

## Msg #1024 Two Ordinances of Christ

What the Bible Says, Good Samaritan's Penny Pulpit by Pastor Ed Rice

The two 'T's in the 8 BAPTISTS distinctives stand for two offices, and two ordinances. The simplest clearest teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ are that baptism and communion are ordinances i.e. commanded physical observances which symbolically portray spiritual realities, and NOT sacraments, i.e. religiously practiced physical activities that invoke a mystical, magical spiritual endowment of grace on the participants. There are no sacraments in the Holy Bible. In the 5th century when Jerome translated the Latin Vulgate with the bad theology of Saint Augustine of Hippo, he errantly inserted this Latin 'magic' or 'sacrament' into God's Holy Word on 8 occasions, Eph 1:9, 3:3, 9, 5:32, Col 1:27, 1Tim 3:16, Rev 1:20, and 17:7. The proper translation was, and still is, 'mystery' as used in the real Bible. Jerome and Augustine inserted 'do penance' for "repent"; 'priest' for "ordained elder" and 'magic sacrament' for God's revealed "mysteries." Care should be taken in who translates a Bible, their bad doctrine is always inserted. Thus for 1700 years now 'Christianity' has been saddled with the horrid misnomer that a 'Holy Water' baptism, and a 'Holy Eucharist' can magically wash sin away or magically unite us to Christ. The Bible has always expounded the two ordinances as physical pictures with no magic, and no mysticism. Protestants carried these horrid translation errors into their doctrines and practices, but Baptists, so named for their refusal to compromise on the exactness of what the Holy Bible says about them, have been true to the exact wording of Scripture for these 2000 years. Many are now trusting the new international and new American ecumenical translation societies that are again changing the Words of God. Sacraments are part of a man made religion, never occurring in an accurate rendition of God's carefully preserved, inerrant, verbally inspired Scripture.

An Essay from week # 24, Sun, June 13, 2010

Posted at <http://www.GSBaptistChurch.com>

In paper back at <http://stores.lulu.com/GSBaptistChurch>

Original Autographa Response to Msg #1024

First Baptist Church wrote:

Hello: I cannot help but respond to your Msg #1024 and what appears to be your comparison of the Latin Vulgate with the NIV and NASB. Perhaps you did not intend to imply that these modern translations have followed the Latin Vulgate, but my reading of your article led me to believe that both the NIV and the NASB use these "catholic" words in their translations. Such is not the case. Your wording would lead a person that is uninformed of the texts of these translations to think that, like the LV, the NIV and NASB have changed the Word of God. Disagree with the modernity of the translations. Disagree with the choice of Hebrew and Greek MSS used in their translations. Believe that the KJV is without error--if you can truly believe that a translation by fallible men can be without error (that assertion sounds more Catholic than Baptist). But do not insinuate that a modern translation--because it is modern--is of necessity a corrupt translation. There has only ever been one perfect manuscript and that would be the original autographa, which no person has. What we have today, and even the translators of the KJV 1611 would agree, is a good translation of a good copy of a word perfect original. That which makes a translation good is if it is accurately translated from both the Hebrew and Greek MSS that the translators have before them and from which they work to produce an accurate translation of the Bible into modern or contemporary language.

Dr. Ray Mitchell,

Pastor, First Baptist Church

Pastor Ed Rice wrote:

Dear Dr. Mitchell,

Greetings in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

I thank you for the feedback and I agree with you on the Latin Vulgate issue. I did not mean to imply that the Latin Vulgate was slipped into the modernist ecumenical international bibles, only that the bad doctrine of the modernist ecumenicals was slipped into their bibles. I stand corrected.

I am interested in additional clarification from you, if you may find the time, on the other issue you herein address. Modernists have long denied the verbal, plenary, inerrant, infallible, inspiration of God's Word, and lead into that denial with the very arguments that you herein present. There is no, and there never has been a set of 'original autographs', therefore, in extending that flawed logic, there is no, and never has been, and never will be, a verbally inspired Holy Bible. In reading your argument for there being no such thing as an inerrant Bible, I am curious where you might draw your lines to take some position on the verbal, plenary, inerrant, infallible, inspiration of God's Word. Each of these adjectives has been intertwined in Bible doctrine since Adam; is it your intent to just rip out inerrancy and keep the others intact? Or to fray the whole doctrine of Bible inspiration? To me that is the crux of the dilemma. I stand by my assertion that the KJV translators had a firm handle on the verbal, plenary, inerrant, infallible, inspiration of God's Word and there are no modern translation teams, ergo no modern bible translations, which hold to that doctrine. You?

I am still exploring and documenting this later thesis and would honestly appreciate hearing your convictions.

Pastor Ed Rice

Hi Pastor Rice:

It sounds as though I may need to clarify a couple of things from my note to you.

1. I do not deny the inerrancy of the Scriptures. What I believe is that while the original autographs of the writers of the Scriptures are lost or destroyed—or some other word to use of their inaccessibility, we do in fact possess the Word of God in that our English translations are an accurate translation of the Greek and Hebrew manuscripts that are available and that were used in the translation process.

2. I believe that “all Scripture is given by inspiration of God” but I do not think that it can be said that the copies of Greek and Hebrew manuscripts themselves or the translations from the copies can be raised to the level of inspiration lest we have to hold to a double inspiration theory. This is why I said that while the originals are perfect because of verbal and plenary inspiration which means that they must also be inerrant and infallible, they are the only ones that we can say that of with absolute certainty.

What I mean is that while there is over 98% agreement among all of the Gk. MSS because there is not total agreement, it begs the question whether any are perfect copies and if so which ones; and how can one know with certainty? But lest you think that I am saying that we cannot have the Word of God then, I believe we do have the Word of God. Scholars have demonstrated that even with the minor variations (none of which impact core doctrinal issues) that the Word of God has been preserved through the copies (over 5,300 known Gk. MSS and portions) and that the English translations that are true to the MSS can with confidence be called the Word of God.

3. I agree with you that the translators of the KJV had a firm grasp on the issues of the verbal and plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, and that they believed because of inspiration that the Word of God is both infallible and inerrant. Yet they also confessed in their preface to the KJV that theirs was not a perfect work because they were not perfect men. They did not hold to the view of double inspiration. I submit to you the following from the KJV translators:

“We do not deny, nay we affirm and avow, that the very meanest translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men or our profession, (for we have seen none of theirs of the whole Bible as yet) containeth the word of God, nay, is the Word of God.”

“Yet before we end, we must answer a third cabil and objection of theirs against us, for altering and amending our translations so oft; wherein truly they deal hardly, and strangely with us. For to whomever was it imputed for a fault (by such as were wise) to go over that which he had done, and amend it where he saw cause.” They appear to have understood that they were indeed fallible men charged with an incredible task of translation that might need to be improved upon over time.

4. You must be aware that even the translators of the KJV 1611 with a high view of verbal and plenary inspiration wrestled with the best way to translate into the English language. These men offered variant readings in the margins when they were uncertain of the correct reading. The original 1611 had 4,223 marginal notes and 2,738 alternative readings.

The translators said “They that are wise, had rather have their judgments at liberty in differences of reading, than to be captivated to one, when it may be the other.

5. With respect to those that have worked arduously to produce modern translations, how have you concluded that all of them have a low view of inspiration and inerrancy? I would submit to you that some translations—gender neutral as an example—may be guilty of this (I agree with you that words have meaning and God knew the words that he wanted to use). But on the other hand, some translations that reflect dynamic equivalence (NIV, NLT) versus formal equivalence (KJV, NKJV, NASB) should not automatically be reduced to the conclusion that there is a low view of verbal and plenary inspiration or of a lack of conviction with respect to inerrancy. Also, some translations have been produced from other MSS other than the Textus Receptus with the decision to do so based evidence such as the dating of MSS and the number of MSS available. The decision to use something other than the TR is actually based on a high view of inspiration and inerrancy and the belief that the earlier copies just might be closer in agreement to the original autographa.

I hope this helps you to understand my position. I have a true appreciation for the inspiration and the inerrancy of the Scriptures. I truly believe that the Bible that I preach from (NKJV in my case) is a good translation of a good copy (copies) of the word perfect original.

Please write me and let me know your thoughts. I will be happy to clarify or explain additionally if need be. God bless your ministry this weekend.

Sincerely in Christ,

Ray Mitchell, D.Min.

Dr. Ray Mitchell

Greetings in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ,

(I have sent a bcc of this correspondence to some friends who share a keen interest in the subject matter)

I greatly appreciate your response to my questioning your stance on inerrancy, and I am a little set back by it. Those who meticulously contrast the 'original autographa' against the grossly edited, revised, and modified versions passed on without preservation via fallible scribes, inept editors and mislead translators generally have their chisel deeply set into a crack of inerrancy with their intent on dividing our final authority and separating it from a sound doctrine of inspiration. You seem to be dancing with these Biblical critics and antagonists while remaining distant, or oblivious to their purposes. What gives?

Before engaging any rhetoric about double inspiration and the accuracy of the King James Bible, I wish to further explore our miscommunication about the roots of this problem. **Bible criticism, both higher and lower, is a diabolical scheme to unhinge Biblical authority, which at the first contends that no one has an accurate, inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Bible.** In direct contrast and exactly opposite to that statement is your argument that the departure from the TR (and I presume then also from the OT Masoretic Text) “is actually based on a high view of inspiration and inerrancy and the belief that the earlier copies just might be closer in agreement to the original autographa.” This is the hub of our departure, and we herein move in completely opposite directions.

Endless talk about translation accuracies and where inspiration may or may not begin or end will not resolve this major departure in convictions. I dare not attack individual motives. Doubtless some think they are doing God a great service in combining old discarded Alexandrian manuscripts with careful textual criticism to restore the original autographa that He lost through scribal error and through the 'Early Church Fathers' being incompetent editors. I contend they are sincere, but sincerely wrong. They, and perhaps you, have misread the motivations of higher and lower Bible criticism, and are aptly playing into the diabolical scheme.

In light, and to shed light, on this primal disagreement I am sending my article on the motivations that moved the NKJV translator team away from the Masoretic Text of the OT. The NKJV translator team seemed to start with a noble purpose, and even a couple of honestly born again believers intact. There are, however, motivations other than restoring the 'original autographa' that prompt the rush to the copyright offices. But I do wish to hear from you about the major departure we seem to have at the hub of this whole issue. Is it major? Is it irreconcilable? Is it the hub?

In Christ,

Pastor Ed Rice

## NEW King James Bible? The Subtle Door To Grossest Compromise

The “New King James Bible” (NKJV) is titled and constructed upon lies, deceit and twisted half truth throughout. Its final aim was not to present the truth of God, but to manipulate itself into a rich market of copyrighted Bible translations. It has nothing to do with “King James” but put such into its title with marketing guile. It promised it would not alter from the Greek Textus Receptus which was the basis for the Authorized Version's New Testament, but the times that they did deviate from the TR did not make up the required 60,000 “significant deviations from all previous works!” They needed these deviations to secure their copyright privileges. They made up the shortage of about 59,000 'significant deviations' by discarding the accepted and accurate Jewish Masoretic<sup>1</sup> Hebrew Text. With deceit and malice the preface of the NKJV (which is NOT King James and NOT related to the KJB) introduces their Old Testament Text with a whole paragraph defending the righteous accuracy of the Masoretic text. They then do a shell shuffle of all the revisions and versions of *Biblia Hebraica* until what was accepted as the Masoretic Text, the Daniel Bomberg first Rabbinic Bible of 1516, called the Ben Chayyim Masoretic Text<sup>2</sup>, the true Hebrew Text, ends up discarded, and the hero of textual criticism, the previously discarded ben Asher text, comes to the forefront because it is the “oldest dated manuscript.” This twisted 'older is always better' philosophy of textual critics, the philosophy that brings up old but corrupted texts from Alexandria Egypt, and now restores the rejected and discarded 12<sup>th</sup> century ben Asher Hebrew text, is the plight of all modernist Bible translators. And it is now the plight of the NKJB (which is NOT King James and NOT related to the KJB) translators for their Old Testament translation.

In their final paragraph they reach into the muddied water and covertly reveal that they only had “frequent comparisons being made with the Bomberg edition of 1524-25.” They never clarify that this Bomberg edition is, and has for 400 years been the only accepted Masoretic Text, nor that this Ben Chayyim Masoretic Text was accepted as the text that Jesus referenced, and that scribes had hand copied for 2000 years previous. “For the New King James Version the text used was the 1967/77 Stuttgart edition of the *Biblia Hebraica*, ... The Septuagint (Greek) Version of the Old Testament and the Latin Vulgate also were consulted. In addition to referring to a variety of ancient version of the Hebrew Scriptures, the New King James Version draws on the resources of relevant manuscripts from the Dead Sea caves.”<sup>3</sup>

Both the NIV and the NASV had already used the BHK (*Biblia Hebraica Kittel*, from Rudolf Kittel in 1937) and that left the NKJV (which is NOT King James and NOT related to the KJV) translators with a German BHS (*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, from Stuttgart Germany, of 1967/77). They had to have a significant textual source deviation from previous works to obtain a clear copyright, which, again, for a work the size of the Bible, needed to demonstrate approximately 60,000 'significant deviations' from ALL previous works! Their preface then reluctantly admits a necessary further departure from the textual accuracy of the Masoretic Text. Remember that Jesus Christ himself said this, the Masoretic Text, was accurate and preserved in not only words, but in every letter, and in every jot or tittle part of a letter! The result is, for English speaking people, you should ALWAYS have a KJB open to any Old Testament passage with your NKJV (which is NOT King James and NOT related to the KJV) to guard against the >20,000 textual changes they accepted into their base Hebrew text, and to tell if Psalm 2 is talking about all 'nations raging' or just 'the heathen raging', the one includes Israel, the accurate one does not. The other choice, is to learn the difference between thee and thou, and you and your, and cast off the polluted Bible and their significant deviations altogether. I wholly recommend this latter solution to the Bible accuracy question.

---

1 “The word '*Masoretic*' comes from *masor* a Hebrew word meaning '*traditional*.' The Masoretes handed down this text from generation to generation, guarded it and kept it.” Dr. Wait pg 20

2 Waite, D.A., “Defending the King James Bible” © 2002, The Bible For Today Press, pg 21,27

3 “Preface to The New King James Version” © 1982 by Thomas Nelson Inc., as recorded in “The New Scofield Study Bible”, Oxford University Press, pg xvi