

ROME AND THE R.S.V.

An address given by Dr. Hugh Farrell of California at the Annual Meeting of the Trinitarian Bible Society at Bridewell Hall, London, on Saturday, May 25th, 1968.

Dr. Hugh Farrell's experience

Before reading the address, it may be of interest to our readers to know how Dr. Farrell, formerly a Roman Catholic monk, came to be speaking at the annual meeting of the T.B.S. "for the circulation of Protestant or uncorrupted versions of the Word of God".

Dr. Farrell was born of Roman Catholic parents in Denver, Colorado, U.S.A., and when he reached manhood became a member of the Discalced (barefooted) Carmelite Fathers, one of the strictest monastic orders in the Roman Catholic Church.

With the passing of time his studies in dogmatic and moral theology caused him to doubt the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. Becoming deeply troubled over his lack of faith he escaped from the monastery and some time later entered the Protestant ministry. For the next fifteen years he served in various pulpits throughout the United States, but was not happy. As he states himself, "I was not truly converted". Indeed his unhappiness was so evident that his Roman Catholic friends persuaded him to return to the Roman Catholic Church and he spent a month at the Trappist Monastery in Lafayette, Oregon. But his sojourn there convinced him that he could no longer believe the teachings of Rome.

At length, after these many years, a zealous Christian layman led him to Christ. His life was changed and since that day he has devoted himself to the proclamation of that Gospel through which he has found lasting peace and certainty of salvation. In the pursuit of this ministry he has preached in the United States, Canada and many parts of Europe.

For many years Dr. Farrell has been deeply interested in the Trinitarian Bible Society, and on a number of occasions he has addressed meetings on behalf of the Society at various places in the U.S.A., where the work and testimony of the Society, and its complete independence of the ecumenical movement, are valued by many who are concerned in the propagation of the Word, and the preservation of its purity.

Rome's predominance foreseen

Over a year ago, back home in U.S.A., to which I returned in 1966 from the British Isles, I was going over my notes and trying to decide what to throw away. Because of my background, I have to read most Roman Catholic periodicals. As many of you know, because I can see many friends here today, for many years I was a Roman Catholic monk, and then for fifteen years a "liberal" Protestant minister, and finally in 1955 I had a real experience and was truly converted. During the years that I have been coming to the British Isles, and this is my eighth trip, I have accumulated a great deal of material, and as I get nearer to sixty, and remembering that the Scriptures speak of "three score years and ten", I decided that I should dispose of what I have, and thus not depend upon relatives, or make them unhappy, if they have to decide what to throw away. While I was looking over my material I came to the realisation that two of the things I had spoken about coming some day had already arrived—that the R.C. Church in the English-speaking world especially would eventually achieve predominance, politically and educationally—and I realised that this had occurred. For a moment I thought—"Well, my battle is over, I have lost, we have all lost temporarily, but the final judgment is with God". Then I thought—what can they do now? Once you are in the rider's seat politically, and also in the rider's seat educationally, you seem to have control of the nation.

Corruption of the Scriptures

Then I realised that the final step must be the distortion of God's Word. In other words, no organisation can triumph unless it destroys the testimony against itself, if that organisation is in error. Now the days of Bible burning are over in most places. That is no longer the thing to do under the ecumenical movement. It is highly frowned upon, as a matter of fact, and would only alienate people, and might even prevent an organisation from achieving its purpose. But by subtly introducing differences into the pure Word of God they can gradually achieve the same purpose as Bible burning. They do not have to burn Bibles, they merely have to change a word here and there, so that it is no longer according to the original text, and if they use what they consider a more suitable word, they have achieved their purpose.

I am very sorry to tell you that in my own country, the U.S.A., the majority of evangelicals are not only totally unaware of this, but it seems that they do not wish to know—for several reasons—but the most important reason is that if they have this knowledge, they must make a stand, if they believe in the pure, unadulterated Word of God. This they do not want to do, because it will cost them too much. In much of the world today we want our faith in God to be easy. We do not want to make sacrifices. We merely want to enjoy all the benefits of believing in the Triune God, without any of the responsibilities.

Subtle differences

Today I am merely going to take one book, one translation, and show you how subtly these differences can be introduced gradually, and how eventually any organisation can thus achieve its purpose of destroying the Scriptural testimony against itself. I have been asked to speak on the Revised Standard Version Roman Catholic edition. There was great elation when this was published. As a matter of fact, I was conducting a series of meetings in the Free Church at Welwyn, and the Pastor there, the Rev. Ian Tait, knowing how much I would like to possess a copy, not for my spiritual edification, but rather for my investigation, presented me with a copy at the end of the meeting, and I was very pleased to receive it.

Before I speak on this R.S.V.R.C. edition, let me point out to you an advertisement that appeared in the R.C. weekly paper, the "Universe", recently. It says, "Virtue's Catholic Bible, gloriously illustrated with 370 full colour plates." (All the lives of the "saints" are portrayed in this book, and all of the paintings of the Madonna.) It is described as "the world's most beautiful Bible, with countless features *not found in any other Bible*". I was amused when I read that, as it is certainly true, and these are not found in the R.S.V. "Coloured photographs of the late Pope John xxiii, gold embossing, maroon binding, the words of Christ in red, the stations of the cross in colour;" (they are not in the Bible, of course); "the Rosary explained and illustrated; glorious colour photographs of the Mass; the life of our Lord pictured in full colour; 266 pages of the Catholic Dictionary, 43 coloured maps, a family register, 16 pages on Rome and the Vatican". That is what you get if you buy Virtue's "Catholic Bible".

Towards a Common Bible

You can see that this is a Bible you would never pick up. You might glance at it out of curiosity, but you certainly would not take it home or use it in your Bible study, because immediately you would see that it is nothing more than a glorified R.C. prayer book. On the other hand the R.S.V. itself has deceived many, including many evangelicals. I have heard repeatedly from the lips of evangelicals here, as well as in the U.S.A., "Is it not wonderful that we have in the R.S.V. what can now be used as a *Common Bible*?" We know that it is not the new Common Bible, which has been spoken of, but is still in the future. They are trying to decide upon which sources to use. The R.S.V. is at this present time as near as possible a *Common Bible* between R.C.s and Protestants. Why am I worried about this? You may say that it is true that we do not approve of the R.S.V., and I was very happy to pick up at the book-stall here this article on the errors of the R.S.V., "The Divine Original", and there are no doubt copies available for any who are interested. I am not going to dwell on this, as there are others here much better qualified to do so, but I am going to point out from the introduction just what the R.C. Church intends to promote and accomplish by introducing this version.

“Catholic Tradition”

I am reading from their new R.C.R.S.V. “In the present edition the aim has not been to improve the translation itself. No doubt there are many places where a different rendering might have been chosen on critical grounds. This has been avoided, but there are other places where, the critical evidence being evenly balanced, the considerations of *Catholic tradition* have favoured a particular rendering or inclusion of a passage omitted by the R.S.V.” This refers to a number of passages which I will read to you, including Luke 1. 26, “In the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent of God to a city of Galilee named Nazareth, to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David, and the virgin’s name was Mary. And he came to her and said, ‘Hail, full of grace! The Lord is with thee’.” As you know, the most common prayer in the R.C. Church is, “Hail Mary, full of grace! The Lord is with thee”. What they have done is to put specifically into the mouth of the angel Gabriel the “Angelic Salutation”, as they call this prayer. Although you recognise the difference immediately because you know the A.V., think what may happen a few generations hence, when this R.S.V. is used as the “Common Bible” between Protestants and R.C.s. The R.S.V. they hope will almost be out of print, and this R.C.R.S.V. will be in the homes of future generations unless something happens, and therefore the people will accept these words as being precisely what the angel Gabriel uttered—“Hail, full of grace! The Lord is with thee”. Now you may think there is not much difference between this and “Hail favoured one”, or something like that, but there is a difference and it is important because it is their intention to plant the very words that they use, so that in future they will be the very words that you will repeat in your memory work. Eventually you will come to accept the words of the “Hail Mary”, the “Ave Maria”, the prayer used by Roman Catholics as being absolutely Scriptural. You will not in any way be repelled by it, and you will say—That is precisely what the Angel Gabriel said.

The Apocrypha

I read on in the introduction—it is always important to read the introduction of a book before spending money on it, as you may find sufficient there to convince you that you do not want the book after all—and come to a reference to the Apocrypha. They have placed the Apocryphal Books, not at the end of the Old Testament, but rather in the position where they feel they belong historically. The introduction states, “In the 16th century, the Reformers rejected the extra books, partly because some of the teaching contained in them seemed to favour Roman doctrine” (*indeed that is precisely why they did so*), “but chiefly because they were not in the Hebrew canon.” That is also perfectly right, these Books never were in the Hebrew canon and were not recognised as divinely inspired, so the introduction tells the truth to this extent. Those who know the true Word of God, if they read

this introduction, will be put off buying it, because of these two statements. "Finally, the Council of Trent issued its decree on the canon of Holy Scriptures in 1546, declaring that all the books which it has been the custom to read in the Catholic Church, and which were contained in the ancient Latin Vulgate Bible, must be accepted as sacred and canonical". The decree gave a list of books in question, which in fact coincided with the list issued by the earlier *councils of the West*.

Roman Catholic Councils

Let me put you wise to something here. Whenever the Roman Church speaks of "*the councils of the West*", they are speaking of Roman Catholic councils, because all of the councils in which the Greek and Roman Church took part were held in the East. Very cleverly, when they refer to "the West", they are speaking of the councils of Lateran, Vienne, Lyons, and so on. It sounds very imposing, and you would imagine, if you did not know any Church history, that they were speaking of the ecumenical councils of the early Church, but from the time when the Greek Orthodox Church, as it is called today, separated from Rome, all the councils of the Roman Church were held in the West. The decree of Trent gave a list which coincided with the list approved by "the councils of the West". It is interesting to note that although 3rd and 4th Esdras and the Prayer of Manasses were excluded from the list, "they were printed at the end of many Bibles in Latin, lest they should altogether be lost". On this we comment that there is no reason why they should not be lost. I would say by the same authority that this R.C.R.S.V. edition should include the "Gospel of Thomas" and the "Gospel of Peter".

I remember many years ago, when I was in the seminary, studying theology in the R.C. Church, we read portions of some of these books which have been almost altogether lost. They were not divinely inspired, of course, but they read nicely, and I remember one story that lifted us up tremendously, because we did not know the Scriptures. The story was that when Christ was a child with the other children in Nazareth they were making little clay animals and He made a bird. When He had finished making it, He breathed on it and it flew away. We thought this was lovely, but even at that time, before I knew the Scriptures, I wondered how it could be that those same children, twenty years later, could take Him out to the brow of a hill intending to throw Him over a precipice, because they certainly did not recognise His Messianic ministry. If they had played with Him and had seen Him make animals from clay and breathe life into them, surely they would have realised that He was an exceptional person, and they would have been willing to listen to Him. It is quite clear that it was not until His public ministry that they had any inkling of His claims, and that He had never made them until He had presented Himself as the Messiah promised in the prophecies of the Old Testament.

There was also another story which seemed to have the essential ingredients of Scripture, but is not found in the Bible. When Jesus,

Mary and Joseph were fleeing into Egypt, when Herod was seeking to destroy the child, they took refuge in a cave and a spider came and spun many webs over the cave, so that when the soldiers came, they looked at the cave and said, "Why waste our time there as it is obvious that this cave has not been occupied for fifty or sixty years". These are beautiful stories to edify the monks as they sit in the refectory, but those stories are not sacred Scripture, and when the canon was closed they were excluded, because they did not speak of the divinity of Christ like the prophecies of the Old Testament and they did not fulfil their words.

Protestants and the Apocrypha

To continue with the introduction, "The positions taken up in the 6th century with regard to the O.T. canon are substantially the same as those held today. The aim of this edition is to show that there is more common ground for the practical purpose of Bible reading than perhaps appears at first sight. Thus there is an *increasing tendency on the part of Protestants* to include the Apocrypha in their Bibles without necessarily admitting its inspired and canonical character. On the other hand Roman Catholics do not today attach the same significance to the traditional order of the Books in the O.T. as they once did". By this statement our dear friends in the R.C. Church admit the sovereign inspiration of God's Word, but they discount it and point out that all these things can change with the centuries.

There are many changes in this R.S.V., but I do not have time to go into them, and possibly I have not seen even one-tenth of them. I read it through this year in conjunction with my devotional study in hope that by picking out the variations I might be able to point them out to others. There was one thing that I noticed and checked with the R.S.V. immediately, and I can see why the Roman Catholics were very pleased at having the R.S.V. so that they might alter *some* points and did not have to alter *all*.

"Mortal" and "Venial" sin

In the 5th Chapter of the First Epistle of John, verse 16, we read—"If anyone sees his brother committing what is *not a mortal sin*, he will ask, and God will give him life for those whose sin is not mortal. There is a sin which is mortal. I do not say that we should pray for that. All wrong doing is sin, but there is a sin which is not mortal." This is substantially the same in the R.S.V. in both the Protestant and R.C. editions. In the Roman Catholic Church two kinds of sin are recognised—"venial" and "mortal". The expression "mortal sin" is very commonly used among Roman Catholics, as these are sins you must confess. *Venial sin* may be forgiven by an "act of contrition", private acknowledgement before God, while *mortal sin* must be confessed to the priest. This terminology was in the R.S.V. already, and in the Roman Catholic edition they did not need to change it, because it favours their cause.

Insidious introduction of false doctrine

There are many other places in here, almost too numerous to mention, in which the text has been slightly altered, but in the slight alteration of the text is the poison. It is not the poison that can creep into your lives today, because you know better, but remember that as this R.S.V. text is gradually accepted, not only among Roman Catholics, but also among evangelicals, it could well become the Bible of the home, the Bible read at daily devotions, the Bible studied and perhaps also the Bible memorised. The result would be the complete introduction of Roman Catholic doctrine even into evangelical households.

How careful we must be. All medicine dispensed in this country, as well as in my country, must if it is poisonous, have "POISON" written on the label. This is the law, and any pharmacist who disregards it can lose his licence or even be imprisoned, but poison introduced in the name of Holy Scripture is being spread throughout the world today, and it is only a Society like the Trinitarian Bible Society that can warn the people and help to prevent the further spread of such a poison.

The Roman Catholic Edition of the R.S.V. New Testament

A brief review by the Secretary of the Trinitarian Bible Society

With "ecclesiastical approval", and by agreement with the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., owners of the copyright, a Committee of the Catholic Biblical Association of Great Britain has produced a new edition of the Revised Standard Version, specially prepared for use by "Catholics". According to the introduction, the committee regarded the work as "a wonderful opportunity to make a real step forward in the field of ecumenical relations", and their aim was "to make the minimum number of alterations and to change only what seemed absolutely necessary in the light of Catholic Tradition". Their objective was "to produce a Bible common to all Christians . . . a version of the Word of God which would be a unifying link, not only in theory, but in fact, so that those engaged in theological discussion could appeal to the same *authoritative text*".

The foreword by H. E. Cardinale, Archbishop of Nepte, Apostolic Delegate to Great Britain, assures the reader that "English-speaking Catholics can now use with ecclesiastical approval a translation of the New Testament which has been widely acclaimed for its accuracy and elegance". The Archbishop also expresses his conviction that the new version will prove "a valuable basis for ecumenical dialogue as the world waits for all of us to proclaim our restored fellowship in Christ, holding the one apostolic faith and preaching the one Gospel". One more sentence from the foreword should be sufficient to convince discriminating evangelical readers of the utterly unreliable character of this publication. The Archbishop continues, "This version has been so edited as to make it acceptable to Catholic readers".

Alterations in the Text and Footnotes

Of the sixty-eight passages affected by these changes fifteen are of little significance, twelve relate to the present equivalents of ancient coins, and eighteen substitute "brethren" for "brothers". Eighteen passages omitted from the R.S.V. text are restored in the Roman Catholic edition, but footnotes assert that they are omitted by some ancient manuscripts. There are two small alterations in the text, with footnotes allowing the alternative reading, and there are only three passages which are altered in the text without any marginal note in favour of the discarded reading. These are in Hebrews 11. 19, where "hence, figuratively speaking, he did receive him back", is altered to "hence he did receive him back, and this was a symbol"; 1 Thesalonians 4. 4, where "how to take a wife for himself", becomes "how

to control his own body"; and 1 Corinthians 4. 6, where "to live according to Scripture", becomes "not to go beyond what is written".

Roman Catholic Dogma in the notes

The explanatory notes on six passages assert the *primacy of Peter*:
Matthew 16. 18, "Jesus makes Peter the foundation upon which the Church is to be built."

Matthew 16. 19, "Peter has the key to the gates of the city of God. This power is exercised through the Church . . . Not only can Peter admit to the kingdom; he also has power to make authoritative decisions in matters of faith or morals."

Matthew 18. 18, "To the other apostles is given a share of the authority given to Peter."

John 21. 15-17, "Jesus gives Peter charge over his flock."

1 Corinthians 1. 12, "It does not follow from this that Peter had ever been to Corinth, but it does indicate his *authority* there."

2 Timothy 4. 21, "Linus was, according to tradition, the successor of Peter in the see of Rome."

If the Roman Catholic reader buys his R.S.V. "Catholic Edition" in a Roman Catholic book shop, he will be able to purchase at the same time "The Convert's Catechism" compiled by the Jesuit Alexander Gito. There he will read in paragraph 87, "**Why is the Bishop of Rome the Head of the Church?** The Bishop of Rome is the Head of the Church because he is the successor of St. Peter, whom Christ appointed to be head of the Church. The Catholic Church will last for ever and there will always be a Pope in this world. St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome and the first Pope". In paragraph 91 he will read, "The Pope is the Shepherd and teacher of all Christians, because Christ made St. Peter the Shepherd of the whole flock when He said, 'Feed my lambs, feed my sheep' . . . The Pope, as Head of the Church, has the divine command to teach all men, to feed the lambs and sheep of Christ's flock".

Roman Catholics who use their new edition of the R.S.V. will find this kind of erroneous teaching endorsed both in the text and in the notes. The version has been edited "*to make it acceptable to Catholic readers*".

The Immaculate Conception and Perpetual Virginity of Mary

The Church of Rome teaches that Mary was born without sin and supports this error with Luke 1. 28, "Hail full of grace". The Roman Catholic R.S.V. brings this formula back into the text in order to make it conform with the private and public devotions of millions of Roman Catholics throughout the world. There is a "Simple Prayer Book" published by the Catholic Truth Society. Eight and a half million copies have been printed and circulated. The "Lord's Prayer" is followed by the "Hail Mary"—"Hail, Mary, *full of grace*, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women and blessed is the fruit

of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners, now and at the hour of our death. Amen.”

In the same “Simple Prayer Book” immediately after the Apostles’ Creed there is a “confession”—“I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary *ever a virgin* . . . that I have sinned . . . Therefore I beseech blessed Mary *ever a virgin* . . . to pray to the Lord our God for me”. This dogma of the perpetual virginity of Mary is disturbed by any Scripture which appears to suggest that Mary had other children beside Jesus. For this reason eighteen passages are slightly altered and notes referring to Matt. 1. 25, Matt. 12. 46 and Luke 2. 7 imply that Mary had no other children.

Baptismal Regeneration

A note relating to 2 Corinthians 3. 18 affirms that, “Cleansed in baptism through the power of the Holy Spirit, our soul shines with the reflected glory of God”. We refer again to the “Convert’s Catechism” for the approved teaching of the Church of Rome on the subject.

“What is Baptism?”

(Catechism Question 256)

“Baptism is a Sacrament which cleanses us from original sin, makes us Christians, children of God, and members of the Church.” Paragraph 261. “Our Lord calls Baptism a second birth because the soul then receives a higher spiritual life from God.”

The note in the R.C.R.S.V. again brings the teaching of Scripture into conformity with the teaching of the Roman Church.

The Mass

Even the Roman Catholic Mass finds a place in this new edition of the New Testament. A note on Revelation 4. 8 reminds the reader that the words, “Holy, holy, holy”, are quoted in the *Sanctus* at Mass. “What is the Holy Mass?” (Convert’s Catechism Question 277). “The Holy Mass is the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, really present on the altar under the appearances of bread and wine, and offered to God for the living and the dead.” We are again reminded that this version has been specially edited “*to make it acceptable to Catholic readers*”.

The translators

In other respects the Roman Catholic edition exhibits the same doctrinal and textual deficiencies as the Revised Standard Version upon which it was based.

Some of the translators of the Revised Standard Version have written articles which indicate that they do not acknowledge the Bible doctrines of the Deity of Christ, His pre-existence, His Virgin birth, His atoning sacrifice and present intercession in heaven. A translator who has adopted an entirely *humanitarian* view of the Son of God, and is prepared to respect only His ideal humanity and to disregard

His claims to full deity, is likely to betray his erroneous views in his translation. That this deficiency is apparent in the R.S.V., and in the so-called "Catholic Edition" of it, is demonstrated by the examples given below.

The advocates of the R.S.V. endeavour to assure their readers that the numerous changes in the text do not affect any fundamental doctrine. They allege that the alterations are exclusively dictated by newly-discovered manuscripts and the gains of scholarly research in the Biblical languages. These assurances are not in accordance with the facts. Fundamental doctrines relating to the Person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ are weakened and obscured in the R.S.V. and the translators appear to have made some changes on dogmatic rather than linguistic or documentary grounds.

The miraculous birth of the Lord Jesus Christ obscured

The Roman Catholic edition attempts to correct the unitarian bias of the R.S.V. in a few places, but many dangerous errors are left in the text. For instance, the offensive footnote in the first edition of the R.S.V. at Matthew 1. 16 suggesting that Joseph was the father of Jesus is given no place in the R.C. edition. On the other hand, the text of Matthew 1. 24 omits the word "firstborn" and thus obscures the literal fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah 7. 14 and weakens the emphasis on the Virgin Birth of our Lord.

His Divine Sonship obscured

Mark 1. 1, "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God".

The R.S.V. has a footnote—Other ancient authorities omit the "Son of God". Biblical scholars have been erratically omitting and inserting these words in the Greek Text and English translations for several generations. The testimony for their inclusion is overwhelming, and even the translators of the N.E.B. were constrained to admit that "the Son of God" is the best attested reading. There is a note to this effect in the Greek Text underlying the N.E.B. edited by Professor R. G. V. Tasker.

His Resurrection and Ascension

The R.S.V. relegated Mark 16. 9-20 to the margin. The R.C. edition restores this passage to the text, but has a marginal note casting doubt upon the genuineness of the passage. The R.S.V. also omitted *Luke 24. 40*, which states that the risen Lord showed His disciples His hands and His feet to prove the reality of His death and resurrection; *Luke 24. 51*, "He was carried up into heaven"; and the declaration in *Luke 24. 52* that His disciples *worshipped* Him. The R.C. edition restores these passages to the text but inserts footnotes implying that their genuineness is doubtful.

Belief in Jesus as God removed from John 6. 47

The Lord Jesus Christ said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life". The implication of His

words is that to believe on Him is to believe on God, whom to know is life eternal. The R.S.V. omits the words "on me", reducing the statement to, "He who believes has eternal life". The implication of this new reading is that whoever believes in God has eternal life. Belief in Jesus as God no longer has a place in the text. This weakened rendering would be quite acceptable to any who deny the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, and this error is retained in the R.C. edition.

Peter's Testimony to "Christ the Son of the Living God" rejected

John 6. 69, "We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God". The R.C. edition follows the R.S.V. in reducing this to, "We have believed and have come to know that you are the Holy One of God". Thus another declaration of His unique Divine Sonship is lost. The new reading is more palatable to unitarians. Admittedly, the "Holy One" is a title of great dignity, but it does not attribute Sonship to the Person addressed.

His use of the title "The Son of God" denied

In John 9. 35 the Lord Jesus Christ asks the man whose sight He has miraculously restored, "Dost thou believe on the Son of man?" and thus eliminates this clear personal testimony of our Lord concerning His own Divine Sonship. Admittedly the title "Son of man" is used elsewhere, but here there is a clear reference to His unique relationship to the Father. The R.S.V. and the R.C. edition both destroy the important doctrinal teaching of this verse.

Testimony to His Divine Sonship omitted

When Philip preached the Gospel to the Ethiopian, as recorded in Acts 8. 36, 37, the Ethiopian asked for baptism and "Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God". The text of the R.S.V. and R.C. edition both omit this affirmation of the Ethiopian's faith in Christ as the Son of God.

The Deity of Christ obscured in Acts 20. 28

Paul admonished the elders at Ephesus, "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". This is altered in the R.S.V. and R.C. editions to read, ". . . the church of the Lord, which he obtained with his own blood", and a marginal note offers the alternative reading, "WITH THE BLOOD OF HIS OWN". This is entirely different. The correct reading asserts that the flock was purchased with the blood of One who was God—"the church of God . . . purchased with His own blood". The marginal reading dilutes this testimony and merely declares that God purchased the church with the blood of one who was His own. This reading removes the testimony to the deity of the Redeemer.

The Deity of Christ obscured in Romans 9. 5

The Apostle Paul writes of his own "kinsmen according to the flesh . . . Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen". This is the plainest possible declaration that Christ is God, but the R.S.V. introduces a radical change by adjusting the punctuation so that the statement reads, "To them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh is the Christ. God who is over all be blessed for ever. Amen". The R.S.V. relegates the true reading to a secondary place in a marginal note. The R.S.V. text merely acknowledges that the Messiah was of human descent from the patriarchs and then in a separate sentence pronounces a blessing upon God who is over all. This passage no longer declares that Christ is God. In the R.C. edition the correct punctuation is given in the text, and the erroneous punctuation is offered as an admissible alternative in the margin. The falsehood is still there for those who prefer it to the true rendering.

The Judgment Seat of Christ abolished in Romans 14. 10

The Holy Spirit inspired the Apostle Paul to write, "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ". This clearly implies that the Son is one with the Father in judgment and is consistent with the Saviour's own words, "The Father . . . hath committed all judgment unto the Son".

The R.S.V. and R.C. edition change the text to read "the judgment seat of God", and thus another testimony to the deity of Christ and His equality with the Father disappears.

The Pre-existence of the Son as Lord in Heaven discredited

1 Corinthians 15. 47, "The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven". In the R.S.V. and R.C. editions this becomes merely, "the second man is from heaven". This is at variance with the whole teaching of God's Word on the mysterious incarnation of the Saviour. He did not come from heaven as man. "He was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the virgin Mary." In this appointed way, "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us". He was eternally with the Father as the Son of God, but He was not eternally with the Father as man. In the incarnation He fulfilled His eternal purpose and took our human nature and "was found in fashion as a man". In this way, "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons". It is not Scriptural to say that "the second man is from heaven", but it is Scriptural, and the utterance of the Holy Ghost, that "the second man is the *Lord* from heaven".

The Miraculous Incarnation of the Son eliminated from 1 Tim. 3. 16

In the majority of the Greek manuscripts and in the A.V. we read, "God was manifest in the flesh". In the R.S.V. and other modern versions including the R.C. edition this is reduced to "He was mani-

fested in the flesh". This is introduced as the great mystery of our religion. There is nothing mysterious in any person manifest in the flesh. This is true of every human being who has ever lived. The great mystery of our religion is that Christ is God manifest in the flesh. This is true only of Him. The overwhelming evidence for the true reading has been given at length in a separate article, "God was manifest in the flesh".

The R.S.V. has achieved a measure of popularity in the English-speaking world, and some of the Bible Societies have amended their Constitutions in order to promote its circulation. It is often quoted by "evangelical" preachers and widely circulated by "evangelical" organizations. This version, and the Roman Catholic edition of it, are neither elegant nor accurate. Notwithstanding their present popularity and the misleading testimonials to their excellence, there are very good reasons why discerning Christians with a reverent regard for the divine inspiration, authority and inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures should exercise great caution in the use of these versions and refrain from encouraging their general use by undiscerning readers.

"He that hath My Word, let him speak My Word faithfully"
Jeremiah 23. 28.

FOOD FOR HUNGRY SOULS

The spiritual need of the world's millions

While false religious and political systems are making increasing use of the printed word to mislead and enslave the multitudes, professing Christians are being encouraged to support literature campaigns "to feed the minds of the millions".

It is good that people should be concerned with feeding the spiritually hungry, but discerning Christians must be equally insistent that—

THE FOOD MUST BE PURE

If we give a tract—does it contain only the truth of God?

If we give a book—does it proclaim the fullness of the Gospel of Christ?

If we give a Bible—is it a faithful version, setting forth the words which the Holy Ghost teaches, or has it been corrupted and adulterated either by Rome or by the errors of modern Biblical scholarship?

THE FOOD MUST BE PLENTIFUL

Those who are burdened with a sense of the world's great spiritual need, and have a reverent regard for the divine inspiration, authority and inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures are invited to join with the Trinitarian Bible Society in its endeavour to feed the souls of the hungry with the pure food of God's Holy Word, which He has promised to bless and prosper.

"Thy Word is very pure."

It is a fundamental principle of the Trinitarian Bible Society to circulate only Protestant versions of the Holy Scriptures. This booklet demonstrates some of the inherent defects of the Romish versions and the discriminating reader will readily discern that a vital Scriptural principle is involved—*He that hath my Word, let him speak my Word faithfully* (Jeremiah 23. 28). By numerous mistranslations and misleading notes the Roman Catholic R.S.V. obscures the truth and leads the reader astray.