

Some men are born fools but the majority become so from practice.

MISSIONARY

PREMILLENNIAL

BIBLICAL

BAPTISTIC

How To Get Results

Whenever You Pray

# The Baptist Examiner

Paid Circulation In All States and In Many Foreign Countries

"To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them."—Isaiah 8:20.

VOL. 18, NO. 53

RUSSELL, KENTUCKY, JANUARY 31, 1953

WHOLE NUMBER 731

## A Book Everyone Should Own

Brother M. F. Engle, of Logan, W. Va., has undertaken to give the gist of "The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination," by Loraine Boettner, in the brief compass of seventy-seven pages, under the title, "Extracts From The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination," and has done an admirable job. This book has recently come from the press in the print shop of the Baptist Examiner. The price is \$1.00, and the book may be ordered directly from the author at P. O. Box 728, Logan, W. Va.

We give this book our hearty commendation, and trust that our readers will avail themselves of the opportunity to buy it. It contains the heart of the doctrine of predestination as taught by John Calvin. The greatest value of this particular book lies in its conciseness. Many who would not take time to read the larger book will be able to find time to read these extracts from it. Thus the smaller book is better suited for wider circulation. The introduction to the book has been written by Pastor Arlon Davis, of the Baptist Church at Gray, Ky., where Brother Engle formerly lived.

This book gives a brief and pointed discussion of the Five Points of Calvinism, viz., Total

Inability, Unconditional Election, Limited Atonement, Efficacious Grace, and Perseverance of the Saints. It then answers many of the objections that are offered against the doctrine of predestination. In doing this, it discusses the difference between predestination and fatalism, the free agency and moral responsibility of man, the relation of predestination to motives for exertion, the sincere offer of the Gospel to all men, and the passages that seem to universalize the atonement.

Pastors who wish to have their people grounded in the glorious Bible doctrine of predestination (Continued on page four)

By Roy Mason  
Tampa, Florida

When people buy a machine or a piece of equipment of any kind that is sent to them "knocked down" there are usually instructions sent along as to how to unpack, set up and operate the thing. These instructions are carefully noted. In buying a car there is an instruction book that goes along telling how to care for it so as to get the best service. Often people who are careful to follow instructions concerning machinery, etc., pay no heed to the instructions given in the one Book which tells them about the proper care for their spiritual life. One of the most important things in life is prayer, and most people resort to it at times, yet there is little reading of the Guide Book which tells people how to pray in such a way as to get results.

What Are Some Of These Instructions?

One must be a child of God—must be a person with a Savior, before he can expect to get anywhere in prayer. (See John 14:6,

"No man cometh to the Father but by me.") To try to get to God, leaving Jesus out, is like one trying to get a person over long distance telephone while ignoring "central." The Jews said, "We know that God heareth not sinners," and Jesus did not contradict them. To pray in your own name is like uttering a cold check—to pray in the name of Jesus is to come in the name of one who has infinite riches in the bank of Heaven.

One must ask according to the will of God. "If we ask anything according to his will he heareth us." Where is the will of God expressed? Mainly in His Word. No use to pray for something that the Word tells you is not the will of God for you to have. We think of the woman who wanted to preach, and who "prayed about it" and went to preaching. She ignored I Cor. 14:34 . . . "for it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church" (v. 35). Did "praying about it" cause God to change His mind? We think not.

One must come to the Father in the name of Jesus (Jno. 14:13-14). Of course one cannot do (Continued on page four)

## THE CHURCH THAT WAS BUILT BY JESUS CHRIST

FOUNDED DURING HIS PERSONAL MINISTRY

Apostles set in the church. "And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues" (I Cor. 12:28).

When the apostles were set in the church.

"And it came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued night in prayer to God. And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples: and of them he chose twelve, whom he also named apostles" (Luke 6:12, 13).

Question: How could the apostles be set in the church by Christ on the mountain, if the church did not exist? Can you

MORE NEWS AS TO ENLARGEMENT

Slowly but surely, the funds are coming in for the moving and erection of our new press, whereby we shall be able to convert this publication from four to eight pages weekly. From the depths of our hearts we thank God that we now have about half the funds in hand for this purpose.

It was our original hope to have the press completely installed by the end of January so that we might print the issue of February 7 (our anniversary issue) on this new press. However, we can not secure the mechanic from the factory to do this work until perhaps around March 1. In the meantime, the money for this work is coming in; perhaps by the time we can get the erector to do the work, we can have sufficient funds in hand to complete the task.

As we have already said, everyone who sends us a contribution, using the business reply envelopes which were recently placed in the paper, will automatically (Continued on page four)

set something in nothing? Called out company.

A church is a called out company of baptized believers covenanted together to carry out the will of the Master. "Church" is translated from the Greek word "ekklesia", a compound word, "ek", out of; and "kaleo", to call.

"If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you" (John 15:19).

The company (church) began from the baptism of John the Baptist.

"Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection" (Acts 1:21, 22).

If Matthias, chosen on this occasion to succeed Judas Iscariot, "companied" with the disciples, there must of necessity be a

BY D. N. JACKSON  
Little Rock, Ark.

"company".

This company (church) was founded by Christ.

"Again the next day after John stood and two of his disciples; and looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God! And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus" (John 1:35-27).

The first members of this company were Andrew, John, Peter, Philip and Nathanael. (John 1:40-49). Soon this company increased in number, both Jews and Samaritans accepting Him. "And many of the Samaritans of that city believed on him for the saying of the woman, which testified, He told me all that ever I did" (John 4:39).

This company (church) baptized people.

"After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judaea; and there he tarried with them, and baptized" (John 3:22). But John 4:1, 2 explains that Christ himself did

not baptize in water, as the act was performed by His disciples as authorized by himself: "When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, (though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples)"

This company (church) was recognized as Christ's bride.

"He that hath the bride is the bridegroom: but the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiced greatly because of the bridegroom's voice: this my joy therefore is fulfilled" (John 3:29).

Christ was the bridegroom and John the Baptist was the "friend of the bridegroom". Who was the bride, unless she was the church? If not the church, then tell us to what the term "bride" applied to that time. If it were the church, then the church was in existence even before John the Baptist was beheaded, "For John was not yet cast into prison" (John 3:24).

"This my joy therefore IS fulfilled"—John the Baptist. Being

a friend, he rejoiced to hear the voice of the Bridegroom (Christ) on whom he had been telling people to believe as they repented (Acts 10:4). John rejoiced to see the Christ in person whom he had been preaching would come. When He did come, John told the people to "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29). John's disciples following Christ, they become the Lord's company, church bride.

As a company, church, bride, the Lord leads His disciples into a mountain where, praying all night He ordained twelve of them as His apostles, whom He set in the church, company, bride, as apostles, they already being members of His church, company, bride.

(Continued on page four)

GOOD NEWS FOR THE UNGODLY

"But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness" (Rom. 4:5).

As long as one is living a clean, upright, honest and truthful life, the average person thinks he "has a pretty good chance for Heaven." But, the man who is a liar, cheat, dishonest, unclean in his life and unquestionably ungodly in every way is not considered to have bright prospects for the future beyond the grave.

Is there no good news for such an ungodly person?

There certainly is!

"But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness" (Rom. 4:5).

This great truth from the Word of God concerns the one who is not trying to do anything to save himself. He is one "who worketh not." The religious world would likely say that there isn't any "chance" for a (Continued on page four)

## The First Baptist Pulpit

### "THE NEW UNHOLY BIBLE"

"Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven."—Psa. 119:89.

If you will look on either the front, or the backbone of your Bible, you will find in one or the other of those two places two words, "Holy Bible," which means literally, "a holy book." Ever since the Lord Jesus Christ called me into His ministry, I have been preaching from an Holy Bible. This one which I hold in my hand this morning, which is beginning to become somewhat frayed and tattered,

is the third of these Holy Bibles that I have used, after having had both of the two previous ones rebound twice. In contrast, this morning I hold in my other hand, another Bible, which is likewise called an Holy Bible. But, beloved, as I have often said, it isn't the name over the church door that signifies what a church believes. You may call it a Baptist church, but if it doesn't stand for the Word of God, it isn't a Baptist church. It isn't the name that makes us Baptists, but it is what we believe, and contend for that sig-

nifies our Baptist position. Though this is called an Holy Bible both on the front and on the backbone, I would insist that if it were properly named, it would instead be called an Unholy Bible; and by God's grace I expect to show you why I refer to it as the new, modern unholy Bible.

Ever since this new Bible made its appearance and came on the market the last part of September, I have been deluged with letters from the readers of THE BAPTIST EXAMINER (Continued on page two)



# THE BAPTIST EXAMINER

JOHN R. GILPIN — EDITOR

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

(Domestic and Foreign)

One Year in Advance 50c

Send Remittance to Russell, Ky.

Editorial Department, RUSSELL, KENTUCKY, where communications should be sent for publication.

Entered as second-class matter May 31, 1941, in the post office at Russell, Ky., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Paid circulation in every state and many foreign countries.

Subscriptions are stopped at expiration unless renewed or special arrangements are made for their continuation.

## "The Unholy Bible"

(Continued from page one) scattered all over America and also have been asked a number of questions by folk here within this local congregation as to what I thought of the new revised edition of the Scriptures. I haven't been too hurried nor too quick in my answer, but rather, beloved, have studied very carefully and have amassed a great wealth of information which I have gathered from others who have had time to study it, even more fully than I. I have done this before I have taken this opportunity to give my answer as to what I think of this new Bible.

I would like to remind you that I am not in agreement with that one dear sister who wrote saying that she didn't think much of these modern, new fangled translations, for said she, "If the King James version of the Bible were good enough for the Apostle Paul, then it is good enough for me." Well, I am not in agreement with her, for the King James Version of the Bible was only made about sixteen hundred years after the Apostle Paul had died and gone to Glory, so I am not speaking this morning from the standpoint that this dear sister spoke, when she wrote her letter. However, beloved, I would like to remind you that the Bible was written originally in three languages. Most of the Old Testament was written in Hebrew, a very, very small portion of the Old Testament was written in Aramaic, and all of the New Testament was written in Greek, so that in the days of the Apostle Paul, of that portion of the Bible that he possessed, none of it was written in the English language. None of it was read from the King James Version when the Apostle Paul, nor any of the balance stood up to preach from God's Book.

In the year 1611, King James of England set about the task of having the Bible translated out of the Hebrew, the Aramaic and the Greek into the English language so that the people of his country over which he ruled might have the Bible in its entirety in the English language. Since it was at the commandment of the king, and since it was authorized by him, and since the translators were paid in full by the English government, it naturally bore the name of the Authorized Version. That is to say, it was authorized by King James, and in the year 1611 that Bible was handed to the English-speaking people of the world, and since that day has been the recognized volume of Scriptures for the great majority of folk who read, and study, the Word of God.

Then in the year 1901 another translation was made, which was

called the Revised Version. The Revised Version was made for one reason, and one reason only. There were certain archaic forms of words which had changed meaning in the interim between 1611 when the King James Version was written, and in 1901 when the Revised Version was presented. For example, in the year 1611, the word "charity" meant "the highest kind of love that a person could bestow upon another," but, beloved, you know today that the word "charity" certainly doesn't in any wise signify the highest form of love. Instead, beloved, when you think of charity, immediately your mind goes to reaching down in your pocket and getting out a little peice of money, and doling it out to someone who may be in need. Paul said:

"Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not CHARITY, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal."—I Cor. 13:1.

Beloved, when you read the word "charity" in the Word of God, it is definitely not the idea of handing out funds to someone, but rather, it is the highest kind of love that the Apostle Paul is speaking of. Hence, beloved, in 1901 when the Revised Version of the Scriptures came from the press, such words had changed their meaning. Such words that were no longer good English words were changed in the R. V. Practically the only changes that were made in the Revised Version in 1901, over the Authorized Version of 1611, were the words that had changed meaning, and the archaic form of words that were no longer considered even good English words.

Now on September 30, 1952, we have a new Bible. I might say that between 1901 and 1952 there have been lots of translations made of the Word of God. We have the Moffat translation of the Bible, the Good-speed translation of God's Word, and Helen Barrett Montgomery's translation of the New Testament. There are others, and all of these are modernistic. Beyond a shadow of a doubt, every one of these translations are tainted and poisoned with the virus of modernism. However, beloved, the Devil waited until September 30, 1952, to put off on all the American people the greatest hoax so far as a so-called Bible is concerned, that is possible for any human being to ever imagine, for when this new Bible was put on the market a couple of months ago—when it was thus published, it was published with one sole purpose in mind, namely, to kill the orthodox form of Christianity and to teach modernism from beginning to end.

I make no apology to any individual who has bought, or who has studied one of these new Bibles, but I tell you that this is the modernist's Bible, and the man who studies it, and believes it, and accepts it, is nothing short of a modernist when he does so.

Now I am willing to agree that there are some things about this new Bible that are quite commendatory. For example, in the twelfth chapter of Acts the word "Easter," which was definitely mistranslated in the King James Version, has been removed. Listen:

"And when he had seized him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four squads of soldiers to guard him, intending after the Passover to bring him out to the people."—Acts 12:4.

In that one instance, beloved, this new Bible is to be commended. It has definitely taken a word which was positively mistranslated in 1611 and has

given to it its proper translation today. Anyone who has ever studied Greek, or who knows anything at all about the New Testament as it was written in the original Greek language, knows positively that the word that is translated "Easter" in the King James Version which is translated "Passover" in this new, modern unholy Bible — anyone who knows anything at all about the Greek language will agree that it is definitely and positively a tremendous help and improvement over the King James Version.

But where you find one instance like that, you will find "scads" of instances where the Word of God has been mutilated at the hands of the modernists. Let me give you a few examples and cite to you some reasons why that you and I as God's people don't need this new unholy Bible. Follow with me as I shall read first from the King James Version and then from this new, modern translation.

I

I imagine the greatest amount of criticism that has been brought against this new Bible, centers around the translation of Isaiah 7:14. In fact, most everyone who has criticized it, has criticized it from this standpoint. In the King James Version we read:

"Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a VIRGIN shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel."

Now, in the new Bible we read:

"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."

In the King James Version it says that a virgin shall conceive; in the new Bible it says that a young woman shall conceive. There is a tremendous difference between a virgin and a young woman. A young woman may be a virgin, and at the same time she may not be a virgin. That is nothing short of an attempt to destroy the virgin birth

## Time With Jesus

Winifred M. Nienhuis

Are you spending time with Jesus,  
As the days are passing by?  
Do you bring your cares and troubles  
To the One who lives on high?  
He's the only One to help you,  
When the burdens make you sigh;  
He's the One who'll bring you comfort,  
When there's no one else so nigh.

Are you spending time with Jesus,  
When life's cares upon you press?  
Do you rest upon His promise  
In the time of deep distress?  
When your heart can find no surcease  
From life's woes and bitterness;  
When your heart is touched with sorrow,  
Do you feel His sweet caress?

Are you spending time with Jesus,  
Resting on His mighty arm?  
Or do worldly pleasures lure you,  
And your testimony harm?  
You can find a peace eternal  
That will never lose its charm,  
If you'll spend more time with Jesus--  
Where no evil can alarm!

of the Lord Jesus Christ. I am satisfied that the thirty-two translators who worked on this new Bible for the past sixteen years, had in mind that by the removal of the word "virgin," that they would be able to destroy at least in part the virgin birth of the Lord Jesus Christ. However, it is rather conspicuous, and it certainly shows the folly of man, that in Isaiah 7:14 they removed the word "virgin" from the Scripture but when they came to the first chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, which is a quotation from Isaiah 7:14, they quote it and give the word "virgin" in the quotation, for we read:

"Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel."—Mt. 1:23.

In the verse preceding this it says:

"All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet."—Mt. 1:22.

It is highly conspicuous that they removed the word "virgin" from Isaiah 7:14, but that they failed to take the word out of Matthew 1:23 when they quoted Isaiah 7:14. To me, beloved, it looks like the Lord purposely caused them to cross themselves just to show the folly of men and the blunders that man can get into as he attempts to destroy the Word of God.

Let me remind you ere I go one step further that I am a firm believer in the virgin birth of the Lord Jesus Christ. I believe that when the Son of God was born into this world that He was born of Mary, who was His human mother, and that she was merely the receptacle whereby that Jesus Christ was born into this world, that she had never known man, that that she herself was entirely a virgin and as such, she conceived the Lord Jesus Christ of the Holy Spirit, and when Jesus was born, He was born not as a result of the combined seed of man and woman, as you and I are born, but rather He was born of the seed of the woman as was prophesied in Genesis 3:15. No man can believe more strongly nor

more firmly in the virgin birth of Jesus than your pastor.

May I cite in passing that little bee, the honey gatherer, his method of procreation is parthenogenesis, which means "generation by a virgin." I loved, if God always uses generation by a virgin to bring forth bees, and to propagate the bee family in the world, surely the great God of the universe can set aside the laws of nature once if He wishes in order that His Son might come into the world as the seed of the woman and a child of a virgin, without a human father. Surely our Lord can do so.

I say then that that is my reason and objection to the modern unholy Bible. You see why I refer to it as an unholy Bible, for a Bible which assiduously attempts to remove the virgin birth of Jesus Christ from it, no longer deserves the name of Holy Bible. In its attempt to remove the virgin birth, it becomes unholy.

II

Not only is it true that the virgin birth comes in for removal, but the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ is likewise objected to and removed in every instance where it was possible for the translators to do so.

For example, in John 3:16 reading, first of all, from the King James Version:

"For God so loved the world that he gave his only BEGOTTEN Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

In the new Bible, in John 3:16 we read:

"For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life."

You will notice the word "begotten" is left out in the new modern translation. That word, "begotten" is a very important word. You and I are born; Jesus Christ was begotten. You and I, beloved, were born as a result of the combined seed of man and woman; Jesus Christ was the only begotten Son of God. This is nothing more than a slap in the face of God, in that it strikes at the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Then in Luke 2:33 we have a similar instance where the deity of Christ is assailed. It says:

"And Joseph and his mother marveled at those things which were spoken of him."

Now turn to the unholy Bible and we read in Luke 2:33:

"And his father and his mother marvelled at what was said about him."

In the King James Version it says "Joseph and his mother," in the new Bible it says "his father and his mother," signifying that Jesus Christ was born of God, but rather He was the son of Joseph, for it refers to Joseph as his father.

Beloved, that wasn't any mistake. It didn't slip in by chance. It took a strong twist on the part of the translators to make it read as though Joseph were the father of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Here is another reference to the like nature in Micah 5:2, which is a prophecy relative to the birth of the Lord Jesus Christ, foretelling the very place where Jesus was to be born. In the King James Version we read:

"But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from old, from EVERLASTING."

In the new Bible we read:

"But you, O Bethlehem Ephratah, who are little to be among the clans of Judah, from you shall come forth one who will be ruler in Israel."

(Continued on page three)



## "The Unholy Bible"

(Continued from page two)

You shall come forth for me one who is to be ruler in Israel, whose origin is from old, from ancient days."

In the King James version He has been "from everlasting"; in the new Bible it says that he has been "from ancient days." There is a lot of difference in saying that the Son of God existed from everlasting and in saying that He is from ancient days. It is a definite, distinct attempt on the part of the translators to deny the pre-existence of the Son of God. In Micah 5:2 in the King James Version, it is said that Jesus Christ had always been God. He is always God. In Micah 5:2 in the new unholy Bible, the pre-existent nature of the Lord Jesus Christ is taken away.

Notice again in Psalms 2:11-12 in the King James Version:

"Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. KISS THE SON, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him."

In the new unholy Bible we read:

"Serve the Lord with fear, with trembling kiss his feet, lest he be angry, and you perish in the way; for his wrath is quickly kindled. Blessed are all who take refuge in him."

In the King James Version we have a reference to the Son of God, but in the new, modern translation it leaves out every reference to the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Son of God is not even mentioned at all. It is merely an attempt on the part of the translators to remove the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ from that verse of Scripture.

However, the most outstanding and the most glaring attempt at the destruction of the deity of Jesus is found in Romans 9:5.

In the King James Version we read:

"Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, GOD BLESSED FOREVER. Amen."

In the new unholy Bible we read:

"To them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ. God who is over all be blessed forever. Amen."

In the King James Version it refers to Christ "who is over all, God," but the translators of the new, modern unholy Bible say "God who is over all be blessed forever." Thus in this new Bible, they do not refer to Christ as God. I tell you, beloved, those things just didn't happen to me. Those are not errors and mistakes that an honest man like that. I insist this morning that a translation such as this did not come from the heart nor the brain of an honest man, and that such a translation merely indicates the dishonesty, the lack of integrity, and the lack of moral stability that the translators of the new, modern unholy Bible are possessors of.

### III

Somewhat the English of the King James Version has always seemed to me to be unusually reverent. You read in the King James Version "thee" and "thou." There is a reverence instilled in the minds of people when they read those pronouns "thee" and "thou," but when you turn to the new, unholy Bible, you will find that these words are removed entirely. Not one time do you find these pronouns in this new version. In-

stead, beloved, you find "you" and "yours" occurring in every place, whereas in the King James Version you will find "thee" and "thou." I will cite you two instances just to give you a sample.

Take for example in Matthew 16:16 when Jesus spoke of the building of His church. In the new Bible we read:

"Simon Peter replied, You are the Christ, the Son of the living God."

Contrast this with the King James Version, when he said:

"And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

To give you an example from the Old Testament, we read in Psalms 2:7 from the King James Version:

"I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee."

Now read Psalms 2:7 in the new unholy Bible and note how the pronouns have been changed.

"I will tell you of the decree of the Lord: He said to me, You are my son, today I have begotten you."

That may sound right to some folk, but, beloved, there is a lack of dignity, and a lack of reverence in the changing of these pronouns and in the putting in of these words in modern everyday speech such as you and I use.

I was rather impressed by an editorial in the "Evening Star" of Washington, D. C., under the date of October 1, when the editor of this editorial, "Something Has Been Lost," said:

"It is disappointing to find that the moving poetry and cadence of such sentences as 'He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: He leadeth me beside still waters' have been lost in the change to 'He makes me lie down in green pastures. He leads me beside still waters.' Another such loss is found in the passage from St. Luke: 'But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; For of such is the Kingdom of God.' The verse now becomes, 'But Jesus called to him, saying, Let the children come to me, and do not hinder them; for to such belong the kingdom of God.'"

Then the editor adds this expression:

"One is inclined to believe that, despite the great circulation planned for the Revised Bible, it will not displace the King James Version."

Beloved, that is exactly my attitude in regard to it. I repeat, there is a reverence in the handling of the Bible as in the Authorized King James Version. I like the expression "He leadeth me" rather than "He leads me." I like the expression "Thou art the Christ" instead of saying "You are the Christ." I say, beloved, there is a reverence about the Scriptures that is taken away by the new, modern unholy Bible.

### IV

There is a fourth reason why I have no place for the new Bible and that is that there are so many other errors. For example, in the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch in the eighth chapter of Acts we find that at least one verse is left out in the new, modern Bible. In the King James Version we read:

"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."—Acts 8:37.

Beloved, I can't read you the contrast from the new Bible because it isn't there. When you come to the new Bible you have the thirty-sixth verse and then the thirty-eighth verse, for the

"COMMIT YOUR BUSINESS TO THE LORD; AND YOUR PLANS WILL PROSPER"  
PROVERBS 16:3  
(GOODSPEED TRS.)



thirty-seventh verse is left out entirely. It just isn't there.

Now why do you suppose it was left out? I will give you a guess. That thirty-seventh verse says, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest," signifying that the proper person for baptism is a person capable of believing. But you know, beloved, the baby baptizers would like to get rid of that. All the folk who believe in baptizing babies would like to get rid of the fact that you have to believe before you can be baptized. Therefore, it was quite convenient for them to leave out Acts 8:37.

Then there is another Scripture which is left out entirely in the sixteenth chapter of the Gospel of Mark. The whole resurrection story is left out. Verses nine through sixteen are all omitted. I might say that in this new unholy Bible they give a footnote at the bottom of the page showing why it should be left out.

Then, beloved, we have another instance in the eighth chapter of the Gospel of John. In the first eleven verses we have the story of Jesus dealing with the woman taken in adultery. You remember that precious story, that wonderful gem of Scripture, which portrays the forgiving nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, and which shows Him to be a forgiver of sins perhaps greater than any other Scripture in all the New Testament. Yet, beloved, when you come to the new, modern unholy Bible, you will find that that portion of God's Word is left out entirely, so that the eighth chapter of John doesn't begin with the first verse, but rather begins with the twelfth verse, so that all eleven verses

are completely left out in this new, modern Scripture.

Now I don't know how it may strike you to pick up a Bible and find that Acts 8:37, Mark 16:9-19, and John 8:1-11 have all been left out. Here are twenty-odd verses of God's Word that have been left out. I will tell you how it strikes me. Beloved, if you are going to leave out those twenty-odd verses, why not take all the balance of it, and throw it all overboard, and then build a monument Heaven high to Tom Paine and Bob Ingersoll and all the rest of the infidels of the world, and forget about the Word of God entirely. If you are going to take out part, you might just as well take it all.

But I remember reading in God's Book in Rev. 22:18, 19, where God has already pronounced a curse upon the translators of the new, modern translation of God's Word. Listen:

"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book. If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And 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, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

Beloved, I wouldn't want the responsibility resting upon me that is resting upon them after they have removed these Scriptures from the Word of God.

I might go further and say that every time the word "Calvary" is mentioned in the King James Version, it is removed from the modern translation, so that you don't find the word "Calvary" one time in the new,

modern translation of the Bible.

I might cite to you also that in the sixth chapter of Matthew when our Lord was giving a form or a model of prayer, which is known by the world as the Lord's prayer, that the translators left out the last part of the thirteenth verse. In the King James Version we read:

"And led us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen."

In the new Bible we read:

"And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil."

You will notice that all reference to the eternal existence and the eternal kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ is left out altogether. Beloved, that is a good reason why I have no use for this Bible — these omissions, these errors, and this leaving out the Word of God.

### V

Let me give you a fifth reason why I must repudiate and reject this Bible. I would remind you as to whom is back of it. It was started by the old Federal Council of Churches sixteen years ago, but you know, beloved, the Federal Council of Churches got so corrupt and so rotten and so modernistic that the name itself smelled badly, so that of recent years it has been changed to the National Council of Churches. Beloved, you can change the name, but it is the same group entirely. When you remember that the Federal



## "The Unholy Bible"

(Continued from page three)

Council of Churches, now called the National Council of Churches, is the group that is back of it, I know it is no good. There isn't anything that the National Council of Churches, formerly called the Federal Council of Churches, has ever sponsored that is worth anything whatsoever to any church. Every president that they have ever had was a modernist. Every president of the National Council of Churches has denied the virgin birth, the deity, the blood atonement, and the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. I won't take time to read it but I can prove it to you this morning by their own quotations. Every man who has ever headed the Federal Council of Churches has been a modernist and has denied the virgin birth, the deity, the blood atonement, and the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. Beloved, with that crowd sponsoring a Bible, would you expect anything good to come from it.

Let me call attention to a few translators. The chairman of these thirty-two who have translated this Bible is a man by the name of Luther A. Weigle. He is a professor in Yale. Would you believe me this morning that Luther A. Weigle is an outstanding modernist himself, and worse than that, he has been cited at least five times for Communistic activities on the part of the Federal government.

Let me go a little further. There is Harry M. Orlinsky, a Jew, of the Jewish Institute of New York City. You know a Jew doesn't believe in Jesus Christ. How could you expect a Jew to translate anything that has to do with the Son of God?

Then again, there is Walter Russell Bowie of Union Theological Seminary. He is not only a radical as to religion, but I can prove this morning that he is a man who has been cited fifteen times for his Communistic connections. Can you imagine this man being honest enough to translate the Word of God. I might say that the very fact that he is a professor of Union Theological Seminary is an indication that he is a modernist, for, beloved, they haven't had a man in Union Theological Seminary for the last twenty-five years who believed the Word of God.

I might say that three of the rest of these translators are professors of Union Theological Seminary. The fact of the matter is, you would have to search with a magnifying glass to find a man in that list of translators that isn't tintured somewhere with modernism.

I want to pause to note one Baptist translator particularly. It has been cited that Kyle M. Yates, who was a professor in the Seminary at Louisville, is one of the thirty-two translators. It is true that Kyle M. Yates was professor of Old Testament in the Seminary, but, beloved, a few years ago there was a young fellow down at Louisville who graduated from the Seminary, and for his graduating thesis, he presented a modernistic paper. I speak of Das Kelly Barnett. Beloved, Kyle M. Yates defended him for his modernism.

### CONCLUSION

I say then to you, beloved, this is the modernist's Bible. To me it is not an Holy Bible; it is an unholy Bible.

Several years ago one of the early translations of the Bible that was made in England was made by a man who was an atheist, but who had a publishing house, and for the purpose of making money he published an edition of the Bible. When he came to the Ten Commandments, he took that commandment which says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and he left out the word "not" and published it, reading, "Thou shalt commit adultery." It was listed immediately by the king as an unholy Bible. Every copy of that edition of the Bible was gathered and burned, and the king assessed such a fine upon that publisher that it bankrupted his publishing house.

Beloved, so far as I am concerned this is just as an unholy Bible as the one that the king assessed.

Let me tell you a story—a Bible story. Jeremiah was one of God's prophets, and one day God gave Jeremiah a message. He wrote it in the form of a roll. He sent a copy of it to the king—King Jehoiakim. When the king sat down to read it, he read it with the nobles and with all the pomp and royalty of the country assembled before him. It was a cool day when they were reading this book of Jeremiah, and there was a fire place in the room, with a fire therein. As they would read a portion of this book of Jeremiah, the king would interrupt when there was something displeasing or something that he did not like, and he would have them take a pen knife and cut it out and throw it in the fire. Time and time and time again King Jehoiakim interrupted the scribe in his reading, and he had this book of Jeremiah cut to shreds and discarded and destroyed in the fire.

Beloved, that didn't keep the book of Jeremiah from being a part of the Bible. God said, "Now, Jeremiah, sit down and I will tell it to you all over again," and God spoke the whole thing over to Jeremiah. At the same time, Jeremiah added something else at the request of God. He told the story of how King Jehoiakim had treated the previous copy of the book of Jeremiah. Beloved, it is right here in God's Word just because God didn't allow that old king to destroy the book.

I am saying to you, dear Christian friends, God isn't going to allow the modernists to destroy the Bible. My text says, "Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven."

Listen again:

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."—Mt. 24:35.

"But the word of the Lord endureth forever."—I Pet. 1:25.

Oh, yes, what happened to King Jehoiakim? A little while later he was captured by his enemies, and they took an auger and bored his eyes out of their sockets. They built a cage for him like you would build for a wild animal, and they shut him up in cage and they started to take him as a prisoner, captive to Babylon. The Word of God tells us that even before they got to Babylon, King Jehoiakim died and there was no lamentation made for him.

Beloved, I offer this prediction this morning. The men who have given to the world this new, modern Bible, when they come to die, there will be no lamentation made for them on the part of the people of God. This old Book is going to last. Surely as there is a God in Heaven this old Book will last, and I thank God today for the privilege of preaching it. May God bless you!

## Prayer

(Continued from page one)

this until he has received Jesus into his life. Coming in the name of Jesus is a confession that we have no worthiness in the sight of God of ourselves—that we must depend upon the worthiness of One greater than ourselves.

One must not only believe in God, but that He will reward the one who asks of Him (Heb. 11:6). To pray half-heartedly is to pray uselessly.

One must not put his faith in "prayer" but in God. This is a very important point. How often we hear someone say, "I have great faith in prayer." Faith in prayer isn't worth a snap—faith in God is what counts. When we have faith in prayer we have faith in ourselves—in our spiritual exercises, and we lose sight of God.

One must have a right motive if prayer is to be answered. "Ye ask amiss," said James, "that ye may consume it on your lusts." Do you ever pray against someone—do you ever vent your dislike toward someone in your prayers? Just as well save your breath. Do you ask in pure selfishness—just because something would minister to your pleasure or comfort? If you want a raise in salary—what for? If you want health—what for? Just so you can have a bigger time?

One should pray with importunity (Luke 11:8). In this story Jesus shows how a person got what he wanted by keeping on asking. To ask God hastily or casually for something, then forget all about it, is very different from asking continuously and in deep earnestness.

One should pray with thanksgiving for benefits already received. "In everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God." Much of prayer should be in the nature of thanksgiving and praise, rather than just "gimme . . . gimme . . . gimme!"

One should have stated times for regular prayer. "Morning, noon, and night I will pray unto thee," said David. Daniel had a similar habit. If one doesn't feel particularly in the mood to pray, he should observe his regular time of prayer anyhow. But, in addition, there should be prayer at any time in between that we feel the need for it.



## A Book

(Continued from page one)

destination may very well try to get this book into their hands; or, better still, conduct a study class in it. We are sure Brother Engle will make special a price to those who wish to order a number of copies at once to come to one address. Write him for prices on such orders.



## The Church

(Continued from page one)

This company, assembled on the first day of Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, numbered about 120.

"And in those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples, and said, (the number of names together were about an hundred and twenty)" (Acts 1:15).

About three thousand were added to this company.

"Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls" (Acts 2:41).

The three thousand were added to the company of one hundred and twenty, not the 120 added to the 3000.

The company of 120 called a church.

"Praising God, and having favour with all the people. And the Lord added to the CHURCH daily such as should be saved", or "were being saved". (Acts 2:47).

The Lord added to the church DAILY such as were being saved. On the first day about three thousand were added. If the church were founded on the first day of Pentecost and the three thousand were in the founding, then the Scripture should read: "The Lord added to the church daily, EXCEPT THE FIRST DAY, such as were being saved".

As the three thousand, converted on the first day, were added to the CHURCH, evidently the little company of a hundred and twenty, coming down from the baptism of John, was the CHURCH, which had assembled at Jerusalem following the ascension of Christ, and while tarrying there for ten days awaiting the dawn of Pentecost, they worshipped God in prayer and supplication and attended to business for the Lord. (Acts 1:12-26).

## Good News

(Continued from page one)  
man who won't try to help himself to Heaven. It would doubtless consign such a man to the realms of the hopeless. But, God says differently.

"But to him that worketh not but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."

How can such be? How can just and holy God give perfect standing to an ungodly sinner who rightly deserves to spend eternity in Hell?

"For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemning sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:3).

"Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God" (I Pet. 3:18).

In order for God to be able to justly and righteously give us godly sinners right standing before Him He sent His eternal perfect Son, the second Person of the Holy Trinity, into the world. He came; kept the law perfectly in every respect; gave Himself for a sin-offering for us; died on the cross under our sin-load; suffered our Hell-debt for us; and fully paid the debt we were due to pay. They buried Him and He stayed in the grave three days and three nights, but on the third day He rose from the dead and forty days later went back to the Father in Heaven, where He now lives and makes intercession for those who believe in Him.

Since the sin debt has been paid by One who is fully acceptable to God, and on terms that honor and exalt God and His righteousness, God can be just and the justifier of every lost sinner who believes in Jesus the Christ (Rom. 3:26).

When we hear this gracious truth and believe it, we see Jesus as the Christ (Anointed One) of God, our Saviour. We see that salvation is in Him alone and in Him alone. He is the One in whom we believe. He is the One whom we believe. He is the faith. Therefore, He is counted to us for righteousness, and we stand before God in our perfect Substitute, "wherein He has made us accepted in the blood" (Eph. 1:6).

"But to him that worketh not but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."

Thank the Lord for the wonderfully good news that He can and does justify, or make right in His sight, ungodly, undeserving sinners, when they believe in Jesus Christ as their Saviour from sin.

## Enlargement

(Continued from page one)  
matically have his subscription set up for "Life". Many of our readers have taken advantage of this offer. Let each of you note: WE ARE TRYING TO CHANGE OUR RECORDS AS RAPIDLY AS POSSIBLE. IF WE MAKE A MISTAKE AS TO YOUR LABEL, PLEASE WRITE US.

As the Lord may lead you please send us your contribution for this cause. 100 years from now, we won't need your help, and you won't need the paper, yet the influence that is accomplished thereby will live on.

## NOTICE

We have plenty of extra copies of this issue. Order a good supply and sow your community down with information as to the new unholy perversion of the Bible.

# Read EXTRACTS FROM THE REFORMED DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION

Price \$1.00

ORDER DIRECT FROM  
M. F. ENGLE

P. O. BOX 728  
LOGAN, WEST VIRGINIA