

(Is a Pronominal Revision ... continued from page 10)

between the apostles (or disciples) and THEE (Peter) disappears.

In Acts 13:47 Paul introduces a quotation from the Old Testament with the words, "For so the Lord hath commanded us, saying." Then follow the familiar words from Isaiah 49:6 which a modern translation renders, "I have set you to be a light for the Gentiles that you may bring salvation to the uttermost parts of the earth." You suggests Paul and Barnabas and by implication every ambassador of Christ. Hence, it is important to note that in the Hebrew and the Greek the pronoun is not plural but singular, and the THOU suggests an individual, primarily the Messiah.

THE REAL ISSUE

The real issue is whether or not we are prepared to give up the use of the singular of the pronoun entirely, and to this there are two main objections. The first is that it gives up the attempt to retain in English a distinction which is clearly drawn in Hebrew and in Greek. The second is that it means that THOU and THEE and THY are to pass completely out of twentieth-century English. The singular form of the pronoun is not even to be tolerated in the language of devotion and worship. It is to disappear from the Lord's Prayer and give place to "Your name be revered," "Your kingdom come"! Scores of our most familiar and best-loved hymns will then have to be discarded or more or less drastically edited. And the liturgies of the liturgical churches (e.g. the Te Deum) will need a thorough overhauling, if such a radical change is to be carried through. It is only in very recent days that Christian people have raised objections to the former language of devotion and worship. When the present century began people did not raise objections to what we may call a scriptural and biblical style as the language of devotion and worship. They liked it. They did not want the Bible to read just like any other book, to have the up-to-the-minute style of the daily newspaper. They loved its quaint, if you wish to call it that, its distinctive, its Biblical way of putting things. And we believe that the great majority of them do so today.

Why should the THOU which is reserved for Deity be used in quotations from the Old Testament which speak of the Messiah, if it is not to be used in a New Testament passage which expressly affirms the Messiahship of Jesus as the Son of the living God? Is the Old Testament in the RSV to have a more archaic style than the New Testament? Hardly, for YOU appears in some quotations from it. If "Thou art my Son, today I have begotten thee" (a quotation from a Psalm), is a proper rendering for Heb. 1:5 in the RSV, why should we read, "You are the Christ, the son of the living God" in Mat. 16:16? To prove that the rendering in RSV is arbitrary, inconsistent, and highly interpretive, it is sufficient to compare Mat. 20:21 with Mat. 25:37-45. ☐

(Cranmer Carries on Tyndale's Work continued from page 9)

replies, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet." In the middle section, King Henry, seated on his throne, hands the word of God to Cranmer and the clergy on one side and to Cromwell and the laity on the other. At the foot of the frontispiece Cranmer hands the Bible to his clergy, with the words, "Feed the flock of God," while in handing the Bible to the laity Cromwell bids them "depart from evil."

Such was the temper in which the Great Bible was published and circulated freely to all who would read it. It was to be a people's Bible, taught by the clergy, read and understood by the laity, and taken as a moral guide for life by all, in public and in private life. To all intents and purposes the hopes of Tyndale were fulfilled by this



"Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you."

I Peter 1:23-25



From Our E-Mail

Sept. 23, 2000

Bro. Reeves,
Got your paper today and again enjoyed reading it. I especially liked *the NIV Challenge!* Great idea for a tract as well!!! Keep up the good work!

D.H.

Sept. 25, 2000

Greetings in the name of our precious Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. I wanted to write and let you know how much I have enjoyed your web site and publica-

... I must say AMEN to

everything you wrote. ... I pray ... and praise God for a publication and site like yours.

America...land of religious freedom, land of Christian roots...look where we are today. I think we've carried that freedom thing too far. Now, even Satanism and Wicca are recognized religions...with tolerance rights!! God's judgment will most certainly be upon this nation.

Again, this is a blessing. Please put me on your mailing list!

S. K.

THE BAPTIST PILLAR

"... The church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth."

I Timothy 3:15



CANADA'S ONLY TRUE BAPTIST PAPER

Published by Bible Baptist Church

1203 4th St. Brandon, MB R7A 3J7

Vol. 8 No. 6 Nov./Dec. 2000

THE TESTIMONY OF GREAT MEN

Editor's Note: With all the character assassination of the founding fathers of the United States a person would be lead to believe that they were as bad as the present administration. But there is no doubt from the following portions taken out of the book, Confirming the Faith, 1910, that they were by far of a different character than the present. And for Canadian content we will add Queen Victoria's witness to why Great Britain was great.

If there is any one message that is proclaimed in the Bible today it is this; "The Divine plan of Human Redemption for All People." This to me was the message of the Apostle Paul, when wrote to the Christian Church at Rome "I am a debtor both to the Greek and to the Barbarians, to the wise and to the unwise; so as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also" Romans 1:14. 15. Now this message of Paul's is being fulfilled and accepted today. There is a common complaint made today, although absolutely without foundation, that the Bible is not equal to the demand of the educated people of today, and that it is only accepted by the unlearned and ignorant, and they say that this is why people are accepting the learned teachings of Mrs. Eddy and others. Now if this be true, let me say that it is not because of their abundance of intelligence, for I have yet to

find one person who has an intelligent understanding of Christian Science.

But then again can it not be truly said that the greatest intellects of today are found in our churches on the Lord's day worshipping the God of the Bible. While it is true that the Bible is so plain that the wayfaring man though a fool need not err therein, yet the keenest intellects in all, the various callings of life have bowed their heads and hearts before the presence of God, and worshiped Him and have gladly learned of His laws and precepts, and have accepted them. To satisfy my own mind that this were really so, I have given this matter a special study, endeavoring to find out the place the Bible has occupied and today does occupy in the minds of great men.

In pursuing our study, let us give to our own Presidents, and American Statesmen the honor of heading this list of great men to speak on this matter. Writing to President Roosevelt, now Ex-President, I asked Mr. Roosevelt to what place in his mind did he give the Bible, and replying through Secretary Loeb he sent me a copy of an address, delivered by himself before the American Bible Society, from which I have taken the following extracts; "Every thinking man, when he thinks, realizes what a very large number of people tend to forget, that the teachings of the Bible are so interwoven and

(The Testimony of Great Men continued on page 4)

Independent

Missionary

EJV 1611

Editor and Pastor: John Reaves Sr.

Phone
204-726-5806

Fax
204-728-0995

Email
bkjv1611@escape.ca

Web Site
www.techplus.com/bkjv1611/pillar.htm

Forget Not The Past

CRANMER CARRIES ON TYNDALE'S WORK

By James Moffat

Taken out of a daily newspaper, 1932

Before the executioners throttled Tyndale to death he was able to pray aloud, "Lord, open the King of England's eyes." The prayer was answered sooner than he could have dared to expect. When the smoke ceased to rise from the pyre of the martyr on October 6, 1536, the officials of the Roman Church congratulated themselves that the heresy of Tyndale had been stamped out. The dramatic sequel was this: Within twelve months the King of England had tolerated a version of the Bible, so that every church in England should possess a copy, and that another translation was at once licensed, which Archbishop Cranmer preferred, and which was substantially Tyndale's version, though this was not at first realized. More steps had to be taken before the final English version appeared in 1611. But the point is that by this time the cause of an open Bible for the people was already won; the cause for which Tyndale had labored and suffered and died. More than that, the final Authorized version which appeared, after the Roman Catholic reaction rising between 1553 and 1558, owed much to Tyndale's translation.

Why and how did this sudden change come about? The inquiry turns upon the part played by Thomas Cranmer, who had become Archbishop of Canterbury in 1533. So long as Archbishop Warham ruled the church little was to be hoped for. In 1530 Warham and a majority of his party had forbidden the free circulation of any vernacular version, and copies of Tyndale's New Testament were solemnly burned before Saint Paul's Cathedral by the Bishop of London. But even then two significant signs of the times were visible. One was that King Henry insisted that some translation of the Bible be prepared. If the churchmen objected to Tyndale's, let them provide a better. Henry was alive to the need and demand for a people's Bible of some kind. The other sign was this, that in 1531 unofficial negotiations had actually been opened between the court and Tyndale at Antwerp. Tyndale nobly offered to come over and surrender himself to whatever punishment the king saw fit if only a bare translation of the Bible were allowed in England, such as the Germans enjoyed in their own

country. These negotiations came to nothing, but again it was important that they should even have been started. By 1531 Cardinal Wolsey had fallen from power and died. The next year Archbishop Warham had died. The scene was now set for a shift in the policy of the church and the court which had a serious and favorable bearing upon the fortunes of the English Bible.

At the time that Tyndale was murdered, both Cranmer and Cromwell had been in power for three years, the one as Archbishop of Canterbury and the other as chancellor of the exchequer. Both were personally interested in Tyndale, but neither could or would intervene. It was in the political interest of King Henry to keep on good terms with the Emperor Charles V, against whose laws Tyndale had technically erred. The craft of the papist party in England and of the clergy of Louvain prevented anything being done to rescue the English scholar from the revenge of the Roman authorities. But the break with the papacy came.

In the very year of Tyndale's death the rising resentment against Rome, on political rather than on religious grounds, made itself felt. This gave a chance to those who sympathized with evangelical reform, and they took the opportunity of pressing for an English Bible. When Henry realized the need of making common cause with the Protestants of Germany against the pope and his allies, he had convocation draw up a book of religious articles restating the Christian faith of England. Cranmer was behind this move, and it was ratified by Cromwell, who ordered the clergy to act upon the royal advice of studying and preaching the Scriptures.

Cromwell's injunctions actually contained a command that a Bible in English as well as in Latin be placed in the choir of every church, for anyone to consult. Why? Because King Henry in the Articles had declared that "all bishops and preachers ought and must constantly believe and defend all those things to be true, which be comprehended in the whole body and canon of the Bible and also in the three creeds or symbols," this is, the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, and the Athanasian. The Articles indeed represent and evangelical catholicism such as had never been dreamed of in England, and the Bible is openly recognized.

It was all very well, however, for the government and the church to draw up this project of reform, proving that the king intended to be a real defender of the faith himself, instead of leaving the interests of English religion to a foreign bishop like the Pope of Rome. But what Bible was to be laid open for men to read in church? There was none in English, none surviving from the Roman régime. Everyone knew that, and some had foreseen the need of an authorized translation. In 1534 the English bishops in convocation, under the impulse of Cranmer, had actually petitioned the king "to decree that the holy Scriptures be translated into the common Eng-

(Cranmer Carries on Tyndale's Work continued on page 9)

(The Testimony of Great Men continued from page 4)

been, to see this great man; great in body, great in mind, great in spirit bow before Almighty God, repentant and seeking pardon for his sins. And how well did he display the beautiful graces of his Christian character in the walk of his life. Just after his first election as president, Mr. Lincoln made this declaration of faith. 'I know there is a God, and that He hates injustice and slavery. I see the storm coming and I know His hand is in it. If He has a place and work for me—and I think He has—I believe I am ready. I am nothing, but truth is everything. I know I am right, because I know that liberty is right, for Christ teaches it and Christ is God. I have told them that a house divided against itself cannot stand and Christ and reason say the same; and they will find it so. Douglass doesn't care whether slavery is voted up or down, but God cares and humanity cares, and I care; and I shall be vindicated; and these men will find that they have not read their Bibles aright.' Another occasion when Lincoln though president of the United States, displayed his spirit of reverence and worship for the God of the Bible, was during the Gettysburg campaign. When tremendous issues depended on a turn of battle, General Sickles asked the President if he had felt no fears when all others were alarmed. 'No' said Lincoln, and added: 'Well I will tell you how it was. In the pinch of your campaign, when everybody seemed panic stricken and nobody could tell what was going to happen, oppressed by the gravity of our affairs, I went to my room one day and locked the door and got down on my knees before Almighty God and prayed to him mightily for victory at Gettysburg. I told Him that was His war and our cause His cause. And then and there made a solemn vow to Almighty God that if He would stand by the boys at Gettysburg I would give my life to Him. And He did and I will. And after that—I don't know how it was and I can't explain it—but soon a sweet comfort crept into my soul that things would be alright at Gettysburg and that is why I had no fears about you.' Who knows, but that the victory at Gettysburg was won because President Lincoln prayed.

Ex-President Grover Cleveland, who recently passed to his reward, likewise was a man who embraced the teachings of the Bible. The New York Commercial, referring to a letter written by Mr. Cleveland, has this to say, 'Writing to a Baltimore clergyman, who had written a book on the New Testament and which Mr. Cleveland was asked to preface, he wrote, 'I very much hope, that in sending out this book, you will do something to invite more attention among the masses of our people to the study of the New Testament and the Bible as a whole. It seems to me that in these days there is an unhappy falling off in our appreciation of the importance of this study. I do not believe as a people, that we can afford to allow our interest in and veneration for the Bible to

abate. I look upon it as the source from which those who study it in spirit and truth will derive strength of character, a realization of the duty of citizenship and a true apprehension of the power and wisdom and mercy of God.' Patrick Henry, one of our great American Statesmen and orators, upon being visited by a friend who found him reading his Bible, said, 'Here is a book worth more than all the other books which ever were printed; yet it is my misfortune, never to have till lately, found time to read it with proper attention and feeling.' And just before he died, calling his family into his room that he might take of them his last farewell, Patrick Henry held in his hands a copy of the Bible and addressing them said, 'My children I leave you this book, it is the greatest legacy that could come into your possession.' And what shall we say to the scores, yes hundred of brainy men, who in this country of ours have borne testimony to their acceptance of the Bible.

From among the cloud of witnesses, further representing the intellect of the world, we appeal to England and we give the first place to speak, to Queen Victoria. An African Prince who was sent on an embassy with costly presents for Queen Victoria from an Ethiopian court, preferred a modest request that Her Majesty would tell him the secret of England's greatness and glory. Queen Victoria did not, like Hezekiah, show the ambassador her diamonds and her precious jewels and her rich ornaments, but handing him a beautifully bound copy of the Bible, said, "Tell the prince that this is the secret of England's greatness.' What a beautiful testimony from the Queen of England. Let me give another illustration of Queen Victoria's acceptance and faith in the teachings of the Bible. 'In a quiet cottage not far distant from Windsor Castle, the palace of the Queen, there lived some years ago, an aged Christian woman, who had seen nearly her hundredth year. The Queen having heard of this aged pilgrim decided to visit her. Great indeed was the joy of the old lady, as she looked on the face of her earthly sovereign. She exclaimed, 'What a joy, and what an honor to me that my Queen should come to see me.' Then she added joyfully, 'But I expect a greater joy, a greater honor still and that before long, I am going to see 'the King in His beauty,' Then softly and with much feeling, the aged saint enquired, 'May I venture to ask if your Majesty has such a hope?' Calmly, Queen Victoria the Sovereign of Great Britain and Empress of India, replied to the aged Pilgrim: 'Through Jesus Christ whose blood cleanseth from all sin, I have such a hope.'

Victoria has since passed to the realization of her hope and certainly her confession is worthy of the attention of all under the British flag, yes, and of every one else besides, for it expresses the only way of access into the presence of a Holy and Righteous God; the only title to a home in heaven being "The Precious Blood of Christ."□

(Another Word on the NKJV continued from page 5)

Bible through, from Genesis through the Revelation. So, when I received this reprint of the original of the KJV from Nelson Publishers, I began to read the Bible through again, from their claimed "reprint of the original!"

Let me quote from Nelson Publisher's own words, in their letter as well as in the advertising material sent with this Bible. I don't want to be misunderstood.

From Nelson Publisher:

"Nelson's reprint of the King James Version of the Bible is a faithful reproduction of the original text set in modern type-face for readability."

And in another place: "Original text in modern type."

"Original spelling, punctuation, and grammar."

"Original preface, 'The Translators to the Reader.'"

The claims are that of Nelson Publishers!

Granted, as we would expect, and already knew, words were spelled somewhat differently than today in many cases. For example, "son," is spelled "sonne." "Keep," is "keepe." The letter "u" and "v" look the same. An "s" could be mistaken for an "f," such as "The Booke of Pfalms." **But the words are the same as in my current KJV! Praise the Lord!**

Granted, again we knew this, that in the first edition of the KJV of 1611, the Apocrypha was included, but not as a part of the text, or of the Word of God. In fact, the translators of the KJV explained that the books of the Apocrypha were "writings or statements of doubtful authorship, authenticity, or authority," and were known to be spurious, non-canonical books. These were books outside the Hebrew Bible, and were fictitious and false. They were not printed to be accepted as part of the text, or of the Bible!

So, I read on, and on, and on, with my own copy of the KJV on the desk, and the "reprint edition of the KJV" beside it. I compared verse after verse, word by word, chapter after chapter through the Old Testament, and on through the New Testament. Every spare moment I could manage was spent in reading the reprint edition, with my own KJV alongside.

I took the reprint edition to staff meetings, and I would read and have them follow in their Bibles. I took the reprint edition to my pulpit and told the congregation to call out and stop me if I read differently than their copy of the KJV.

Finally, with tears of joy and praise unto my Lord, I cried out, "It's the same! It's the same word. Some letters may look differently from ours today and some words may have an extra "e" or slight difference in spelling, **but it is the same word! He has 'preserved His Word' and we have it in the KJV of 1611!**"

Of course, I knew this and believed this all the time, but it was wonderful to see the evidence before my very eyes, and to verify what I have been preaching and teaching all these years.

What are these "five revisions" they speak about and write about? Evidently, they are spelling changes and updating of letter styles if Nelson Publishers is telling me the truth that they sent me a "reprint of the original KJV of 1611." For I declare unto you that they **are the same, identical Bibles!**

So, I wrote to Nelson Publishers thanking them for the "reprint edition of the original KJV of 1611," set in modern type for easy readability, and said, "You have just about turned me into a shouting Baptist! Thank you!"

I haven't heard from them since, but don't talk to me about "revisions." The "New King James Version," is not the same. It has been changed, and different words substituted that even change the meaning, so once again, **stand by your old KJV of 1611! It is the Word of God!**

And again, seriously, I am grateful for the copy of the "reprint of the original KJV of 1611, set in modern type." I am enjoying it a great deal, for it's the same Bible I have been reading all my life! ☐

~~~~~

(Is a Pronominal Revision ... continued from page 6)

living God." Here, in reply to a direct question as to what Jesus' apostles and immediate followers held Him to be, Peter affirms that He is the Messiah of Old Testament prophecy, that He is the Son of the living God. Yet several modern versions use YOU here instead of THOU (cf. also Matthew 14:33; 20:21). We turn to Mark 1:11 and Luke 3:22 and there, according to the RSV, the living God addresses His "Son" with thou. Does this affirm Jesus' Deity, or does it not? In Acts 1:24 the "Lord" is addressed with THOU (RSV). Does this mean that God is addressed, or that Jesus is addressed as God? Since Jesus chose His twelve apostles while He was on earth, it would be natural to suppose that this prayer for guidance in the choice of a successor to Judas would be addressed to Him in heaven (cf. Acts 9:13 with 4:24-27). Is such the intent of the revisers? We note in this connection that the risen but not yet ascended Christ is addressed as YOU in Acts 1:6 (RSV). Finally, we turn to Hebrews where, in the first chapter, the unique dignity of this Son of the living God is elaborately proved by six or seven quotations from the Old Testament. In four of these the pronoun of the second singular is used. RSV renders it here by THOU or THY.

It is important to remember that the retention of the distinction between the singular and the plural is sometimes quite essential to accuracy of rendering YOU, as both singular and plural is at times confusing in English, as in French and German, and requires explanation if used for both, as for instance in Luke 22:31,32, where by the use of YOU, the distinction

(Is a Pronominal Revision ... continued on page 12)

## FOOLISH PAGANS MOCKING

The following is a letter to the editor of the Oklahoma Gazette newspaper which I wrote in response to an extremely blasphemous article written by a Dr. Robin Meyers. Without first reading Dr. Meyers' article you cannot completely appreciate the wording of my letter. Nevertheless, I think you will find my letter informative and worth reading.

In Christ,  
Louis A. Turk

Dear Editor:

Dr. Robin Meyers' article against capital punishment in the August 30, 2000 issue of the Oklahoma Gazette ("Wise Woman Walking") deserves some critical analysis.

First of all, note in his first paragraph that he views the subject from the evolution worldview; he "assumes" with a fervent but blind faith that evolution really has occurred, and that therefore the first chapter of the Bible is a myth. The two core beliefs of evolution are: (1) that God did not create life in the biogenesis (which means only life can begat life) manner the Bible says, but rather it spontaneously arose without parents from dead matter (this is termed abiogenesis or spontaneous generation); and (2) that animals of one kind can and have given birth to animals of a different kind. Such events would indeed be miracles, for they are exactly the opposite of what is observed in nature today. When Dr. Meyers is prepared to show an example of either of these two miracles happening, please make a public announcement so we can all attend.

I would remind your readers that Louis Pasteur proved both of these ideas wrong, and in so doing brought in the era of modern medicine. Looking through his microscope at tiny creatures reproducing, Pasteur realized evolution was wrong. Pasteur reasoned that if life only came from life, and if a kind of creature could only reproduce its own kind, then by determining a germ's kind and learning how to kill that kind without destroying its host, the disease it caused could be cured. These simple conclusions are the basis of all modern medical advances. After demonstrating one of his famous experiments disproving evolution, Pasteur said:

Never will the doctrine of spontaneous generation recover from the mortal blow of this simple experiment...No, there is now no circumstance known in which it can be affirmed that microscopic beings came into the world without germs, without parents similar to themselves. Those who affirm it have been duped by illusions, by ill-conducted experiments, spoilt by errors that they either did not perceive or did not know how to avoid [Louis Pasteur as quoted in Vallery-Radot, The Life of Pasteur, translated by R.L. Devonshire (Garden

City, New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1923), 107-9].

Evolution is not science, but a return to the dark ages of misdirected blind faith in pagan religion. Evolution is myth—a lie. Dr. Meyers' logic is therefore based on unprovable, false assumptions.

In his second paragraph Dr. Meyers makes another statement he cannot prove, and which I believe he knows is untrue (after all he has a doctorate, so one cannot give him credit for ignorance). He states that the Bible "does, and it doesn't" endorse the practice of capital punishment—it is the second part of that statement that he knows is untrue. He is implying, of course that there are contradictions in the Bible, and that therefore we should believe nothing it says. Below are a few verses showing the Bible does endorse—in fact, commands—capital punishment for those proven guilty of certain crimes; it will be up to Dr. Meyers to show us where the Bible doesn't so teach.

Numbers 35:30 Whoso killeth any person, the murderer shall be put to death by the mouth of witnesses: but one witness shall not testify against any person to cause him to die. 31 Moreover ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, which is guilty of death: but he shall be surely put to death. 32 And ye shall take no satisfaction for him that is fled to the city of his refuge, that he should come again to dwell in the land, until the death of the priest. 33 So ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye are: for blood it defileth the land: and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it. 34 Defile not therefore the land which ye shall inhabit, wherein I dwell: for I the LORD dwell among the children of Israel.

Leviticus 20:9 For every one that curseth his father or his mother shall be surely put to death: he hath cursed his father or his mother; his blood shall be upon him. 10 And the man that committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that committeth adultery with his neighbour's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death. 11 And the man that lieth with his father's wife hath uncovered his father's nakedness: both of them shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them. 12 And if a man lie with his daughter in law, both of them shall surely be put to death: they have wrought confusion; their blood shall be upon them. 13 If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them. 14 And if a man take a wife and her mother, it is wickedness: they shall be burnt with fire, both he and they; that there be no wickedness among you. 15 And if a man lie with a beast, he shall surely be put to death: and ye shall

(Foolish Pagans Mocking continued on page 8)

*(The Testimony of Great Men continued from page 1)*

entwined with our whole civic and social life that it would be literally—I do not mean figuratively I mean literally—impossible for us to figure to ourselves what that life would be if these teachings were removed. We would lose almost all the standards by which we now judge both public and private morals; all the standards towards which we, with more or less resolution, strive to raise ourselves—"The Bible has been the Magna Charta of the poor and the oppressed. Down to modern times, no State has had a constitution in which the interests of the people are so largely taken into account; in which the duties, so much more than the privileges, of rulers are insisted upon, as drawn up for Israel in Deuteronomy and Leviticus. No where is the fundamental truth that the welfare of the State in the long run, depends upon the righteousness of the citizen, so strongly laid down. The Bible is the most Democratic book in the world"—"If we read the Bible aright, we read a book which teaches us to go forth in the work of the Lord; to do the work of the Lord in the world as we find it; to try and make things better in this world, even if only a little better, because we have lived in it. That kind of work can only be done by the man who is neither a weakling nor a coward; by the man who in the fullest sense of the word is a true Christian, like Great Heart, Bunyan's hero. We plead for a closer and wider and deeper study of the Bible, so that our people may be in fact as well as in theory, doers of the word and not hearers only. Surely we have reason to be thankful for the esteem and reverence which Ex-President Roosevelt gives to the Bible.

Next to Mr. Roosevelt we will consider the testimony of our beloved martyred President, Abraham Lincoln. Who has not yet become acquainted with Lincoln as a man of faith in God, and one who was acquainted with the Scriptures. For some reason or another there seems to be great diversity of opinion as to the religious sentiments of Mr. Lincoln. Some people are unwilling to admit that Lincoln was a Christian man, while others are totally ignorant of his attitude toward religious things. That we might be thus enlightened, I quote from a recent issue of the Literary Digest, the statement of Dr. Jacquess, who was Colonel of the Seventy-third Regiment, Illinois Infantry Volunteers, during the Civil War, also a Preacher at Springfield in the days of Lincoln. Dr. Jacquess writes. "The mention of Mr. Lincoln's name, recalls to my mind an occurrence that perhaps I ought to mention. I notice that a number of lectures are being delivered on Abraham Lincoln, but they all when they reach one point, run against a stone wall and that is in reference to Mr. Lincoln's religious sentiments. I happen to know something on that subject that very few persons know. My wife, who has been dead nearly two years, was the only witness of what I am going to state to you as having occurred. Very soon

after my second year's work as minister in the Illinois Conference, I was sent to Springfield. There were ministers in the Illinois Conference, who had been laboring for twenty-five years to get to Springfield the capital of the State. When the legislature met there were a great many people here and it was thought to be a matter of great glory among the ministers to be sent to Springfield. But I was not pleased with my assignment. I felt my inability to perform the work. I did not know what to do. I simply talked to the Lord about it, however, and told him that unless I had help I was going to run away. I heard a voice saying to me, 'Fear not,' and I understood it perfectly. Now I am coming to the point I want to make. I was standing at the parsonage door one Sunday morning, a beautiful morning in May, when a little boy came up to me and said: 'Mr. Lincoln sent me round to see if you was going to preach today.' Now I had met Mr. Lincoln, but I never thought any more of Abe Lincoln than I did of anyone else. I said to the boy: 'You go back and tell Mr. Lincoln that if he will come to church he will see whether I am going to preach or not.' The little fellow stood working his fingers and finally said: 'Mr. Lincoln told me he would give me a quarter if I would find out whether you are going to preach.' I did not want to rob the little fellow of his income, so I told him to tell Mr. Lincoln that I was going to try to preach. I was always ready and willing to accept any assistance that came along, and whenever a preacher or one who had any pretense in that direction would come along I would thrust him into the pulpit and make him preach because I felt that anybody could do better than I could. The church was filled that morning. It was a good-sized church, but on that day all the seats were filled. I had chosen for my text the words, "Ye must be born again," and during the course of my sermon, I laid particular stress on the word 'must'. Mr. Lincoln came into the church after the services had commenced, and there being no vacant seats, chairs were put in the altar in front of the pulpit and Mr. Lincoln and Governor French and his wife, sat in the altar during the entire service, Mr. Lincoln on my left and Governor French on my right. I noticed that Mr. Lincoln appeared to be deeply interested in the sermon. A few days after that Sunday, Mr. Lincoln called on me and informed me that he had been greatly impressed with my remarks on Sunday and that he had come to talk with me further on the matter. I invited him in and my wife and I talked and prayed with him for hours. Now I have seen many persons converted; I have seen hundreds brought to Christ and if ever a person was converted, Abraham Lincoln was converted that night in my house. His wife was a Presbyterian, but Mr. Lincoln was not inclined that way. He never joined my church, but I will always believe that since that night, Abraham Lincoln lived and died a Christian gentleman.' What a beautiful sight it must have

*(The Testimony of Great Men continued on page 11)*

are criminals? Could it be that they are just attempting to make sure they themselves will not be punished for their crimes should they be caught?

Ignore humanists, for they are merely foolish pagans mocking. ☐

*(Cranmer Carries on Tyndale's Work continued from page 2)*

lish tongue by certain upright and learned men . . . and handed over to the people for their instruction." Nothing came of this; the majority of the bishops were either incompetent or unwilling. But meanwhile one translation appeared, the first printed English version of the entire Bible. This was the work of a Yorkshire student, Miles Coverdale, who had been in close touch with Tyndale. Eventually he became Bishop of Exeter, but at present he was on the Continent. So far as Tyndale's work had gone, Coverdale practically revised it, but he drew upon other versions, especially German and Latin, fusing them into fine musical prose of his own. He dedicated the book to the king, in order to win sanction for it. But, although he had Cromwell's influence behind him, the most that he could gain was freedom for his book, which had been published abroad, to circulate within England.

This was indeed something. But still there was no authorized Bible such as the royal plan demanded. What Tyndale had written was certainly circulating now, under the thin guise of Coverdale; yet the English church required a better edition of the Scriptures, for Coverdale's Bible was not wholly accurate, and he himself recognized frankly that it was not a final translation.

Soon a second contribution appeared, which was really a revised edition of Coverdale and Tyndale, though for political reasons their names were suppressed. This was the so-called "Matthew's Bible." Like Coverdale's version, it was printed abroad and dedicated to the king by the editor, a young colleague of Tyndale, but it had better fortune than its predecessor enjoyed. By this time Cranmer had lost hope of the bishops translating the Bible themselves. He felt the urgent need of a good version, backed by royal favor, and when he read this one he was so delighted that he pressed Cromwell to obtain the king's consent. Let this book of Scripture be licensed so that anyone may be free to buy and read it, "until such time as that we bishops shall set forth a better translation, which I think," he adds wittily, "will not be till a day after doomsday."

The result was that by the autumn of 1537 "Matthew's Bible" was formally approved by his majesty. Cranmer and Cromwell had succeeded in their effort to lodge the English Bible in the English church.

So far as Cromwell and King Henry were concerned the motive was not a pure love of the word. These statesmen realized that the reading of the Bible was one effective means of discrediting the papist claims of

Rome, and it is not unfair to argue that this consideration was uppermost in their minds. But Cranmer had a nobler aim in the business. Other bishops might doubt the wisdom of letting the common people read the Bible, but Cranmer believed honestly in educating all members of the church by means of a version of the Bible in their own tongue. There is no doubt in the mind of historians that Cranmer roused the authorities to realize the need of the Bible in English Christianity, now that it was being freed from the papacy. But let us admit that although the civil authorities conceived the need and the usefulness of the Bible less deeply than Cranmer did, and undertook the policy for reasons which were less religious than his, they were able to carry the project through as no churchman could have done.

Cranmer had still more to do for the cause of the Bible among his own countrymen. We do not know whether the authorities realized what they had done in licensing Coverdale's edition. If they did, how did they feel when a book was now patronized which practically reproduced the very version of Tyndale at which they had launched their anathemas? It must have been an awkward situation. However, even apart from this there were reasons why neither the Matthew's Bible or Coverdale's edition could be accepted as final. The latter contained controversial notes and prefaces, for one thing. The former had other weaknesses that made it not only unsatisfactory in itself but of less value than the Coverdale Bible as a basis for further editions. A revision of the Coverdale edition was therefore demanded and carried out almost at once. Cromwell pressed for this, and the revision was intrusted to Coverdale himself. It was printed in Paris, as the press there was better than in England. The Romanists in France did their best to prevent the export of the sheets, but the English were too clever for them, and by 1539-1540 the newly revised Bible was issued in England. It was called either "Cromwell's Bible" or the "Great Bible."

Almost before this Bible could be launched in England a shift of politics led to the fall and execution of Cromwell, and Cranmer had to complete the measures taken for the publication of the Great Bible. So it is sometimes called "Cranmer's Bible," although the only part Cranmer took in the venture was to contribute a prologue or preface to the second edition. In this prologue he makes a statement about earlier English translations, that is, earlier than Tyndale's. But before leaving the Great Bible let us recall that, although it was wisely stripped of notes, it was introduced by a significant picture, which the great painter Holbein, then patronized by Cromwell and King Henry, is supposed to have drawn. At the top of the woodcut Christ is represented in heaven, saying, "I have found a man after mine own heart, which shall fulfill all my will." (Acts 13:22); this addressed to King Henry, who kneels on the ground and

*(Cranmer Carries on Tyndale's Work continued on page 12)*

(Foolish Pagans Mocking continued from page 3)

slay the beast. 16 And if a woman approach unto any beast, and lie down thereto, thou shalt kill the woman, and the beast: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them.

Why does the Bible command capital punishment for murderers? Because if a murderer is executed he will never murder again; taxpayers will not have to support him in jail thereby being effectively robbed again (it is evil to take food that could be used to relieve innocent children's hunger and give it to convicted felons), and it will make other potentially violent people fear to murder. If murderers don't fear to murder, then the rest of us must fear being murdered. Of course, as the above verses show, murder is not the only crime that deserves capital punishment. Many of your readers have had their homes broken and their lives shattered by adulterers who would have been far less likely to steal another person's mate had they feared it would have cost them their lives. Millions are dying of aides because of homosexuals being allowed to spread AIDS worldwide with their filthy practice of anal intercourse; in their method of sex they get human feces on themselves and contact and spread diseases. Many of them persist in this practice, knowing they are giving their sex partners an incurable disease. They are committing premeditated murder pure and simple, and God says they therefore deserve what? See Lev. 20:13 above. Sodomites will no doubt accuse me of hate crime for pointing out this verse—they believe so strongly in freedom of speech for none but themselves—, but it is they who are the violent, hateful ones. They are the ones who rape and murder little boys. It is they—not the Bible believers—who can only multiply by seducing other people's children. It was homosexuals—not Bible believers—that threatened to murder one of our city counsel members several years ago. Sodomy is a sin (crime). It is criminal activity in the same classification as murder, rape, robbery, and having sex with animals. Homosexuals no more deserve special protection by the government than robbers, murders, rapists, and drug users do. Homosexuals blame their criminal behavior on God, saying they were born that way, but God's word blames their behavior on their own choice to commit an abominable crime, and it is the duty of government to see that they pay the price for such wickedness.

Now let us examine Dr. Meyers' logic in the third paragraph of his article. It must be stated that there is no point in trying to refute this kind of logic—it will not change the mind of any true believer in evolution such as Dr. Meyers. Evolutionary humanism (which is what Dr. Meyers is advocating) assumes that murderers should be protected so that they can murder again much as it assumes anal sex is normal. It is part of a worldview that also assumes a Big-Bang-created universe (a big bang blew the Federal Murrah Building to pieces,

but Dr. Meyers' Big Bang was a miracle!), and assumes lightning striking the ocean as the origin of life, and assumes lizards have given birth to birds, and assumes men as inferior to women. By the way, nowhere in the Bible does it say that women are the inferior possessions of men, as Dr. Meyers states. Only a person who has never given the Bible a fair reading would believe that or any of the other blasphemous statements Dr. Meyers makes about what the Bible teaches. He is a blatant unbeliever, yet he implies that he is a Bible expert so that he can persuade those that do believe the Bible but never read it to believe just the opposite of what it says.

Let us see just how much of a Bible expert Dr. Meyers actually is. He states in paragraph 5 that Jesus "did not 'die for us'—rather, he was killed by us, by people just like you and me." Yet in I Corinthians 15:3-4 the Bible states clearly "that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures." Someone is not telling the truth, and somehow I do not think the liar is the Apostle Paul or God.

The facts of Christ dying on the cross for our sins, being buried, and rising again is the very most important teaching of Christianity; this is the gospel (meaning "good news") through which we can be forgiven of our sins and saved from sin's penalty (I Cor. 15:1-4). God is just—so just that all sin must be punished. Romans 3:23 tells us that "the wages of sin is death." Jesus took capital punishment for us so that we could be justified (made just as though we had never sinned in the eyes of God's law): "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit" (I Pet. 3:18).

Dr. Meyers says, "The idea that Jesus was the Paschal Lamb, the perfect sacrifice, the Lamb of God who had to be slaughtered to cancel out the sins of the world...The fact is, almost nobody believes this anymore." But God's Word says, "Christ our passover (from the Greek word "pascha") is sacrificed for us" (I Cor. 5:7). "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29). Most pagans are more subtle than Dr. Meyers. By his blunt blasphemy Dr. Meyers has done a great service to all your readers by making exceedingly clear that arguments rejecting capital punishment are based on atheism and the rejection of the Bible. People who believe in a holy, righteous and just God have no trouble seeing the righteousness and justice of capital punishment.

To be consistent with humanist logic, Dr. Meyers will also have to advocate abortion—the premeditated murder of innocent babies. Such is the twisted thinking of the atheistic humanist religion: it is ok, even good—humanists think—to murder innocent babies, but criminals must be coddled and protected at all costs. Could such thinking arise because humanists themselves

## BIBLE VERSION DILEMMA

I can understand why liberals, new evangelicals and other unbelievers prefer modern versions, but for the life of me I cannot understand why professing fundamentalists want a Bible with many verses and thousands of words missing. Furthermore, they all teach some false doctrine (though many loudly proclaim these phony Bibles alter no doctrine). For example, look at John 7:8 in the NASV (the folks at Bob Jones assure us that this represents the best text). Jesus' brothers were urging Him to go up to the feast. The NASV says, "Go up to the feast yourselves; **I do not go up to this feast...**" In verse 10 it records that Jesus went up to the feast. If the NASV doesn't make the Son of God to be a liar, language means nothing. It makes Him say he wasn't going when in fact he clearly intended to go all along. The KJV says, "*Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up yet...*" One little three letter word makes all the difference in the world. Which rendering do you think accords with the truth and the true nature of Jesus Christ? You don't have to know any Greek to understand this! Do you think Jesus could ever lie? The NIV has the word "yet" in the text but there is a footnote which says "some early manuscripts omit 'yet.'" Yes, and they are the same two manuscripts (not a lot like they would have you believe) from which all modern versions come. There is only one Bible, one pure text and it is in the King James Version.

Many fundamentalists (so-called) are hoping that this issue will go away. They say it is silly and nothing more than a tempest in a teapot. However, I tell you this is the most important issue of the day and will remain so until Jesus comes again. I tell you that it is not going to go away because there are still some who believe that there is nothing more important than whether we have the true Word of God or not. If we lose God's Word we have nothing! God promised to preserve that Word forever (Ps. 119:89, Lk. 21:33, etc.) and we intend to persevere in reminding people that God cannot lie.

*Cornerstone Challenge*

*"The words of the LORD are pure words:  
as silver tried in a furnace of earth,  
purified seven times.  
Thou shalt keep them, O LORD,  
thou shalt preserve them  
from this generation for ever."*

Psalm 12:6&7

*"Heaven and earth shall pass away,  
but my words shall not pass away."*

Matthew 24:35

## ANOTHER WORD ON THE "NEW KING JAMES VERSION"

By Bruce D. Cummons

*"I will worship toward thy holy temple, and praise thy name for thy loving kindness and for thy truth: for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name."* Psalm 138:2.

*"The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.*

*Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever."* Psalm 12:6,7.

One year ago, in the February issue of the Baptist Reporter, I carried an article entitled, "A Critique of the 'New King James Version.'"

Thomas Nelson Publishers had sent me a copy of the "New King James Version" as a "Reviewer's Copy." Since this was mailed to me specifically as a "Reviewer's Copy," I supposed Nelson Publishers wanted me to "review it!" This I did, in the copy, "A Critique of the New King James Version."

A gentleman wrote to me from Nelson Publishers, and was quite unhappy with my "review!" Understandably so! Had I published the NKJV, I would have been unhappy with the review also. But I was strictly honest, whether the review was liked or not!

In the letter of criticism received from Nelson Publishers, they promised to send me a reprint of the original King James Version of 1611, set in modern type to make it easier to read. Their purpose in sending me this reprint of the original KJV of 1611 was to show me that there was a vast difference between the original KJV of 1611, and the copy I preached from each Sunday, and read from each day, which purports to be the KJV of 1611.

Since the claim was made that my Bible was so different from the original KJV of 1611, and since there has been (supposedly), some four or five revisions of the KJV of 1611, I anxiously (seriously!) awaited the "reprint of the KJV of 1611!"

Finally, the "reprint of the original KJV" arrived, and I cleared my desk, closed my study door, cancelled everything for the afternoon, and began to read this Bible.

I do not mean to imply one word of sarcasm in what I am reporting to you! I am being as serious as I've ever been in my life. I longed to see a reprint of the original KJV of 1611! I wanted to seriously compare the original (reprint) with the KJV I have been reading out of since a child, and preaching out of for over 35 years.

I love my Bible! I read it constantly. January, February, and March of 1983, I had already read my

*(Another Word on the NKJV continued on page 10)*

## IS A PRONOMINAL REVISION OF THE AUTHORISED VERSION DESIRABLE?

By Oswald T. Allis

The farther translators depart from the style of the document they are translating, the more complicated does their problem become, the greater will be the variety in the translations proposed, and the greater will be the danger of the translation becoming an interpretation. Dr. Burrows lays down what we believe to be the true governing principle for all accurate translating, when he says, "The translator can only follow his text, leaving it for the commentator to explain." Many of the difficulties in which revisers have become involved are the direct result of their failure to observe this fundamental rule. An especially important example of this, because of its doctrinal implications, is their rendering of the second person singular where it occurs in the Greek text.

### THE FORMS THOU, THY, THINE

It is a well-known fact that in contemporary English the forms THOU, THY, THINE have almost disappeared from secular use. They are largely restricted to the language of religious devotion, in which they are constantly employed, and which is largely formed by, and owes its peculiarities to, the Authorised Version.

Consequently, it is often asserted or assumed that the usage of the AV represents the speech of 300 years ago, and that now, three centuries later, it should be changed to accord with contemporary usage. But this is not at all a correct statement of the problem. The important fact is this. THE USAGE OF THE AV IS NOT THE ORDINARY USAGE OF THE EARLY SEVENTEENTH CENTURY: IT IS THE BIBLICAL USAGE BASED ON THE STYLE OF THE HEBREW AND THE GREEK SCRIPTURES. The second part of this statement needs no proof and will be challenged by no one. It is undeniable that where the Hebrew and Greek use the singular of the pronoun the AV regularly uses the singular, and where they use the plural it uses the plural. Even in Deuteronomy where in his addresses, and apparently for rhetorical and pedagogical effect, Moses often changes suddenly, and seemingly arbitrarily, from singular to plural or from plural to singular, the AV reproduces the style of the text with fidelity. THAT IS TO SAY, THE USAGE OF THE AV IS STRICTLY BIBLICAL.

The first part of the above statement is not quite so easy to prove, but there is abundant evidence to support it. According to the late Professor Lounsbury of Yale, the substitution of the plural for the singular in addressing an individual, "Made its appearance in the English language toward the close of the thirteenth

century ... in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the use of the plural steadily increased, and in the sixteenth century it became the standard form of polite conversation ...

For some two centuries it may be said that in a general way they (the THOU and THEE) were employed to denote affection or inferiority or contempt." Examples of these three uses are to be found in Shakespeare, for example, in Henry V. Lounsbury was especially concerned to illustrate the last of the three, contempt. If the correctness of Lounsbury's statement is admitted, IT IS QUITE OBVIOUS THAT THE AV DID NOT ATTEMPT TO MAKE THE USAGE OF THE HEBREW AND GREEK CONFORM TO THE USAGE OF THE ELIZABETHAN OR EARLY JACOBEAN PERIOD. IT SIMPLY FOLLOWED THE BIBLICAL USAGE, DESPITE THE FACT THAT FOR SOME THREE HUNDRED YEARS THE TREND HAD BEEN INCREASINGLY AWAY FROM IT. Needless to say, the two earlier revisions--the English Revised Version of 1881 and the American Revised Version of 1901--followed the AV in this regard, despite the fact that the ordinary usage in the years 1880-1900 was much the same as it is today.

The following words of A. T. Robertson are worthy of careful pondering in this connection: "No one today speaks the English of the Authorised Version, or ever did for that matter, for though, like Shakespeare, it is the pure Anglo-Saxon, yet unlike Shakespeare it reproduces to a remarkable extent the spirit and language of the Bible" (A Grammar of the Greek NT. p. 56). This is its great claim to distinction, the reason it has endeared itself to multitudes of English-speaking people for more than three centuries: IT REPRODUCES TO A REMARKABLE EXTENT THE SPIRIT AND LANGUAGE OF THE BIBLE.

### LANGUAGE ADDRESSED TO THE LORD JESUS

There is another very important consideration. If the second person singular is to be used only "in language addressed to God," what is to be done in the case of language addressed to Jesus the Christ? Is THOU to be used regularly, because He is God, whether so regarded by the speaker or not? Is YOU to be used regularly, because He was, or, it is assumed, was regarded by the speaker as man? Or, is the translator to exegete each passage and decide dogmatically which of these pronouns is to be used in a given case? For example, in Matthew 16:16 the words of Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi are rendered in the Revised Standard Version (RSV), "You are the Christ, the Son of the

(Is a Pronominal Revision ... continued on page 10)

## HOW TO READ YOUR KING JAMES BIBLE

I've heard lots of excuses why people read other translations. Now, I'm not one of those who think that the KJV is better than the Hebrew or Greek or that think you're doomed to hell if you ever read another version, but considering the serious theological errors in ALL of the modern versions with the exception of the KJV, I have always used it and encourage others to.

"But it's so hard to understand," people say. Actually once you overcome a few minor hurdles the KJV is not only easy to understand, it comes closer to representing the original languages than any other English version.

Other than names and a few archaic nouns and verbs, the following make up the entirety of what most people have problems with. It's not that hard to grasp the syntax.

Thou, Thee, You, Ye Ever wondered (if you've studied other languages) why English is one of the few languages without a different singular and plural second person singular? The French have vous and nous, the Spanish have usted and ustedes. But we just have you. (Of course down South here we've attempted to correct this flaw by adopting the word ya'll, as a plural form of you, and some areas up North occasionally will use the word yous, as in "yous guys") Well, we used to have four words for the first person: singular, plural, subjective and objective. (If you don't understand the difference between subjective and objective, I is the subjective form ("I give it to you") and me is the objective ("you give it to me").

In King James English;

**Thou** is the second person singular subjective. "But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, **thou** shalt not eat of it..." Ge 2:17a

**Thee** is the second person objective "And I will put enmity between **thee** and the woman..." Ge 3:15a

**Ye** is the second person plural subjective. "...Yea, hath God said, **Ye** shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" Ge 3:1

**You** is the second person plural objective. "And God said, Behold, I have given **you** every herb bearing seed..." Ge 1:29 (note: He is addressing both Adam and Eve.)

As far as understanding goes, the objective and subjective are really just parts of grammar and since in English, sentence placement is more rigid than in Greek (for example, if the phrase "thee throw to I" were in the Greek equivalent it would be OK grammar, and would be understood as "I throw to thee", but in English we would still need to place the words like this, "I throw to thee") it's easy to figure out what's being said.

Reread the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. chapters 5, 6 and 7) now with the knowledge that you and ye are plural and thee and thou are singular. Does it add to the

message? (it helps me to substitute ya'll for you and ye as I read it.)

### Thy, Thine, and Mine

Thy and thine mean your or yours, thy word is your word. This is thine is this is yours. Of course when the noun begins with a vowel, thy becomes thine as in thine anger.

My and mine work the same way, just as in modern English, my word, this is mine, but unlike modern English, KJV would say mine anger. ...eth, ...est, etc. There are a lot of words that end with "eth" in KJV English. Do you remember learning verb tenses in grade school? This is the same stuff. Take the word answer. There are three tenses: past, present and future and three persons: first (I, me or we), second (you) and third (he, she or they). Here is how the word answer works with each tense and each person:

Notice how thou seems to always add a t or st

|               | Past                             | Present                            | Future            |
|---------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| First person  | I answered                       | I answer                           | I shall answer    |
| Second person | thou answeredst or thou answered | thou answerest (or answerest thou) | thou shalt answer |
| Third person  | he answered                      | he answereth                       | he shall answer   |

somewhere. But notice that whether you know what the correct tense form of the verb is, the text is still understandable.

Now...Dost thou think thou shalt understand thy Bible when next thou takest it up? ☐

## Editor's Note

In *The Baptist Pillar* we use articles taken from many different publications and written by many different authors. Please realize that this does not necessarily mean we agree with the doctrinal position of the publication or the author of the article, but that the particular article presents a scriptural truth we do agree with.

If you would like to receive *The Baptist Pillar*, please write and request one. Also, feel free to copy it and hand it out.