

EXCERPTS FROM

October - December 1983

THE LINK

THE QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER OF

North Road Chapel (Evangelical)

BIDEFORD

Internet Edition

FELLOWSHIP.

Dictionaries define the word fellowship as, "sharing - a community of interest - the state of being a fellow of the same order".

With regard to Christian fellowship, there is more than one aspect, and that which is central and of prime importance is our relationship with God; for man in his natural state certainly does not 'share' the mind of God; there is no 'community of interest': man's mind and heart is 'alienated from God'. Indeed is "at enmity with God". (Cf. Ephesians 4:18 and Romans 8:7).

Not until reconciliation is effected can there be fellowship. Through the matchless love of the Eternal God in the trinity of His being, sinners enter into this blessed relationship by virtue of the electing grace of the Father, the atoning work of the Son, and the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit.

On the cross Christ 'slew the enmity' and reconciled to God' (Eph.2:16), the Holy Spirit regenerating and 'renewing the mind' (Titus 3:5 - Col.3:10). Hence, the truth of Col. 1:21; "And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled". When this has taken place, true fellowship begins: "our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ." (1 John 1:3).

The truly regenerated person will begin to share the mind and will of God and his or her interests will be that of the KINGDOM OF HEAVEN. This is the inevitable sequence of the true work of grace, because spiritual union has been made actual and vital to such an one - they become of 'the same order', partakers of Christ (not of His Divine essence) but a member of His Body (The Mediator) of which He is the Head, receiving of 'His fulness'. This is the central aspect of FELLOWSHIP.

When dealing with this subject, one must go further, for fellowship is not just a matter of personal relationship with God, but, being formed into the "Body of Christ" as "members in particular" (1 Cor.12:27), we have a relationship with every other member of that body. Surely,

no true believer would ever fail to recognise this. Every blood-washed sinner must be seen as our brother or sister in the lord. This is our relationship one to another, but, what of our fellowship with each other? Here lies the tragedy.

As one looks at the Church, the Body of Christ, one sees anything but unity: certainly the practices of so many denominations and sections do not denote 'fellows of the same order'. What is the cause of this disorder? (for such it is), and how are we to act in such a situation?

Here, let it be said that God in His wisdom has ordained independent autonomous churches, local companies of believers who are responsible to Christ their Head. Such local Bodies are to be replicas - working models of the whole.

The Church in her entirety as seen in Christ is without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, a harmonious and glorious body. One is not suggesting that it is possible to get an exact replica of this at a local level but this is the pattern. Although we are failing creatures, yet, we should strive earnestly to this end, ever going on in humble confidence and faith, "let us go on to perfection" (2 Cor.13:9). Though we shall never achieve a perfect church on earth, yet, our sights must ever be set upon it, and never must we compromise the mandate of Scripture which would imperil or jeopardize such progress.

Because the Biblical pattern for a local church is one of autonomy, we are responsible to God for the local body of which we form a part, we cannot be held accountable for massive drifts or departures from the true pattern, outside of our own church.

Within the local assembly there should be true unity, not just a happy agreeable atmosphere: It is the unity of the spirit of which we are now treating, and this will only be known where there is the unity of the faith where all are at one regarding truth and practice. "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same judgment". (1 Cor.1:10).

In order that such might be brought about the Risen Head gave gifts unto men, the pastor and the teacher "For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ:" (Eph.4: 12-13).

As the God given gift of the teacher functions within a local church and he faithfully, consistently and systematically ministers the Truth of God, shunning nothing, and the members, diligent in their hearing receive "with meekness the engrafted word"; so, the church comes to TRUE UNITY. This is not an arranged or organized thing, it comes as a natural sequence to being in agreement with the Head and His Word. The two can never be separated, for Christ the living Word is THE TRUTH; so, also, is Scripture, the written Word THE TRUTH. Both are without error or mistake and are binding and absolutely authoritative, even to the minutest detail.

Sad to say, many companies of Christians are seeking a unity which is not of this order. It is the gathering together of all practices and persuasions in order to secure what may appear to be a united front. Misguidedly they think that such is pleasing to God and will add great force to the witness.

Seeing that many of these folk are born again - therefore, our brothers and sisters in the Lord - does not this relationship demand our fellowship? The answer must be, emphatically, NO.

Within the church today there is a false spirit of tolerance prevailing. This is solely due to the fact that doctrine has fallen out of the pulpits. Consequently, reasons for divisions are no longer apparent. Those truths for which our forefathers suffered and died are no longer regarded as vital. Such is the drift of our age} but a company of believers who are striving for the outworking of the mandate of the great Head of the Church, will never countenance such practice. The yardstick for unity and fellowship must ever be sound doctrine and practice. The Bible does not see truth merely as something to be believed; it must be OBEYED, and that, in its entirety;

because Christian fellowship in its Biblical sense, is a sharing of truth, there can be no fellowship with those who deny parts of that truth; for to deny truth is to deny Christ who is THE TRUTH.

Some may say that our views are schismatic, this is not so. It is not schism to refuse to join in an organization or system for valid doctrinal reasons; indeed doctrinal indifference is a heinous sin. In times of doctrinal controversy or complacency, we are to "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3). Never let us be middle-of-the-road pacifists, for such men are responsible for the ruining of many a local church, and for such will be accountable at the judgment day.

In the New Testament, and more particularly with regard to the writings of John, one finds a great emphasis upon love. This is often cited; but let none lose sight of the fact that this same apostle is uncompromising on Truth and firmly denounces false teachers: "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed. For him that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." (2 John 10-12). There is no inconsistency between love and the vigorous denunciation of that which is contrary to the truth. When the honour of Christ is at stake or the integrity of His truth, there can be no compromise: We must stand up and cause our voice to be heard, even though other Christians be involved.

Again let it be pointed out, this does not affect our relationship with one another, as being in Christ, but, it will affect our fellowship with each other: it is inevitable in such a situation. The Scriptures themselves make it abundantly plain that even preachers who have been much used of God can slip into error. Galatians chapter 2 gives a classic example of this. Peter the apostle, so greatly used to the blessing of thousands of souls, was now in Galatia siding with those who were influenced by the false teaching of Judaism and by so doing he was virtually denying the very gospel which he had preached. Peter may not actually have been preaching false doctrine by direct statement, but, by association with men who were, he was denying the faith.

Paul, although a younger man than Peter, reacted to the seriousness of the situation, not with sentimentality, as so often happens in our day: he did not say "Peter is my brother in Christ, after all he is an old man now, and what a preacher he has been; thousands have been converted through him; it ill becomes me to criticize him, let alone speak to him about the matter". On the contrary, Paul knew that Peter was wrong, that it was dishonouring to God and that it would have disastrous consequences.

So, the apostle Paul, although many years younger, says, "I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed" (Gal.2:11). Have we ever stopped to think what the result would have been had the apostles joined with Peter in his compromise? Do Christians to-day contemplate the end of unholy alliance with the mixed company who are joining together for the declaration of a so-called gospel; a compromise at the expense of "all the counsel of God". We are not to fellowship with such; rather are we to reprove. (Cf. Eph. 5:11). We have been called unto the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord." (1 Cor.1:9).

As we can only fellowship with our Head over Truth, so, also, can we only fellowship with fellow members of the Body over truth. Where TRUTH is mutually shared there is fellowship, where it is not, fellowship is not possible.

W. H. Molland.

"Disunity is not caused by a too-thorough attachment to Scripture, but by the intrusion and toleration of beliefs and practices which are the products of human wisdom alone: the Lord's will is in the Scriptures, and if we searched them more and more and were determined, irrespective of anything that may have been done by the church, or the world, or by governments, or by anybody else, that we would all follow our Lord's will, we should come to closer union. We are divided because we do not study the Scriptures and know the will of God as we should."

C. H. Spurgeon

"THE NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION OF THE BIBLE"

The following is an extract from a sermon preached recently by Dr. Ian Paisley at the Martyrs Memorial Church, Belfast.

I want to examine with you a recent publication of the whole of the Old and New Testaments called 'The New International Version of the Bible', or taking its initial letters, 'The N.I.V.' - 'The New International Version of the Scriptures'.

We live in a day when there has been a whole rash of translations, so-called, of the Word of God. For instance, we had 'The Revised Standard Version', published through the arm of the World Council of Churches in the U.S.A., and copyrighted by them under the title 'The National Council of Churches'. Then that Version had its counterparts in the British Isles in a Version known as the 'New English Bible'. It was sponsored by the British Council of Churches which, of course, is an arm of the World Council of Churches. Then we have 'The Living Bible' as if the Bible ever was dead, and we found them calling it 'The Living Bible'. Then we have 'The Good News Bible'. Then we had 'The Common Bible'. Then we had 'The Jerusalem Bible', and we have had a whole rash of translations, falsely so-called, of God's Word, because they were not really translations but rather interpretations of God's Precious Word.

Now, of course, these particular translations that I have referred to, had a question mark upon them because people were already alerted to the apostacy of the World Council of Churches, and who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? So, the believer who saw a book copyrighted by the World Council of Churches was immediately suspicious and rightly so. Thus people became aware of the unbelievers, infidels, modernists and I apostates who sat upon the Boards of the Translating Committees and who covered the Word of God with their pernicious and vile blasphemies.

The label on an article is very important, and if you believe what is on the label and you purchase the

commodity, if the label is wrong then you are in serious difficulty. If I bring to this pulpit a labelled bottle presenting a cough cure (and we are all troubled with coughs at the present time) you say, "is that a good cough cure?" I say, "yes, it is beautifully labelled, it is the best cough cure you could have." But, if in that bottle there was poison, although the label said 'cough cure', if you took it, you would certainly have your cough cured, but you would never breathe again. Yes, labels are important.

When I get a Bible that is labelled and the label tells me that this Bible is translated by translators (I quote) "united in their commitment to the Authority and Infallibility of the Bible as God's Word in written form." When I read that on the label, my defences are down, I am not suspicious, I say, "Thank God there are people who believe in the Authority and Infallibility of God's Precious Word, and they are going to translate the Bible and as they are committed to the Word of God, I am sure their translation will be in keeping with the great principles of the Divine revelation." So, God's people today are more likely to be deceived by the 'New International Version' of the Scriptures than they would be by 'The New English Bible', or 'The Revised Standard Version', or 'The Living Bible', or 'The Good News for Modern Man', or 'The Common Bible' which has upon it the imprimatur of the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church. So, this 'New International Version' is well labelled, produced by men, we are told, who are committed to the Infallibility and Authority of God's Precious Word. But when we examine this Bible, we find in a most subtle, underhand and Jesuitical manner that this perversion of Scripture lays its axe to the great fundamentals of the Christian faith in a far more subtle way than 'The New English Bible'; in a far more Jesuitical way than 'The Revised Standard Version'; in a far more deceptive manner than 'The Good News for Modern Man' or 'The Living Bible'. This Bible professedly produced by men committed to the Authority and Infallibility of Holy Scripture, this translation lays the Satanic axe to the stout oak of God's Holy and Precious Word.

Let me just by way of preface say something more. Any attack on the Word of God is Satanically originated. Could

I repeat that. Any attack on the Word of God is Satanically originated. It is the Devil who attacks the Word of God, and he does it in three ways, and let me show you those three ways.

In Genesis Chapter 3 the Devil is first mentioned in the Bible. He comes on to the stage of Holy Scripture and what are his first recorded words? The first recorded words of the Devil, Genesis 3:1, "Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" The first time the Devil speaks in the Bible he questions God's Word. That is his first avenue of attack; to question the Word of God. The second avenue of attack; "and the serpent said unto the woman (Genesis 3:4), "Ye shall not surely die." Direct denial of God's Word. First, the questioning, then the denial of God's Word.

Now turn to the New Testament and you will find the Devil entering the New Testament and he is still attacking God's Word, and we find him speaking to the Lord Jesus in His temptation, and the Lord Jesus answers him and says to him, "It is written", and then the Devil in verse 6 (Matthew chapter 4) says, "It is written", and he makes a quotation from Psalm 91. But I want you to notice the difference between our Lord's quoting of Scripture and the Devil's quoting of Scripture. The Lord quotes the Scripture accurately, but the Devil quotes the Scripture inaccurately, he leaves out parts. He leaves out this important part, Psalm 91:11, "To keep thee in all thy ways." The third avenue of attack is to change the Scriptures. So there is the questioning of the Scriptures, the denying of the Scriptures and the changing of the Scriptures. The 'New International Version' - the N.I.V.' - both questions the Scriptures, denies the Scriptures and changes the Scriptures.

Now, of course, when one sees the rash of Bibles, and you go into a modern bookstore and you say, "I want a copy of the Scriptures" they say, "What one will you have sir? Will you have the Living Bible, Will you have the Revised Standard Version? Will you have the New English Bible? Will you have the Jerusalem Bible? Will you have the Common Bible or will you have the New International Version Bible?" You would think that God had written over a dozen Bibles. "God only wrote one Bible, and the 'New

International Version' in its Foreword lets the cat out of the bag, and it says, "The Greek text used in translating the New Testament was an eclectic one". (Don't be afraid of that big word, just go to the Dictionary the same way as I did when I read that, and I discovered the meaning of eclectic is 'a bit from here and there'. In the opinion of the author the best bits of all, all put together). So they took these various manuscripts, false and true, and they took the best bits, in their opinion, and put them all together to make a basic text for their translation from the Greek into the English of the New Testament. But, then they said that they took the choice of readings. (How did they know what bits to take, and what bits not to take?). They said they were "guided by the accepted principles of New Testament textual criticism". That covers a multitude of infidelity and sin, because we all know that modern textual criticism is not textual criticism at all but 'Higher Criticism' as it is called - the criticism of the Bible - the destruction of the Bible by the theories of men. Immediately after I read the Preface I was suspicious, my suspicions were aroused and rightly so. Of course, there is one question that I ask of any book and especially of any translations, so-called, of the Word of God: "What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He?" I just want to ask that question and find the answer that is given to it in this New International Version, because my time is limited, therefore our investigation into this matter has also been limited. We are going to limit ourselves to asking of this Version: "what think ye of Christ?"

Let me make it perfectly clear who Christ is, and I quote the definition that is given founded upon the Precious Word of God by the Westminster Confession of Faith in Chapter 8 and section 2, "The Son of God, the second Person in the Trinity, being Very and Eternal God, of one substance and equal with the Father, did when the fulness of time was come, take upon Him man's nature with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin, Being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary of her substance, so that two whole perfect and distinct natures, the Godhead and the Manhood were inseparably joined together in one Person without conversion, composition or confusion. Which Person is Very God and Very Man, yet One Christ the only

Mediator between God and man." (If you care to get a copy of the Confession of Faith you will find the Scriptural proofs upon which that great historic definition is based).

Now what does this New International Version think of Christ? Well, the first text you turn to is Genesis 3:15. If there is any straying in that verse or any dilution of that verse, or any deviation from that verse, then the roads are going to divide. You know, you don't need a very big divide at the beginning. You see a road going that way and there is a road beside it and it is just going a little off the parallel, not very much, just a fraction of an inch: but as the road goes on the fraction of an inch becomes an inch, it becomes a foot, it becomes a yard, it becomes thousands of yards, it becomes thousands of miles; the deviation is great. So, at the very beginning of this Bible there is the deviation. Take your Authorised Version and let us read that verse, Genesis 3:15: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seeds it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. The N.I.V. reads: "And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers". Immediately the word 'seed' is dropped. That word 'seed' has a very strong predictive element in it. Christ is to be the seed of David. He is also to be of the seed of Abraham. He is also to be the seed of the woman, but the word 'seed' is dropped: 'offspring' is put in its place. Then the text goes on, "He will crush your head, and you will strike his heel." Let me say that there immediately we have a deviation in regard to the extent of the great battle at Calvary. The Lord Jesus Christ was not merely struck at the Cross, He was bruised to the death at Calvary. But here we have in the 'N.I.V.' a dilution of the strength of the text. "It is very slight," you say, Mr. Paisley, it is not very much of a dilution or a deviation." I grant you that, but it is the beginning, just a fraction, and then as we go through the Scripture we see that gap widens and widens and widens until in the New Testament this Version deletes the Precious Blood of Christ and denies the Second Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is just the commencement of the way of deviation.

Let us go a little farther and let us come to Genesis Chapter 49 and verse 10, and here we have another great Messianic prophecy, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come? and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." In the 'N.I.V.' the text is changed completely, and reads, "The sceptre will not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, until he comes to whom it belongs and the obedience of the nations is his." The word 'Shiloh' is deleted. Old Dr. Munroe Gibson points out (and I quote): "There is, I cannot help thinking, something more than curiosity in the fact that if the Hebrew equivalents were given for the Greek word in the hymn that was sung by the angels over Bethlehem's plain, when the great Son of Judah was born there, a Prince and a Saviour, it might read thus, 'Judah in the highest, and on earth Shiloh, for Judah means Glory to God, and Shiloh means Peace,'" So here we have a further deviation from God's Precious and infallible Word.

Let us then turn to the prophecy of Micah, Micah 5 and verse 2. (We are well into the Old Testament now and so you can expect a far greater deviation). "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, (I'm reading from the Authorised Version) though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall come forth unto me that is to be ruler of Israel; whose going forth have been from of old, from everlasting." A tremendous proof text from Micah 5:2 of the Eternality of the lord Jesus Christ and of His Everlasting activities, "whose going forth have been from of old, from everlasting."

Listen to the 'N.I.V.': "Thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though you are small among the clans of Judah, out of you will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel, whose origins are from old, from ancient times." Here we have a Satanic attack upon the Eternity of Christ, and the teaching that Christ originated in ancient times; that there was a time when the Son of God was not. This Scripture in the original has nothing to do with the origin of Christ, it has to do with the goings forth and the activities of Christ. But the 'N.I.V.' changes it and gives Christ an origin - that His origins were from of old, 'from ancient times that Jesus Christ one day originated.'

Let me say from this pulpit that Jesus Christ was before all worlds; that Jesus Christ was in the beginning, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by Him," and Jesus Christ was not made. Jesus Christ forever was, He had no origination for He is God.

Let us turn back to the Bible, and you can see now the difference developing. Let us turn back to Psalm 45 and verse 11, and we read in the Authorised Version, "So shall the king greatly desire thy beauty: for he is thy LORD; (notice the word LORD is spelt in capitals) and worship thou Him." This, of course, is a text applying to the church - the bride of Christ. Who is the Lord of the church? None other than the Saviour. What does the church do? It worships Him.

When we turn to the 'N.I.V.' the text reads, "The king is enthralled by your beauty; honour him for he is your lord" (spelt with a small letter 'l'). This has a complete change of meaning. No longer is it the Lord of Glory. No longer does the church worship Him. The Scripture is diluted to mean just the honouring of a person by the honour that a wife would give to her husband.

Could I just quote to you what William Jennings Bryan said concerning Christ: "To those who try to measure Christ by the rules that apply to man, He is incomprehensible. Take Him out of the man class and put Him in the God class, and you can understand Him. He also can be measured by the work He came to perform. It was more than a man's task. No man aspiring to be a god could have done what He did. It required God condescending to be a man. When once His Divine Character is admitted we have an explanation that clears away all the perplexities. We can believe that He was conceived of the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary. We can believe that He opened the eyes of the blind when among men. We see Him today giving a spiritual vision of life to those who have known only the flesh and the pleasures that come through the flesh. We can believe that He wrought miracles when upon earth. We see Him so changing hearts today that they love things they used to hate and hate things they used to love. We can even believe that at His touch life was restored. He can do that now, He could have broken the bonds of the tomb."

Hallelujah! What a Saviour! That is the Christ of God and that is the Son of God!

Let us turn to the New Testament and let us see what happens in the New Testament Scriptures in this particular 'New International Version'.

One of the great Scriptures concerning the Deity of Christ in the New Testament is in the ninth chapter of Romans, and verse 5. That verse reads in your Authorised Version of the Bible in clear strong language. Romans 9:5: "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen." In the 'New International Version': "Theirs are the patriarchs, and from them is traced the human ancestry of Christ, who is God over all for ever praised, Amen." There is, however, a very damaging footnote alternative which reads: "Christ. God who is over all be for ever praised." So they take from Christ His Deity in the footnote, and turn the last part of the text into a doxology and not a reference to the Character and Nature of the Blessed Son of God.

I would suggest to you that the first thing you do when you lift any Version of the Scriptures is to look at the text Romans 9:5. For when a Version departs from the clear, unambiguous declaration that Christ is God over all, then in all other parts of that Version there will be a serious weakening of the Deity of the Son of God. So, it is in the 'New International Version'.

Let us turn to John chapter 9 and verses 35,36 and 37: The Lord Jesus Christ is the speaker here. "Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when He had found him He said unto him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered and said, Who is He, Lord, that I might believe on Him? And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen Him, and it is He that talketh with thee." (John 9:35-37). Keep your eye on that text and listen to the 'New International Version': "Jesus heard that they had thrown him out, and when He found him He said, do you believe in the Son of Man?" Just think about that: "Do you believe in the Son of God?", that is what Jesus said, but the 'New International Version' makes Him say, "Do you believe in the Son of Man?" "Who is he sir?", the man asked, (according to the

'N.I.V.'). The man didn't say that at all; he said, "Who is He, Lord?" Think about it. Do you see the attack upon the full orb'd Deity of Jesus Christ in this 'New International Version' of the Bible?

Come with me to John Chapter 3 and verse 16. The verse that we all learned, the first verse of Scripture that ever crossed our lips possibly. "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life," 'Monogenes' - a Greek word; it means 'only Begotten'. Christ is the only begotten Son of God.

Do you know that this 'New International Version' refused to use that concerning Christ? The expression 'only begotten' is completely deleted from this Bible.

Turn to the second Psalm, where that expression is first found in the Bible, and in Psalm 2 verse 7 we read, "I will declare the decrees The LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." The Eternal begetting of Christ. There are relationships in the Godhead - the Father begat the Son, the Son is begotten of the Father; the Spirit of God proceeds from the Father and the Son. So we talk about the begetting of the Son, and the procession of the Spirit in Scriptural terms.

In the 'New International Version' so do they hate the expression "the only begotten Son of God" that they refuse in any scripture to use it, and in that text they change it to read: "You are my Son, today I have become your Father", and the words 'only begotten' are removed. That expression also occurs in John chapter 1 and verse 14, "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." It occurs in verse 18 of the same chapter: "No man has seen God at any time, the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." It occurs in John chapter 3 verse 18: "He that believeth on Him is not condemned, but He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the Name of the only begotten Son of God." It occurs in John 4 and verse 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." In every one of these Scriptures that is deleted, and it is made to read, "The one and only Son of God", and "only begotten" is taken completely out of this 'New International Version'. Why? Because of the Satanic strike at the full orb'd Deity and the mysterious relationship of God the Father to God the Son in the Everlasting Trinity. Oh, this is where the attack is always made. Men cannot understand the Trinity so they attack it.

A Jehovah's Witness came to the door of a friend of mine, and he got very cross: he said to the man, "explain the Trinity?" The man said, "It would be a quartet if I could explain it." "Can anyone by searching find out God? "Can they find out the Almighty unto perfection?" saith the Book.

I would commend a little tape I made, a teaching tape on the Trinity. I trust you will get it, and that you will study the Word of God. What a doctrine is the great doctrine of the Trinity - this Everlasting Trinity!

There is one verse I would like to refer you to, for it is very important; it is that verse in John's Gospel chapter 1 and verse 18. (just look at that for a moment) - and we read here in our Authorised Version these Words: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." Listen to the 'New International Version': "No one has ever seen God, but God the only Son who it is at the Father's side, has made Him known." Jesus Christ is not only at the Father's side but He is in the bosom of the Father. Before He was in the bosom of the Virgin, thank God He was in the bosom of the Father. He is Everlastingly God. Here we have another weakening and taking away the wonderful expression 'the bosom of the Father'.

Let us move along a little more rapidly. Let us turn to 1 Corinthians Chapter 15 and verse 47: a great text of Scripture concerning the Deity of Christ: "The first man is of the earth, earthy, the second Man is the Lord from heaven." That is a great expression, is it not? Listen to it in the 'N.I.V.': "The first man was of the dust of the earth, the second man from heaven". 'The Lord' is left completely out. The Spirit of God calls Him 'The Lord from

heaven'; the 'N.I.V.' says simply, 'the second man from heaven.'

Another great proof text of the Deity is 1 Timothy chapter 3 and verse 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." God was manifest in flesh. Listen to the 'N.I.V.': "Beyond all question the mystery of godliness is great: He (not God) appeared in a body, was vindicated by the Spirit, was seen of angels, was preached among the nations, was believed on in the world, was taken up in glory." So the Word 'God' is taken away, and 'he' is substituted in its place. Now the Lord Jesus Christ, being God, was worshipped when He was upon this earth.

Turn to Matthew chapter 8 and verse 2. He was worshipped because He was Lord over disease. "And behold there came a leper and worshipped Him, saying, Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean." The 'N.I.V.': "A man with leprosy came and knelt before Him and said, Lord, if you are willing, you can make me clean." The word 'worship' completely deleted. Christ was worshipped because He was Lord over death. Matthew 9 and verse 18: "While He spake these things unto them, behold, there came a certain ruler; and worshipped Him, saying, my daughter is even now dead; but come and lay Thy hand upon her, and she shall live." The 'N.I.V.': "While He was saying this, a ruler came and knelt before Him and said..." The word 'worship' completely deleted. Christ was worshipped because He was Lord over Hell itself, and the demons were subject to Him. Mark chapter 5 verse 6: "But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran and worshipped Him." The 'N.I.V.': "When he saw Jesus from a distance, he ran and fell upon his knees in front of Him." 'Worshipped' completely deleted.

Christ was worshipped because He was the Everlasting King. Matthew chapter 20 and verse 20: "Then came to Him the mother of Zebedee's children with her sons, worshipping Him, and desiring a certain thing of Him." The 'N.I.V.': "Then the mother of Zebedee's sons came to Jesus with her sons, and kneeling down, asked a favour of Him." 'Worshipped' completely deleted.

Then we turn to Revelation chapter 5 and verse 14. Christ is worshipped because He sits upon the Everlasting Throne. Revelation 5:14 - "And the four beasts said, Amen, and the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped Him that liveth for ever and ever." Listen to the 'N.I.V.': "The four living creatures said, Amen', and the elders fell , down and worshipped." They wouldn't give worship to Christ the One who liveth for ever and ever. I want to tell you that is the hatred of the Devil against the Blessed Son of God. Today I worship Him, He is Lord of disease. Today I worship Him, He is Lord of death. Today I worship Him, He is Lord of Hell. Today I worship Him, He is the Everlasting King. Today I worship Him for He liveth for ever and ever. King of kings, Lord of lords, the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth.'

We have already discovered the subtlety of an attack upon the Virgin Birth in Genesis chapter 3 and verse 15, and when we return to Matthew's Gospel, chapter 1, we see the boldness of the attack upon Jesus Christ the Virgin born Son of Mary. When we turn to Matthew chapter 1 and verse 25: "And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son". If Christ was not the firstborn son of Mary, then Christ was not Virgin Bom. The Holy Spirit is very careful, and in the Greek text there is that firstborn before the son, "and he called His Name Jesus."

What does Matthew 1 and 25 read in the 'N.I.V.'s "But he had no union with her until she gave birth to a son." Her 'firstborn son' is changed to 'a son', "and he gave Him the name Jesus."

Carrying on from that we turn to Luke chapter 2, and in Luke chapter 2, verse 33, we read: "And Joseph and His mother marvelled at those things which were spoken by Him." Notice how Joseph is not called His father, he has separated Joseph and His mother, but in the 'N.I.V.' that verse reads: "The child's father and mother marvelled at what was said about Him", making Joseph the father of Jesus Christ, striking at the Virgin Birth of Christ.

Let me give you three Scriptures briefly in which the 'N.I.V.' strikes at the Death of the Lord Jesus Christ. The first you will find in Luke chapter 9 and verse 56: "For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives,

but to save them. And they went to another village." Here is the reading in the 'N.I.V.': "And they went to another village." That whole statement, "For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives but to save them" is completely taken away. What Scripture gives a better definition of the Death of Christ than that? "The Son of Man is come not to destroy but to save." With the penknife of infidelity these men who are supposed to believe in the Infallibility and Authority of Holy Scripture, cut it out, striking at the Death of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Colossians chapter 1, verse 14: "In whom we have redemption through His Blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Here is the 'N.I.V.' translation: "In whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins." The vital words, 'through His blood' are deleted. "Through His Blood", striking at the Blood of Christ.

1 Peter 4 and verse 1; a very important Scripture: "For as much then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind; for He that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin."

What does this perversion of Scripture do, The 'N.I.V.'? "Therefore, since Christ suffered in His body, arm yourselves also with the same attitude, because He who has suffered in His body is done with sin." The all-important words that bring out the full significance and meaning of His sufferings 'for us' is deleted. "He died for me" - the great doctrine of Substitution is penknifed by the 'N.I.V.' translators out of this text of Holy Scripture.

Then we come to the final attack in Matthew Chapter 25 and verse 13: "Watch, therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh." This is the conclusion of the parable of the ten virgins - the five that were ready and the five that were unready. "Watch, therefore for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh."

Here in this twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew's Gospel in the 'N.I.V.', verse 13| it says, "Therefore keep watch, because you do not know the day or the hour." The words 'wherein the Son of Man cometh' are completely cut out of this Scripture - a plain Scripture revealing the Second Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.

I have had only time to deal with the Lord Jesus Christ in this great study, but if we had time we could deal with the great doctrines of the Gospel, the doctrine of Propitiation, "He is the propitiation for our sins." What does that word mean? It means that He propitiated Deity, as the Shorter Catechism puts it so well, "He satisfied Divine Justice." That great work of propitiation is completely taken out of the 'New International Version'.

I think I have said enough to put up a warning flag and to warn you to stick to your mother's Bible; to your father's Bible; to the Bible that comes to us direct from the great Protestant Reformation. The Bible that the great preachers of the past used. There is only one Book and of it we say "There is none like it, give it me". May we ever submit ourselves to the Word of the Living God, settled in Heaven. God bless you! AMEN and AMEN.

"The English of the King James Version is not the English of the early 17th century. To be exact, it is not a type of English that was ever spoken anywhere. It is biblical English, which was not used on ordinary occasions even by translators who produced the King James Version. The King James Version owes its merit, not to the 17th century English - which was very different - but to its faithful translation of the original. Its style is that of the Hebrew and of the New Testament Greek. Even in their use of 'thee' and 'thou' the translators were not following 17th century English usage but biblical usage, for at the time these translators were doing their work these singular forms had already been replaced by the plural 'you' in polite conversation.

Lounsbury, History of the English Language, p.287.

The King James Version is the historic Bible of English-speaking Protestants. Upon it God, working providentially, has placed the stamp of His approval through the usage of many generations of Bible-believing Christians. Hence, if we believe in God's providential preservation of the Scriptures, we will retain the King James Version, for in so doing we will be following the clear leading of the Almighty."

Edward F. Hills, Th.D.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION

ANNUAL CHURCH MEETING

This will be held in the Chapel on THURSDAY 3rd NOVEMBER 1983: Commencing at 6 pm.

There will be no public meeting on this date.

EDITORIAL

We are living at a time when there is much confusion and misunderstanding among Christians regarding doctrinal matters of fundamental importance, and in the article on Fellowship we have endeavoured to project the genuine from the false.

We are pleased to have this opportunity of including a sermon by Dr. Paisley in which he sets out in plain language, that all can understand, the dangers inherent in this more recent version of the Scriptures, the 'N.I.V.' There have been many technical appraisals of this work and it has been widely advertised, but there has been a lack of clear directive by many Pastors and Church Leaders. Dr. Paisley has shown the way.

During the lovely summer weather we have had during the past three months, it has been a great joy to have fellowship with the Lord's people from other parts of the country who have been holidaying in the area.

Editor (L.W.Gee).