

THE MODERNISM OF MODERN VERSIONS

by
Richard P. Myers

Modern versions of the Bible are founded upon apostasy, unbelief and theological liberalism. They are as much a traitor to the “written” Word of God as Judas Iscariot was to the “living” Word of God. This can be seen in four areas.

First, Their False Underlying Premise. The fallacious underlying premise is that the Bible is lost and it is up to them, the textual critics, to find it. They believe that God took a deistic, laissez-faire, hands off attitude towards His Word, that He abandoned it to Satan and natural processes when it came to keeping intact what He had inspired. This belief flies in the face of such scripture as 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.”; Isaiah 40:8, “The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the Word of our God shall stand for ever.”; Matt. 24:35, “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.”; I Peter 1:23, “Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.”, and a multitude of others. These scriptures definitely declare that God did not fumble the ball when it came to preserving His Word.

I like to equate Providential Preservation with eternal security. God saves the sinner – and keeps him saved (“who are kept by the power of God”...). God inspired His Word – and will preserve and keep His Word (“Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever”).

Second, Their Humanistic Philosophy. The King James Bible translators used verbal, formal equivalence. That is, if the word was “blood” in the Hebrew or Greek, they brought it over as “blood” into the English. If the word was a noun in the Hebrew or Greek, they brought it over as a noun in the English, not an adjective or something else. They believed the scriptures unfold absolute truth which transcended time and culture.

Modern-day translators use dynamic equivalence. It sounds good (active, forceful, alive), but it is not. They believe the Bible is dull and boring and needs to be livened up. It is a thought for thought, idea for idea, concept for concept approach, rather than a word for word approach. It is more interpretation than translation. Eugene Nida, the guru of this humanistic philosophy, and his followers (the translators of all the modern versions) believe exactly the opposite as the 1611 A.V. translators. They believe that the scriptures are bound in their ancient time and culture. For example, what the Apostle Paul wrote to the Corinthians was only for them in their time and therefore has no application for us 2,000 years later. This dishonors God by implying He is unable to speak absolutely to all generations and cultures.

William Tyndale, (1494-1536), perhaps the greatest translator who ever lived and the “grandfather” of our King James Bible (there is over 80% of Tyndale in the 1611 A.V.), gave this God-honoring testimony in a letter to a friend, “I call God to record against the

day we shall appear before our Lord Jesus, to give a reckoning of our doings, that I never altered one syllable of God's Word against my conscience, nor would I so alter it this day, if all that is in earth, whether it be pleasure, honor, or riches, might be given me." In other words, no amount of money could get him to change one letter of God's Word.

Compare this to Kenneth Taylor, translator of the Living Bible, losing his voice. An article in Time Magazine, July 1972, said: "Mysteriously half way through the paraphrase Taylor lost his voice and still speaks in a hoarse whisper. A psychiatrist who examined him suggested that the voice failure was Taylor's psychological self punishment for tampering with what he believed to be the Word of God." Taylor's paraphrase is filled with dynamic equivalency and contains some swear words.

Third, Their Heretical Beliefs. Origen (185-250), the Father of Bible corruption, said: "The scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as written." In 1947, Dr. Robert M. Grant, a textual critic, said: "It is generally recognized that the original text of the Bible cannot be recovered." About this time, I begin to get a little uncomfortable. There were two Unitarians (Henry Thayer and Ezra Abbott) on the American Standard Version (1901) translating committee. The translators of the Revised Standard Version of 1952 were all unsaved theological liberals. All the translators of the New American Standard Version of 1960 are anonymous; we don't know who they were or what they believed. There were two homosexuals, and others sympathetic to them on the translating committee of the New International Version (NIV of 1973). Of the approximately 115 translators of the NIV, there was not one fundamentalist. The fathers of modern textual criticism (J.J. Griesback, Karl Lachmann and Count Tischendorf) were all German rationalists. Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892), of Westcott and Hort fame, denied the deity of Christ, were evolutionists, were sympathetic to Rome, didn't believe in miracles, denied the reality of David, Heaven and Eden, believed in baptismal regeneration, and denied the inspiration and preservation of the very Bible they were translating. The litany could go on and on. This is the stuff that the modern versions are made of, and it is not a pretty sight to a true Bible believer.

Finally, Their Man-Made Rules. These so-called textual experts made up a bunch of translating rules, and then palmed them off as scientific rules. Every one of the rules, besides being false, are "tailor made", subjective, conjectural and ambiguous. There is not a book, chapter or verse for the lot of them. Such rules as: (1) the shorter reading is to be preferred; (2) the more difficult reading is to be preferred; (3) conjectural emendation; (4) intrinsic probabilities; (5) transcriptional probabilities; (6) textual families; (7) genealogy; and (8) conflation. It would take too much space to give an explanation of all of these rules, but John William Burgon, great textual scholar and contemporary to Westcott and Hort, called them "mere moonshine" and an "excursion into cloudland." In other words, they are fictitious and bogus. There are four additional counterfeit translating rules that should be addressed.

- The Bible is not unique. It should be treated like any other book. This totally denies that any special considerations should be made concerning its claim of inspiration and preservation. In other words, it should be looked at as if it were the L.A. Times or Reader's Digest.
- There are no signs of deliberate falsification. In others words, the Bible has never been subjected to any tampering. This is totally unbelievable. Not only does God have a special interest in His Word, but so does Satan. Within 200 years after its completion, heretics like Marcion and many others were trying to deliberately mutilate the Bible. In fact, this destruction was going on before the New Testament was completed because Paul says in 2 Corinthians 2:17 (written about 59 or 60 A.D.) "For we are not as many, which corrupt the Word of God." Satan has been trying to destroy God's Word since the Garden of Eden.
- Oldest is Best. By this, the critics mean that the oldest manuscripts are closer to the originals and therefore should be the best. Normally this is true – but the Bible is not normal, it is supernatural. It claims to be inspired, God-breathed. Wilbur Pickering, in the book, True or False, p.276, makes the analogy of a stream. He explains that it is normally true that the closer we get to the source, the purer the water will be. But what if a sewer pipe empties into the stream a few yards below the spring. Then the process is reversed. As the polluted water is exposed to the purifying action of the sun and ground, the farther it runs the purer it becomes (unless it passes more pipes). This is exactly what happened with the Bible. It came from the mouth of God as pure as could be, but very quickly the sewer pipes of the enemy began to pollute it, as it was copied and translated through time. Getting further and further away from the pollution, it became purer and purer until today, we have the pure, perfect Word of God in our 1611 A.V.
- Weighed not counted. This rule was made up by the textual critics to counter the fact that, of the 5,300 Greek manuscripts extant, 99% of them are what our King James Bible comes from; only 1% is what all other so-called Bibles come from. So to justify their human translations, the critics had to make the value of one of their manuscripts be more important than a thousand of the other manuscripts. This is nothing short of desperate speculation and storytelling to justify their woefully inadequate position.

All of the foregoing is why the modern versions are accepted and promoted by the Unitarians, Catholics, cults, neo evangelicals, National Council of Churches, and modernists. This ought to raise a red flag to any red-blooded fundamentalist. We close this article as we began it. Modern versions of the Bible are founded upon apostasy and unbelief. They are as traitorous to the "written" Word of God as Judas was to the "living" Word of God. **FUNDAMENTALISTS BEWARE!**