than the new.

There are more difficulties in chapter four, but let's go on to chapter 5.

KJV 1 Tim. 5:1

"Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father; and the younger men as brethren;"

NKJV 1 Tim. 5:1

“Do not rebuke an older man, but exhort him as a father, the younger men as brothers.”

Here our NKJV has a problem. Every older man is exempt from rebuke. So if you as a younger man are called to minister to a local body, and that local body is in a particular transgression, you cannot say one word of rebuke to them if there is an older man than yourself in the congregation. Your hands are tied! But does it not mean someone physically older than you, or does it mean one who is your senior and therefore commending your respect? No, it means if they are only one year or more! How do I know that? Because in verses 17 and 19 which will be dealt with later, the NKJV refers to these respected individuals. So, all men who are any older than the pastor are automatically free and exempt from rebuke from their pastor. That is if you go by the NKJV, but the KJV keeps the same word elder in all three verses, showing that there are some you respect and some you can rebuke. If it is of any interest, all three verses have the same Greek word for “elder.”

KJV 1 Tim. 5:7

“And these things give in charge, that they may be blameless.”

NKJV 1 Tim. 5:7

“And these things command, that they may be blameless.”

The words “give in charge” have been changed to “command.” I alluded to this change previously. In chapters 5 and 6 there are four times that Paul gives Timothy a specific charge. This “charge” that is spoken of is again specific language. When a young minister is ordained, he is given a charge or to put it in other words, an elder pastor preaches his charge. This is not a command; it is an exhortation, it is a challenge of things to do and to be faithful to his God. This is known the world over as a charge.

Of the four times the KJV says that Paul “charges” Timothy, the NKJV changes three of them. In chapter 6:13 the NKJV says that Paul “urges” Timothy to do something and in 6:17 the NKJV says that Paul “commands” Timothy again. All of these are charges. In fact the whole book of I Timothy is the “charge” given to Timothy by Paul, not his commands.

KJV 1 Tim. 5:11

“But the younger widows refuse: for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry;”

NKJV 1 Tim. 5:11

“But refuse the younger widows; for when they have begun to grow wanton against Christ, they desire to marry,”

In this verse actions and desire are equated. This may be true in some spiritual sense, but I sure am glad by the grace of God that I have not committed everything that my flesh has desired. You probably are, too. I think Paul was too, when he said that he kept under his body, lest that when he had preached to others that he should be a castaway.

KJV 1 Tim. 5:19

“Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses.”

NKJV 1 Tim. 5:19

“Do not receive an accusation against an elder except from two or three witnesses.”

This is an interesting verse indeed and deserves special attention. In Num. 35:30; Deut. 17:6, 19:15; Mat. 18:16; II Cor. 13:1.; Timothy already has the scriptural guidelines that any accusations must have at least two or three witnesses to be considered valid. Notice this verse tells the conditions upon which an accusation is specifically to be received against an elder, not just anyone in general. These two or three witnesses are to be there to hear the accusation brought against the elder by a third party. The situation is this, someone has a grievance against an elder in the church. He can only air his grievance if there are two or three people standing there to hear what he says to you. This surely would cut down on “roast” pastor if all church members followed this verse.

The KJV and the NKJV say exactly opposite things.

KJV 1 Tim. 5:23

“Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach’s sake and thine often infirmities.”

NKJV 1 Tim. 5:23

“No longer drink only water, but use a little wine for your stomach’s sake and your frequent infirmities.”

Where did the word “only” come from? It’s not in the KJV, and it’s not in the manuscripts. It was obviously added to help us understand the text better. Then it should have been in italics.

KJV 1 Tim. 6:5

“Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.”

NKJV I Tim. 6:5

“Useless wranglings of men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth, who suppose that godliness is a means of gain, From such withdraw yourself.”

Now this verse has surely been made easier to understand in the NKJV. You know what a “useless wrangling” is, don’t you? I’d have to go to my dictionary to get that one. I don’t have any problem though with “perverse disputings.” Do you think “useless” and “perverse” are synonyms?

But the real problem is in the last part of the verse. The KJV supports us against the idea that people may have that if God is prospering them financially and materially that they must be in His favor, and what they are doing is right. I’ve seen them take up the offering in garbage cans, and drive the best cars the dealer can offer. This is exactly their thinking. They have no concept that the devil can bless someone (Mat. 3:9). But in the NKJV this is not the thought. The NKJV is saying against those who say that the ministry is a way to get God to bless a person, or if I’m really a godly person then God is obligated to bless me with gain. That’s not the same thing.

KJV 1 Tim.6:10

“For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”

NKJV 1 Tim. 6:10

“For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil, for which some have strayed from the faith in their greediness, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”

My KJV tells me that if there is anything that is evil, that if you check long enough there will be a dollar bill behind it. People are dishonest to get gain, and that's the only reason. The love of money is the root of all evil. That is an absolute. But that's too restrictive for us in our modern era. We must be more general, don't we? So we say that the love of money is only a root of all kinds of evil. Just a few words changed here and there, and we aren't so offensive. That's being more Christ-like. I wonder what Christ was like when He was cleansing the temple? I wonder what He was like in Mat. 23 talking to the scribes and pharisees? I wonder what He was like when He spoke to the people in John 6, and they all walked off, never to return, except the twelve? Maybe we need to rethink what Christ-like really is!

KJV 1 Tim. 6:11

“But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness.”

NKJV 1 Tim. 6:11

“But you, O man of God, flee these things and pursue righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, gentleness.”

Here the difference is “pursue” and “follow after.” What's the picture here? If we are to pursue righteousness, righteousness must be swift of feet like a rabbit or deer. We must hasten to keep up lest we lose the trail and be hopelessly lost forever or righteousness figures out that we are no longer on the trail and doubles back to give us another chance at the chase. Brothers and sisters, that's not God's way. God is slow and methodical, He is the Good Shepherd who calls to His sheep and sets out at an easy pace lest the ewes and little ones fall behind and be destroyed. This is what Jacob told Esau. He used it to trick his brother, but the principle is true, none the less. Read what the proverbs say about he who makes haste with his feet. Why, we are told to be still and know that God is God. Again, the KJV is consistent with the whole of scripture.

KJV 1 Tim. 6:18

“That they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate;”

NKJV 1 Tim. 6:18

“Let them do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to give, willing to share,”

These verses on money really are tough for new translators. Your KJV says that rich people are to be ready to distribute. Now do you know that under the hood of your car there is a distributor. It takes in one charge of electricity and changes it from one direction to four, six, or eight. (If your distributor goes to twelve you probably aren't even reading this paper, but you are precisely the ones to whom this verse is pointed.)

So, the KJV says distribute, some here, some there, and some way over there. But the NKJV says you can give it all to one place. What if that one place to which you were probably encouraged to give is crooked. Oh, well, they just got it all, and you were not a good steward of what God had entrusted to your keeping. But if you are going by a KJV you couldn't do that!

KJV 1 Tim. 6:20

“O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called:”

NKJV 1 Tim. 6:20

“O Timothy! Guard what was committed to your trust, avoiding the profane and vain babblings and contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge-”

Notice this verse being changed again allows the Christian to be lured into one of Satan’s biggest traps - science. Surely you don’t have your head in the sand on this one. The biggest hindrance to the gospel in the twentieth century has been the theory of evolution. This has done more damage than anything else, and is one of the hardest oppositions to overcome. I praise the Lord for the wonderful work of the Institute for Creation Research in San Diego and other such ministries. Notice our text in the KJV says “science falsely so called.” True science always agrees with the Bible.

But taking this a little farther, sometimes Christians allow things into their lives because science either supports them or is mute on the subject. Science is not our God and what we know scientifically for sure “we know in part.” We cannot scientifically prove or disprove God. The scriptures say He is, therefore He is. We have been blessed to have evidence that He is, but whether we have the evidence or not, He still is. Do we have any scientific evidence that heaven is a real place? How about angels? How about your own precious soul? Do we have scientific evidence that there is life after death? No, we don’t! But it is still true, according to the scriptures. Beware of science falsely so called.

The editors of the NKJV have also chosen to follow suit with the other new Bibles when dealing with the word “Easter” in Acts 12:4. For an explanation for using the word “Easter,” please refer to that section in chapter 8.

I would like to call your attention to another difficulty with the NKJV; it has to do with verb tenses. We will use Gal. 2:20 to illustrate this situation:

Gal. 2:20 KJV

I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

Gal.2:20 NKJV

I have been crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

“I am crucified...” has been “improved” to read, “I have been crucified...” As we look at those two verb tenses, they, at first, don't seem too much at odds with each other, but if we change the name verb, the change hits us square in the face. Watch: “I am married” becomes “I have been married.” Do you see any difference, now? This first statement declares that I married sometime in the past and am still married. That condition still exerts its influence. But the second statement shows a situation that could have been changed. In fact, we could hear is that verb like this: “I have been married three times.”

The verse that states, “I am crucified with Christ...” shows a continuing state of being dead with Christ. I was crucified with Him and still am! Verb tenses are critical in the understanding of the doctrinal truths of our Bible, and the NKJV shows it lacks in its ability to communicate these thoughts 100% accurately.

This ends our section of the NKJV. I hope that from these citings of the few verses from this one book that you can see why I don’t recommend this work as without error and absolute truth. I do not question the

sincerity or scholarship of those who prepared this work, for I would never attempt such a task myself. I still say that with our old KJV, an 1828 Webster's Dictionary, much prayer and a smattering of Greek word studies, we can be equipped with everything God sees necessary to be fruitful and that our fruit should remain for His Glory.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE IMPORTANCE OF “THEE’S” AND “THOU’S”

So many times when people say something negative about the A.V. 1611, they say that it’s hard to understand because of the language. And so often they will refer to the “thee’s” and “thou’s.” It is true that the language usage of the A.V. is different from modern English and takes some getting used to, but I have found that those “thee’s” and “thou’s” have been incredibly important in the proper understanding of many passages.

First of all, let me explain what grammatically the “thee’s” and “thou’s” indicate. In Hebrew and Greek, the two major original languages of the Bible, there is a means of showing the difference between second person singular and second person plural pronouns. Also, in the King’s English, these differences were indicated. Please notice the chart:

	Singular	Plural
First person:	I, me	we, us
Second person:	Thee, thou	ye, you
Third Person	he, him	they, them

Even in Dr. Harris’ exercises in Hebrew,⁴⁵ he uses “thou” and “ye” to distinguish between singular and plural. We see the same thing in Arthur Machen’s Greek exercises.⁴⁶ With the endings of ever Greek verb, the number and person of the subject of that verb is an integral part of that word. So, we see that in the language of the A.V. 1611, we have preserved for us the ability to know whether one person is being spoken to or two or more are being spoken to.

The first example I would like to cite is John 3, where Our Lord is speaking to Nicodemus. A few months ago, I heard a very prominent pastor using this text to call people to salvation. Basically what he said was that the Lord told Nicodemus, “Truly I say to you, you must be born again;” thus making a personal plea or calling one man to conversion. I don’t have a problem with using this passage for personal evangelism; I’ve used it myself. But if we watch the pronouns carefully, we will see that the Lord had more in mind than just the salvation of one man. Let’s quote the King’s English, “Verily, verily, I say unto thee, ye must be born again.” Now we can see that the Lord is telling Nicodemus that the message of salvation is imperative to all men, not just to him. Notice that Christ is addressing a ruler of the people and informing him that he, Nicodemus has a responsibility to know that the people for whom God has made him responsible, must yield their hearts to their Savior and be born again.

Now we have seen that the “thee’s” and “thou’s” have revealed this to us.

Here is another wonderful example of the preservation of the ability to determine between second person singular and plural. It appears in Revelations chapters two and three. Most commentators tell us that the Lord in these two chapters is talking to the seven churches of Asia Minor and challenging, rebuking, exhorting these churches that they have done poorly or well or what ever have you (ye). Let’s take another look with our “thee’s” and “thou’s.”

45 R. Laird Harris, Introductory Hebrew Grammar, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1978, p 9

46 J. Gresham Machen, New Testament Greek For Beginners, Macmillan, Toronto, 1951, p. 20.

Our Lord in chapter one has seven stars in His right hand and is walking among seven golden candle sticks. Chapter 1 verse 20 tells us that the stars are the angels of the seven churches. The Lord says that the seven stars are the seven angels of these churches. It seems to be the commonly accepted teaching that these seven angels represent the seven pastors of these churches.

As we go into chapter two, then, we see that our Lord is not dealing directly with the churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, etc., but he is calling each of the pastors of the churches to task and dealing with them personally. What a powerful section of scripture for us who are pastors to see the magnitude of our responsibility before God for our congregations. Let's just quote a part of the section to the angel of the church of Ephesus:

1. Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus write; These things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks;
2. I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil: and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars:
3. And hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name's sake hast laboured, and hast not fainted.
4. Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love.

How often I, myself, have read through these two chapters, not paying attention to the “thee's” and “thou's” and been misled by thinking that our Lord was dealing with the congregations and the problems that these congregations were facing. Now as I read, the words have barbs, and points that find too often their target in my own heart, for I am a pastor.

I feel that we are only beginning to unlock the door to the gold mine of scripture. If we do away with things now that sometime later could open up more treasures to us, we may suffer incredible loss, never attaining to where our Lord desires us to be.

We, in modern English, have no means of distinguishing between second person singular and plural. This simple thing, as it may seem useless to some critics now, could open incredible riches later on. So let's not drop it from the page of sacred writ.

Please note: There is some more important information on this topic in the chapter dealing with the New King James Bible in chapter 5.

CHAPTER EIGHT

AN EXPLANATION FOR I JOHN 5:7 AND “EASTER”

There are two common complaints that scholars register against the A.V. 1611. I will deal with those in this section. The first will be the use of the word “Easter” in Acts 12:4, and the second will be the so-called “Joannan Comma.” The first section concerning word “Easter” will prove conclusively that this is the only possible English translation for the Greek word “pasca”. The answer to this whole question is so simple that it just about insults one’s intelligence. The key is found in verse three where it says, “ Then were the days of unleavened bread.” The holiday of Easter has a wide range of dates upon which it can fall, but the feast of Passover is not like that. The real point that solves the mystery is that only the first day of this celebration is referred to as “Passover.” The rest of the feast is referred to as “the days of unleavened bread.” This can be substantiated in Leviticus 23:5+6.

Leviticus 23:5-6 In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the LORD'S passover. And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the LORD: seven days ye must eat unleavened bread.

Only one day is designated as “the passover,” and that is the fourteenth day- more no less!

In Acts 12:3 it precisely says that Peter was taken prisoner during the days of unleavened bread. By then Passover had already past. So to translate “pasca” in the next verse as “passover” would commit a textural error, and “Easter” is the only possible correct word.

The “Joannan Comma” is a little more involved but just as conclusive. The answer here lies in the Greek text.

I John 5:7 and 8

Even though the answer lies in the Greek text, I will make my explanation so that you will not need to know any Greek. If the reader has studied Spanish, French, Latin or any other romance language, you will know that nouns in those languages have gender, that is, they are masculine, feminine, or neuter. Adjectives and articles must agree with the nouns they modified in gender. One would say, "La mesa," and not, "el mesa." One would say, "le jarden," not, "la jarden." As it is with articles and adjectives, so is with nouns and pronouns. A pronoun must agree in gender, case, and number with its antecedent. One more point to realize is that when speaking to or about a group of people or objects, if there is one individual in that group that is masculine, the whole group is referred to as masculine. If all the members are feminine, the group is referred to as feminine. If the whole group is neuter, then the group is referred to as neuter. But if there is one masculine member in the group, the whole group is referred to as masculine.

Let's illustrate. If there was a group of people who were to be delegates to a meeting, and there was only one man in the group, then the spelling of the word in Spanish, French, Italian, etc. would have to show a masculine spelling format. Greek is the same way. Now, let's look at the verses in question in our old Bible:

I John 5:7 and 8 (")

In verse 7 and 8 in the Greek text, there is a word that is translated into English as "that bear record," or "record bearer." In verse 7, the record bearers are the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost. In Greek "Father" and "Word" are masculine and "Holy Ghost" is neuter. According then, to the rules of grammar, the spelling of the word "record bearer" should have a masculine form, and it does. Verse 8 is different. Please follow me prayerfully and carefully! The word "record bearer" is in this verse, also. The three words that refer to it are, "water," "blood," and "spirit." All three of these words are neuter in gender. That would make it necessary that the spelling of the word "record bearer" should be neuter, but it isn't! It is not neuter in any Greek manuscript; they all have the masculine form for the spelling of this word. The only way that this is allowable is because verse 7 is so similar, and so parallel, and so powerful, that it overrides and influences verse 8 so much that its "record bearer" is in the masculine form.

In all the new Bibles, verse 7 makes no mention of "Father" or "Son," so that "record bearer" is only making reference to the three neuter nouns "water," "blood," and "spirit." This grammatical structure is impossible to justify. There is no possible way that can be allowed dramatically. It would be a gross error in grammar construction even for first year Greek students, but this is exactly what the Greek text that the new Bibles use says. How did that come about? Surely when John was pinning this verse, he knew Greek grammar. He got everything else right. Isn't the word of God supposed to be perfect, at least in grammar?

Let's look at something else for a minute. There are two sides to the Bible issue. The old Bibles, the King James, the Geneva Bible, and William Tyndale's Bible have more verses and more words in them. The newer Bibles have fewer verses and fewer words in them. One group is longer, and the others are shorter. The people who support the longer reading say that others took some things out (i.e. Acts 8:37, Matthew 17:21). The people who support the shorter readings say that the others added to the readings. Who can say who is right, and who can say who is wrong? I think we have a major piece of evidence before us in I John 5:7 and 8.

In the Greek texts behind the new Bibles, as the text stands, it is wrong. Somehow it became in error. It wasn't written that way to begin with. If someone noticed the error, the easiest way to fix it would have been just to spell the word right. It sure looks like what happened is that when someone was wanting to do away with verse 7, they just lifted it out of the text and split verse 8 to make a verse seven when they were rewriting it, but failed to see and catch the error that their maneuver imposed on the is their new verse 8. Remember in the old cowboy movies when the fellows would drag a tree limb behind the horse to cover their tracks so that they could not be followed? It sure does look like somebody didn't cover up their tracks too well.

By the way, the verse that we're investigating here just happens to be the strongest verse in the whole Bible on the triune godhead. "... The Father, the Word her, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one." They are one! Jesus Christ is God in the flesh! Let's be honest here. Does I John 5:7 and 8 conceal the deity of Christ in the new Bibles? I think that you would have to agree with me that it absolutely does! God was manifest in the flash!

Manifesting God in the flesh is just what II Timothy 3:16 says:

All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

That verse is changed in the new Bibles, also. But guess what? When they changed that verse in the Greek texts,

they made another blatant error. But I'll save that for another day. If you want to know what he is, call me or e-mail me, or just study it out yourself if you're handy with Greek.

Our conclusion is that verse 7 has to be in our text in its entirety, bearing witness that Jesus Christ is God! All the Bibles that shorten this verse are concealing the deity of our Lord, and are a hindrance to revival. Let's use the Bible that has all of the verses and all the words. This is the Bible that was being used when all revivals happened. That's the old one, our King James, A.V. 1611.

CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSION

As I started this study, I was not too sure of the outcome of the research that I was following. But if no one else is convinced that the information that we have studied has revealed that the study of Christology has changed over the last 200 years, I certainly am convinced. It is alarming to me that in a time when we need the truth so desperately, that it has been removed from us. Even in our seminaries, where our pastors, missionaries, evangelists and other Christian leaders are being trained the fundamentals of the faith, this corner stone of truth as to who our Lord really is, is not being presented in its fullness to these future spiritual leaders.

Comparing the teachings on the deity of Christ through the teachers of theology has truly been an eye-opener for me, and has answered my personal questions as to how and why our spiritual condition in America has degenerated to a fertile condition for the cults to grow, immorality to increase, and every kind of vice and crime to go rampant. These evils are all the results of the spiritual anemia that we are experiencing in our churches.

If our churches were strong, then our society would be strong. But, we are weak, and the strength that we need must come from God. BUT, the strength that we get from God, He imparts through His word. Hebrews 4:12 tells us that it is the word of God that is quick (alive) and powerful. POWERFUL - full of power. That's what we need.

This morning, I picked up and read an article written by one of the speakers from the local Institute of Creation Research, Ken Ham. He concluded his article of appeal to us that even the study of creation is not the end in itself, but a means to turn people back to our true foundation of the scriptures. He said that even if we Christians do succeed in changing some of our laws to reflect true Biblical morality that the next generation simply can vote and change them right back to reflect their ungodliness. His solution was a good one. In fact, it's the only answer that will last. He said that we must get people back to the Bible and its concepts. I agree to a point, but I don't think that he has gotten all the way to the root of the problem. You see, if we start all over again without having the sure and pure root of the scriptures, the true foundation, then we will surely, as we have already done, "progress" in short order to where we are right now. The only thing that sustained the Reformation under Martin Luther in the 1500's was that it was founded on the purity of the correct Greek manuscripts from Antioch of Syria! I said the only thing. The one thing that allowed the Roman Church to stay in power was a lack of the correct scriptures and them in the tongue of the common people. For had they read their Bibles, Jerome's Latin Vulgate, they would have read the same twisted doctrine in Mat. 4:17 of "do penance" and the same twisted doctrine in James 5:16 that in most new translations of "Confess your sins, one to another." This is the one and only verse that the Roman system bases its sacrament of confession to the priests. (By the way, all money from confessions go straight into the priests' pockets.)

The issue of the proper scriptures which produce revival is THE issue. Once we "rediscover" these scriptures, then we can know exactly what God expects of us. We can know Him and especially His Son exactly as was originally penned for us. In "seeking His face," fulfilling the third step of II Chron. 7:14, He can then show us things in our lives that are displeasing to Him. We can then confess them as sin, claim the cleansing power of the blood of Jesus Christ, and with Him proceed to heal our land, not just put a band-aid on the open wounds of ungodliness.

Do you remember a similar time in the Old Testament when the king Josiah came to the throne at eight

years of age? The Bible says that he was a good king for thirty some years. It also says that he served for eighteen years and then decided to renovate the temple. Please, please notice that he had ruled for eighteen years and thought everything spiritually was fine in his kingdom. He had not one clue that anything was wrong, until Hilkiah, the priest, found a book of the law in the temple. Now I could reproduce two chapters of the Bible for you here, but please read 1 Kings 22:1 through 23:28 to see the total depravity that was going on and to see that NO ONE suspected that anything wrong at all was occurring. PLEASE READ. Did you see those things about idols and sodomites and killing babies! No that was not today's newspaper, but it sure could have been!

Do you also remember how that our Lord had to remind the scribes and pharisees as to what the scriptures said. Even in John 3, Jesus Christ told Nicodemus, "Art thou a ruler of the Jews and knowest not these things?"

I tell you the time has come for us Christians to rediscover God's Word as He has preserved it for us as English speaking people in the A.V. 1611, King James Bible. But please understand me, that will not be an end in itself, because knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth. Once we have made that discovery, we must continually strive to stay humble before our Mighty God and allow Him to do His precious work of revealing the many things in our lives that are not pleasing to Him. Let us pray for mighty grace from His precious hand to bring these things to pass, that others may see our good works and glorify our Father who is in our hearts.

AMEN.