

NEW TRANSLATION OF BIBLE A DISAPPOINTMENT

"If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life" (Revelation 22:19).

While rejoicing over the recent nation-wide publicity given the Bible, one could not help wondering what improvement the new version could be over the King James Version which has been a source of greatest comfort, the highest means of inspiration, and the builder of the noblest character of men and nations since its issuance in 1611. Upon examination of this new version, it was saddening to learn that some very vital changes had been made which obscure if not substantially deny fundamental truths of the Bible.

"Such fundamental changes have been made that it would be nothing short of a calamity of infinite proportions if the Book should be accepted by the English-speaking world, and replace the King James Version." The author of that statement is the President of the International Council of Christian Churches, a group of churches which have sought to adhere to the historic Christian faith and have not formed an alliance with the National Council of Churches of Christ.

The Modernist Viewpoint

The reason for some of the objectionable changes may best be understood if one knows something of the theological viewpoint of those who did the revising. No doubt the entire committee of translators concurred in the statement that "the Biblical translator is not an expositor; however pronounced his views about Biblical doctrines, he has no right whatever to intrude his opinions into the translation, or to permit his dogmatic convictions to qualify or shape its wording." However, one is strongly inclined to believe that their theological convictions did lead the translators to "intrude" their opinions into the translation. In a footnote where Isaiah 7:14 is quoted, it is indicated that the word "virgin" could have been retained. Evidently "young woman" was more in accord with their own theological views.

Who, then, are the translators of the "Revised Standard Version"? The head of the committee is a man who is an outspoken Modernist. He has been associated with organizations that have been labeled decidedly "pink" if not "subversive." One of the translators has been "named on fifteen Communist or Communist-front organizations." Four of the translators are from 'one of the theological seminaries called the "hotbed of modernism and socialism." Three are from a Divinity school said to be a "center of socialism and modernism."

A converted Jew writes: "One of these translators is a noted Jewish scholar, who, by very tradition, is bitterly opposed to the Christ as having been sent of God to bring to the world redemption through the sacrifice of his own body and blood."

It is stated that "not one of these scholars — and we wish to give them every token of respect — would classify today as a devout, orthodox believer on the Lord Jesus Christ as the only begotten Son of God, Who was Himself God made manifest in the flesh." It is stated by one who carries the degree of D. D., LL.D., Ph.D., that the "entire translation committee was made up of men who do not believe in the infallibility of the Bible."

Is it surprising, then, that where there is a choice in the translation of a word, the "liberal" translator will select the word that corresponds with his liberalistic theology? That this has been the choice is apparent in a few of the basic examples.

Christ's Miraculous Birth

The prophecy of the miraculous birth of Christ is eliminated by the change the translators made in substituting the words "young woman" for the word "virgin," in Isaiah 7:14: "Therefore the Lord Himself will give you a sign. Behold, a young woman shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel" (footnote: "or virgin").

We are told that "the Lord himself shall give you a sign," and that was the sign given—the "virgin" birth. Matthew declares that "all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet." In Matthew 1:22, 23, the translators must have felt bound to translate it as the Lord had spoken — "a virgin." Then why the change in the prophecy of His "virgin" birth in Isaiah's account? Other translations — the Septuagint, the King James Version, the English Revised Version of 1881, and the American Standard Version of 1901 — have kept the word "virgin." Did not the translators of the new version reflect their "liberal" view?

The Deity of Christ

The King James Version says: "When the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God" (Matthew 27:54). The RSV says: "When the centurion and those who were with him, keeping watch over Jesus, saw the earthquake and what took place, they were filled with awe, and said, "Truly this was a son of God!" " The same change is made in quoting Mark 15:39. Notice that the translators use a small "s" instead of the capital "S" used in the King James Version.

In the King James Version, Revelation 1:13, we read: "And in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle." The RSV says: "One like a son of man." One becomes suspicious that the change was made to lower the status of the Divine Savior to the level of an ordinary man.

Another justifiable conclusion that the translators question the deity of Jesus Christ is found in their practice of addressing God reverently as "thou" and "thee," but addressing Jesus as they address men with "you" and "your," thereby putting the Savior in the same class as men, and denying Him the reverence accorded Deity, God.

The Blood of Atonement

In the King James Version we read, Romans 3:25: "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, . . ." The RSV makes it, "Whom God put forward as an expiation by his blood, to be received by faith." The change from "propitiation" to "expiation" is not warranted. "Propitiation" carries the meaning of a provision for pity; "expiation" could mean just a goodwill offering, not necessarily a basis of justification. "Expiation" is less than the great truth set forth in the original. His purpose was that "he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus" — the pity of God.

It has been stated authoritatively that the "change was made deliberately, with the intention of eliminating the teaching of an objective sacrificial element in the atonement." Evidently the translators are not in accord with the Biblical teaching that it was necessary for Jesus to die on the cross in order to satisfy divine justice, and reconcile us to God. Explaining why the translators made the change, a professor in a Modernist seminary stated that God did not need to be satisfied before He could save man.

If it is not necessary that the righteous justice of God be satisfied in order that a sinner may be saved, then the Epistle to the Romans, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the entire Bible must be discarded. It is plainly taught in the Scriptures that Christ as our High Priest offered Himself up a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, and reconcile us to God: "Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people" (Hebrews 2:17) ; "But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. . . so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many" (Hebrews 9:26, 28).

"The Scribe Must Be. Clean"

Certain rigid and sacred rules were established to govern the scribe who undertook the writing of the parchment of the Holy Scriptures. There were hundreds of special laws directing them how to write the Hebrew scrolls. It was required rigidly that the scribe should be a pious man. Every time he would begin to work on a scroll, he had to be immersed. The extremely holy scribes used to immerse themselves each time they came to the sacred Name of Jehovah, so that they should be perfectly pure before writing the name.

Poison in the Loaf

This new version has, been labelled "The NW's Bible," "a travesty," "a blasphemy," "a triumph of Satan," "an antichrist Bible."

The so-called "mistakes" in the King James Version that have been corrected in the Revised Standard Version are called "grasshoppers" as compared with the enormous theological errors that the translators have made in their choice of, or preference for, words that amount to perversions of the pivotal declarations of God's Word concerning Christ, and the destruction of God's prophetic foundations. The advantages that have come through the clarification of the meaning of words that have changed with the years, words such as "let" in the sense of "hinder," "prevent" in the sense of "precede," "allow" in the sense of "approve," and other similar words, are recognized. Archeological discoveries do not alter the facts of the Bible but corroborate them.

When one reads the adverse comment on the Revised Standard Version and hears the criticism from prominent representatives of the historic faith, one must feel that something vital, which is found in the King James Version, has been lost by the new version —its "simplicity, its dignity, its power, its happy turns of expression," and its basic truths upon which man has built his hope of salvation from sin and confidence of eternal life.

With the changes that have been made, something most deadly has been added. It has been aptly said that "When there is arsenic in the bread, one does not spend his time discussing the good ingredients of the bread, but warns against the arsenic."