

FOLLOWING JESUS

If any man serve me, let him follow me... (Jn 12:26)

Lesson 10 Final Authority God's Word

OUTLINE

Introduction

II. God's Word is THE final authority

A. Characteristics of revelation

1. Written
2. Preserved
3. Inerrant
4. Infallible
5. Self-declared
6. Unique
7. Effective
8. Objective
9. Ancient
10. Pervasive
11. Supernatural
12. Historically and scientifically accurate
13. Relevant

B. Understanding how we received our Holy Bible and why the King James translation is the best version for English speakers

1. Some history

2. *A More Sure Word* by Dr. R. B. Ouellette

- Foreword & Chapter 1 - Introduction
- Chapter 2 - Understanding the Spirit of the Discussion
- Chapter 3 - Understanding the Terms
- Chapter 4 - Understanding the Trouble
- Chapter 5 - Understanding the Truth
- Chapter 6 - Understanding the Text, Part 1
- Chapter 7 - Understanding the Text, Part 2
- Chapter 8 - Understanding the Translations
- Chapter 9 - Whom Will You Trust

We have spent this last month studying Lesson 10, Final Authority-God's Word. We started by studying the characteristics of revelation, and then moved on to understanding how we received our Bible. And then for the last several weeks we've been studying through Dr. R. B. Ouellette's book, *A More Sure Word*. We have been discovering why the King James Version is the very best translation for English-speaking people. This week we'll conclude Lesson 10 and we'll pick up in *A More Sure Word*, chapter 8, in regard to understanding Bible translations.

PART 5

Chapter 8 - Understanding the Translations (pp. 121-132)

Pt. 1 *God gave His people in His churches the responsibility of protecting and propagating His Word.*

Jesus testifies in His high-priestly prayer to His Father, *Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is **truth*** (John 17:17). And Paul explains in I Timothy 3:15 that the local church is the *pillar and ground of **truth***. So, we can state with Bible authority that the local churches down through history have been used by God to preserve THE ACCURATE INTERPRETATION of His preserved Word. God preserves the Word, and he gives His churches the responsibility to preserve the proper interpretation of the Word.

Have you ever wondered how all the different denominational groups could use the same Bible, but come up with widely different, and often heretical, interpretations of the same Scripture... and then, where those denominational differences came from in the first place? Paul gives us the basis for how all of this happens

there in I Timothy 3:15. When churches go “haywire” and slide off into doctrinal error; they cease to be pillars and foundations for Truth!

You see, God is 100% responsible to preserve His written Word (His revelation to all generations). It's a supernatural job and only He can do it. But God preserves the correct interpretation of that Word through the Holy Spirit working in the minds of His born-again believers ...**in scriptural local churches**. Commission authority rests in local churches; God does his Kingdom work through local churches! So, if/when a local body goes “haywire” in some aspect of doctrinal interpretation and teaching (e.g., works salvation, baptismal salvation, rites-based salvation, church-based salvation, carnality, worldliness, and etc.), then God absolutely will “jerk their badge”, so to speak! He will revoke His franchise of that local assembly by removing *the candlestick*, i.e., as he threatened the local church at Ephesus (Revelation 2:5)! The *candlestick*—from *lookh-nee* ' -ah meaning a lamp-stand—was a double picture of the unction (anointing) and leadership authority/guidance of the Holy Spirit. Both the fuel of the lamp (olive oil) and the flame of the lamp, have been used throughout Scripture, to symbolize the Holy Spirit in his empowerment and leadership ministries. And I want to be sure to point out that Satan brings doctrinal heresies into the local body through two kinds of people. The first, and most obvious, is through lost people! Lost people get into the Lord's churches and they, very naturally, start pushing the church outside the boundaries of God's Word. Jude warns about these often-reprobate individuals. And the second kind of person that Satan uses is the proud and carnal Christian. Satan can use proud, carnal, rebellious Christians just as easy as he can use lost reprobates.

So what happens when God removes the Holy Spirit's unction (anointing) and authority from a local church gone-rogue? First, that now-heretical group spins out of the historical lineage of God's local, independent scriptural churches. But interestingly, God doesn't squelch their voice. You see, God will always persevere in preserving His Truth to every generation, but God will never force men to believe and follow the Truth. Men have free will and they can choose to rebel (as did Cain) and believe a lie. And God will allow them (in their pride and rebellion) to advertise and propagate their lies. Eventually these opposing interpretations of God's truth become different denominations as false teachers lure away the unlearned believers and other rebellious lost men and women.

Ironically, these Divinely-instituted “spin outs” are actually beneficial; it's like bad apples being culled from the barrel! It separates false doctrine from true doctrine and helps maintain the purity of the true doctrine in scriptural, local New Testament assemblies. But these heretical spin-offs can and eventually do become very large, popular and powerful. They actually become majorities (as far as numbers are concerned) in the world of “so-called Christian” religion, (e.g., Catholicism and her Protestant children).

With this process understood, it now becomes clear how God has used his scriptural local church bodies down through the church age to preserve the best Greek text. And the text that has been used and supported by the vast, vast majority of the local churches throughout history has been the “Majority” or “Received” text! It was not until the 19th century A.D. that liberal “scholars” decided that Christianity needed a “better” text, and in opposition to all historical evidence and even negating common sense, they created what we call the Critical text.

Dr. Ouellette then writes, “When we reach a decision concerning which text is authentic, genuine, preserved, and used by Bible-believing churches through history, it is then time to choose a translation” and “You must give your attention to two particular and important areas regarding translation. First, you should consider the method that was employed by the translators. Second, you should consider the men who translated the Scriptures.” (p. 121, 122)

Pt. 2 *The King James Translation Committee was made up of fifty-seven men in six companies. Each company was in a different location, Pt. 3 The translators had a high view of God's Word and used formal equivalency as their translational method, and Pt. 4 The translators of most new versions used a dynamic equivalency method of translation.*

On p. 122, Dr. Ouellette writes, “Methodology is based upon principles. Principles are based upon one's paradigm* of truth. The methodology employed by the translators of the Authorized Version (the KJV) are radically different from the methodology used by the translators of the modern versions.” *[A paradigm is a worldview, a framework or way of looking at something.]

The translation technique used by the KJV committee was **formal equivalency**, i.e., the words and the forms of the words were rendered as closely as possible from Hebrew or Greek into English. It is a word-by-word translation, as close as can be managed. Most other English translations (and especially the NIV and even the New King James Version) use **dynamic equivalency**, i.e., where the translator tried to determine

the thoughts and message of the original writer, and then the translator explains the message in his own words (i.e., interjecting his own interpretation). Those who choose dynamic equivalency must maintain that the original words are not as important as the ideas or thoughts of the original writers. Yet, how can we KNOW the thoughts and ideas of the original writers? These men are all dead! The only way we can know the mind and thoughts of the original writers is by their words! Consequently, those who use dynamic equivalency actually do not produce translations! They produce commentaries or paraphrases based upon their own paradigm of truth. This may not, at first, ring alarm bells, but when we consider that many of the men involved in the creation of the modern corrupted texts and then the translation of those corrupted texts into new English Bibles, were very liberal, and some even unbelievers, the alarm should ring loud and continuously.

Dr. Don Waite, in his book entitled, *Defending the King James Bible*, has counted 2,000 examples of dynamic equivalency in the New King James Bible, 4,000 examples in the New American Standard, and 6,653 examples in the New International Version (NIV).¹

Dr. Ouellette concludes, "The method of dynamic equivalency has become a license to change the words of God according to the whims of men" (p. 125).

Pt. 5 The men behind the King James believed the basic doctrines of the Word of God, while the men behind the Critical Text did not.

Dr. Ouellette explains that while we do not, of course, know the true spiritual standings of those 57 scholars who formed the KJV translation committee, no one would dispute their respect for the Word of God, their education and scholarship, or their belief in the Bible AS God's Word. He writes, "These were remarkable men of their day and highly qualified to handle the task of giving the English world an Authorized Version" (p. 126). Dr. Ouellette lists two names of that KJV committee. First, was Mr. Lancelot Andrews, who oversaw the entire translation project; he was conversant in 15 languages. Another committee member was Mr. John Bois, who by age 5 could read the Hebrew Bible in its entirety and by age 6 could write the Hebrew language eloquently.

Compare these scholars to those involved in the formation of the Critical Text. No two men had more influence over the formation of the Critical Text than Brooke Foss Westcott ((1825-1901) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892), upon whose text the Critical Text was largely based. Dr. Ouellette pulls quotes from Westcott's own book, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, that demonstrate that Dr. Westcott did not believe in the creation account of Genesis 1-3, but literally wrote, "No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history—I could never understand how any one reading them with open eyes could think they did..."² He was also very vague about his view of the Resurrection, he distorted the doctrine of inspiration, he promoted baptismal regeneration, and was very confusing in regard to the doctrine of salvation. Hort was just as heretical, stating clearly that he believed baptism to be necessary for salvation. He made fun of those who were committed to systematic Bible study and reading, he objected to eternal punishment, and he called substitutional atonement a "heresy". He openly admitted his lack of understanding of why the shedding of blood was necessary for atonement and he concurred with Darwin's theory of evolution. He even encouraged the exploration of Mariology (the worship of Mary)!

Clearly, both Westcott and Hort were gross heretics, and it's a far stretch for me to even consider that they were born-again. And these two, more than any other "scholar", contributed to the denigration of the *Textus Receptus* and the promotion of the corrupted Critical Text, from which virtually every English Bible is translated (if not all)... except for the King James Version!

Friends, it's NOT just archaic language that the modern liberal "scholar" sets out to change. Two centuries of "textual criticism" have literally added to and deleted from the very Words of God. And here is the really scary part: much of that change has been planned and perpetrated!

Pt. 6 The King James translators scrutinized every passage at least fourteen different times. The NIV translators scrutinized each passage three times.

Pt. 7 Frank Logsdon, one of the respected members of the New American Standard Bible committee later

¹ Waite, D. A. 1998. *Defending the King James Bible*. Bible For Today, Inc. pp. 83-90.

² Westcott, Brooke Foss. 1903. *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, Vol. 2. MacMillan and Co., London. p. 69.

renounced his involvement and publicly stated that he believed the King James Bible to be 100% correct.

Chapter 9 - Whom Will You Trust? (pp. 133-144)

Pt. 1 *The Bible question boils down to either trusting God or trusting (in many cases) **unbelieving** scholars.*

Dr. Ouellette asks, "Whom will you trust?" Do you trust GOD ALMIGHTY to preserve His own inspired revelation to every generation? Or do you trust 18th, 19th, and 20th century "scholars" to first FIND the Word of God, and then tell us what they think God meant? There is certainly nothing wrong with scholarship, but there is an obvious danger when we turn away from trusting God to preserve his Word and instead place our trust in the "wisdom" of human scholars to supposedly FIND IT and then RECONSTRUCT IT!

Many of the "scholars" who led out in the creation of the new 19th and 20th century Greek New Testament texts, e.g., the Westcott and Hort text (which was itself a major contributor to the modern Critical Text) were at the very best liberal heretics, and at the worst, Hell-bound unbelievers!

The Scriptures DO speak to the matter of trusteeship (meaning those to whom God entrusted His Word). The Bible teaches that God first uses saints (believers) and then second, saints congregating in local, New Testament churches.

First, Jude commands SAINTS to contend for the faith which was once delivered. Jude 3 reads, *Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was **once delivered** unto the **saints**.* This verse itself **teaches two important truths**.

The first truth is this...

1 - THE WORD HAS BEEN DELIVERED. Our body of beliefs (the *faith*) has been delivered, and was likely at the time of James' writing, only lacking the Revelation given to John. If the delivered words of God were, over the next 1700 years, corrupted through mistranslation and lost, then this doesn't speak well of the ability of our all-powerful God's to preserve them! This logic says that God was powerful enough to miraculously inspire His revelation, but not powerful enough to preserve it to all generations.

The second important truth is this...

2 - THE RECIPIENTS OF THE DELIVERED WORD WERE THE SAINTS DOWN THROUGH HISTORY. The word *saints* means set-apart ones. The Bible's definition of a *saint* is simply a born-again believer, nothing more or less. Bottom line: the Word was delivered into the hands of born-again believers.

Second, God also used saints congregated in local New Testament churches to preserve the interpretation of His Word. Paul called the local church, *...the pillar and ground of the truth* (I Timothy 3:15). A pillar is just what the word sounds like: it is a support or a column. The word *ground* means a foundation; a base.

So, have you ever wondered how so many different groups could use the same same Bible, but come up with such different and even opposing doctrines? Well, here is the answer: many of these groups are heretical. Consequently, they do not have the Holy Spirit as their Administrator and Empowerer.

And since the Scriptures are *spiritually discerned* (I Corinthians 2:14), it is necessary to possess the unction (anointing) of the indwelling Holy Spirit to make proper **personal** interpretation and application of the Word of God. And since the Scriptures are *spiritually discerned*, it is necessary to possess the corporate unction and the administration and leadership of the Holy Spirit for a local church to maintain proper interpretation and application. Consequently then, as Peter warned, when individuals or local churches do NOT possess the unction and leadership of the Holy Spirit they will *wrest* or twist the Word, to their own destruction (II Peter 3:16)! God uses scriptural, New Testament churches, to preserve the proper interpretation and application of the preserved, written Word. God is in the Word preserving business. The Holy Spirit is in the interpretation and application preserving business through the pillar and ground of the truth: scriptural, New Testament churches.

But... what do the proponents of the Critical Text affirm? Are they trusting God or scholarship? The belief of the proponents of the Critical Text generally follows that of W. Edward Glenny in his book, *The Bible Version*

Debate ³. Dr. Ouellette quotes Glenny...

“Our purpose is to reconstruct from all the witnesses (meaning manuscripts) available to us, the text essentially preserved in all, but perfectly preserved in none.” What does he believe? He believes that all the preserved manuscripts available today each contain some truth. Some might have more; some might have less; but all contain some truth. But, no one text has it all! And so he follows with this...

“...we do not believe that God has preserved His Word perfectly and miraculously in any one manuscript or group of manuscripts, or in all the manuscripts. Therefore, in our study of the text we work with all the manuscripts to compile a text closer to the original than any one manuscript or group of manuscripts.”

From this claim Dr. Ouellette makes these observations, with sarcasm...

“It would appear that the ordinary Christian cannot know the validity of God’s Word without an understanding of the Greek or Hebrew [and I might add, without access to all extant manuscripts!]. We are in danger of falling into a major error of the Catholic Church. Catholic doctrine teaches that only the clergy can understand and interpret the words of God and that the laity must simply accept what is told to them” (p. 135).

Ouellette continues...

“The same scholar (referring to Glenny) goes even further to say in his quote that the... ‘Bible has still not been found, even with all of the translations today.’ It is clear that this man (Glenny) begins with the assumption that we don’t have God’s Word, we will never have God’s Word, but we can [with study and diligence] as least get closer to what it once was in original form” (p. 135)!

It all boils down to this friends: Do we HAVE the Word of God OR do we need scholars to FIND and then RESTORE the Word of God? And even then, never, ever be sure if they have it right or have all of it?

Pt. 2 *The Received Text and the King James Bible are widely acknowledged to be reliable, even by those who also support newer versions.*

Pt. 3 *The Critical Text supporters agree and admit that it contains errors.*

Pt. 4 *The men and methods behind the Critical Text are not trustworthy.*

Pt. 5 *The men behind the Critical Text were heavily biased and dishonest.*

Pt. 6 *Modern-day translators ask “Hath God said...?” The King James committee believed, “The Lord hath spoken...”.*

Dr. Ouellette writes of these modern-day translators, “...scholars and textual critics today and in recent decades have led Christendom not only in asking ‘Hath God said?’, but also in concluding that on one can really know exactly WHAT God said at all!”

• Dr. Ouellette lists seven reasons why the modern Critical Text, and the translations it supports, are not to be trusted (pp. 138-141). And by the way, the Critical text is used to translate every English Bible except for the KJV.

- 1 - They weaken or deny vital Bible doctrines such as the deity of Christ!
- 2 - Their own proponents admit the uncertainty of their own positions!
- 3 - Their sources agree on obvious error!
- 4 - There was a preconceived bias against the *Textus Receptus* on the part of Hort.
- 5 - They create doubt and confusion about the reliability of the Word of God!
- 6 - The methodology employed in forming them is untrustworthy!

³ Glenny, W. Edward. *The Bible Version Debate*. pp. 122, 131.

7 - They are presumptuous, if not dishonest.

- Closing his book, Dr. Ouellette comes to these conclusions... (p. 142).

1 - God has promised to preserve His Word!

2 - He has made His church and its born-again members the guardians of His Word!

3 - This historic church has accepted the Traditional Text (Received Text or Majority Text) as authentic and has used it predominantly.

4 - An attempt to undermine the doctrine of preservation and the Received Text originated during the 1700s from within the liberal realm of Christendom.

5 - Those who use a Critical Text and/or its modern translations recognize the King James is still an accurate translation of God's Word.

6 - New Evangelicals⁴ recognize the truth that the KJV has been the Bible of Fundamentalism.

7 - If the Head of the Church, Christ, gave His Words to the local churches and they received them; if these local churches made faithful copies of what they received and spread them; if the majority of manuscripts found in the region where Christianity began still support the KJV, then there is no need to believe the church has been wrong for nearly 2000 years!

And so friends, the version of the Bible that we use DOES make a difference. The 200+ English translations and paraphrases range from good to very bad. We believe that the KJV is the best translation for English-speaking peoples.

Assignment for the Next Lesson

- **Meditate:** Study and meditate through the handout, "*The Three Keys of True Discipleship*". Do this once each week through out our entire discipleship course.

- Recommended reading:

Ouellette, R. B. 2008. *A More Sure Word: Which Bible Can You Trust*. Striving Together Publications. A publications ministry of Lancaster Baptist Church, Lancaster, CA.

Hard cover on amazon:

http://www.amazon.com/More-Sure-Word-Which-Bible/dp/1598940473/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1417791796&sr=8-1&keywords=A+more+sure+word

Kindle edition on Amazon:

http://www.amazon.com/More-Sure-Word-Which-Bible-ebook/dp/B005JZT3ZE/ref=sr_1_2?ie=UTF8&qid=1417791796&sr=8-2&keywords=A+more+sure+word

- Other references and videos (These are not guaranteed to be scriptural, but are useful for information and history.)

Nicholson, Adam. 2003. *God's Secretaries: The Making of the King James Bible*. HarperCollins Publishers

Kindle edition on Amazon:

http://www.amazon.com/Gods-Secretaries-P-S-Adam-Nicolson-ebook/dp/B000FC11ZG/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1417792199&sr=8-1&keywords=God%27s+Secretaries

When God Spoke English: The Making of the King James Bible. BBC Documentary. On [YouTube.com](http://www.youtube.com). Narrated by Adam Nicholson, the author of the previous citation.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rL57Y4zGvOY>

⁴ See p. 17 and 18... Pt. 4 *The new evangelical position is characterized as "belief compromised" because this position seeks to fellowship with the neo-orthodox and liberal positions.* "This group of people, which developed in the 1940s, was known in its early days as the Intellectual Fundamentalist. This person is characterized by the term "belief compromised". He want to dialogue with the liberal and neo-orthodox crowd in an attempt to draw them to his position. However, what has happened is that he become more like them. While the fundamentalist emphasizes separation, the new evangelical emphasizes infiltration." (p. 69)