

**A TEXTUAL COMMENTARY
ON THE
GREEK RECEIVED TEXT
OF
THE NEW TESTAMENT**

Being the Greek Text used in the

AUTHORIZED VERSION

also known as the

KING JAMES VERSION

also known as the

KING JAMES BIBLE

also known as the

AUTHORIZED (KING JAMES) VERSION

also known as the

SAINT JAMES VERSION

**by
Gavin Basil McGrath
B.A., LL.B. (Sydney University),
Dip. Ed. (University of Western Sydney),
Dip. Bib. Studies (Moore Theological College).**

Textual Commentary, Volume: 4

**St. Matthew's Gospel
Chapters 26-28.**

Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum

“The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever” (I Peter 1:25).

McGrath, Gavin (Gavin Basil), b. 1960.

*A Textual Commentary on the Greek Received Text of the
New Testament, Volume 4 (Matthew 26-28), 2012.*

Available on the internet: <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

Published & Printed in Sydney, New South Wales.

Copyright © 2012 (Volume 4) by Gavin Basil McGrath.

P.O. Box 834, Nowra, N.S.W., 2541, Australia.

Volume 4 Dedication Sermon, preached at Mangrove Mountain Union Church,
Mangrove Mountain, N.S.W., 2250, Australia, on Monday 6 Feb., 2012.

Oral recorded form presently available at <http://www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible> .

This copy of Volume 4 (Matt. 26-28) incorporates corrigenda changes from Appendix 6
of Volume 5 (Mark 1-3) © 2015 by Gavin Basil McGrath; and Appendix 6 of Volume 6
(Mark 4 & 5) © 2016 by Gavin Basil McGrath.

Printed by Officeworks in Parramatta, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, 2012.

Dedicated to Almighty God on Accession Day, Monday 6 February 2012, being the 60th anniversary Diamond Jubilee of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II (1952-2012), and the commencement of her 61st Regnal Year (Regnal Years: since 1952). Dedicated at the completion of the Queen's 60th Regnal Year, and start of her 61st Regnal Year on 6 February 2012. The Queen of the United Kingdom, Queen of Australia, and elsewhere, Queen Elizabeth II, is one of only three English monarchs whose reigns have extended into a 60th Regnal Year, the others being George III (Regnal Years: 1760-1820) & Victoria (Regnal Years: 1837-1901). The Accession Service is attached by Royal Warrant to the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* which made the King James Version the Authorized Version, stating in its Preface, "portions of holy Scripture ... are now ordered to be read according to the last Translation;" and 2012 is also the 350th anniversary of this Caroline prayer book (1662-2012). The Preface of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer also refers to "several Princes of blessed memory since the Reformation," & Article 37 of the Anglican 39 Articles says, "The King's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other his Dominions," "whether" "Ecclesiastical or Civil," wherefore "The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in ... England." The Accession Service thus celebrates the legal Protestantism of the throne, in which, under God, the monarch rather than the Pope or anyone else is *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*. Since 1859, the annual Accession Service for the Anniversary of the Day of the Accession of the Reigning Sovereign, is the only red-letter day with its own Office commanded by Royal Warrant of the monarch as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Defender of the Faith*, and then annexed to the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662.

"O Lord our God, who upholdest and governest all things by the word of thy power: Receive our humble prayer for our Sovereign Lady ELIZABETH, as on this day, set over us by thy grace and providence to be our Queen; and together with her, bless, we beseech thee, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, and all the Royal Family; that they, ever trusting in thy goodness, protected by thy power, and crowned with thy gracious and endless favour, may long continue before thee in peace and safety, joy and honour, and after death may obtain everlasting life and glory, by the merits and mediations of Christ Jesus our Saviour, who with thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth ever one God, world without end. Amen."

Office for Accession Day, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662). Royal Warrant by command of Elizabeth R. (Latin, "Regina" for "Queen"), given at St. James's Court, on 26 July 1958, revoking the earlier Royal Warrant of Elizabeth R. of 12 June 1953, so as to alter in this Office the words, "Charles Duke of Cornwall" (1953) to "Charles Prince of Wales" (1958).

The *Accession Service* is attached by Royal Warrant of a reigning monarch to the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662. The 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* is essentially that of Cranmer's 1552 prayer book. Thomas Cranmer was the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, and together with Bishops Latimer, Hooper, and Ridley, he was one of the many Marian martyrs killed under Bloody Mary for their Protestantism. As recorded in the Protestant hagiological work of *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, these many Marian martyrs were part of the strong Protestant resistance movement against the reintroduction of Popery, and sealed the English Reformation with their blood. The 1662 prayer book is thus a symbol of Protestantism, being restored in 1559 after being taken away by Roman Catholics under Bloody Mary (1553-1558). Thus as stated in the 1559 Act *Primo Elizabethae* traditionally printed at the front of the 1662 prayer book, "The Book of Common Prayer ... of ... King Edward the Sixth, ... was repealed, and taken away by ... Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's religion ... therefore ... the said repeal ... shall be void and of none effect"

Both the Offices of *King Charles the Martyr's the Day* and *The King's Restoration Day* (or *Royal Oak Day*) removed in 1859, and that of *Accession Day* which remained after 1859, include a Communion reading of I Peter 2:13-17, with the words, "Fear God. Honour the king." Both the Office of *Royal Oak Day* removed in 1859, and the Office of *Accession Day* which remains after 1859, have a Communion reading of Matt. 22:16-22 which includes Christ's words, "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." One of the Communion readings in the Office of *Papists' Conspiracy Day* removed in 1859, and one of the readings at Mattins and Evensong in the Office of *Accession Day* which remains after 1859, includes the words of Rom. 13:1-7, e.g., "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers" and "whosoever ... resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." "Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour" (Rom. 13:1,2,7).

These points of commonality in the Scripture Lessons in the Offices of *King Charles the Martyr's Day* (30 Jan.), *The King's Restoration Day* (29 May), and *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.) which were all removed in 1859, and the Office of *Accession Day* of a reigning monarch which remained after 1859 to this day (presently 6 Feb. for Elizabeth II), thus show some important points of intersecting agreement in theological emphasis. These include the recognition of the lawful authority of the monarch; and the legal Protestantism of the Crown as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith*, even if in practice some monarchs are more worthy recipients of such honours than others. The *Accession Day Service* thus provides an important point of ongoing continuity amidst the changes of 1859, and is now the lone surviving red-letter day with its own Office issued by Royal Warrant of the reigning monarch.

By tradition "the four beasts" of Ezek. 1:10 & Rev. 4:7 are used to symbolize the four Gospels, and these also manifest parts of the *Nicene Creed*. In the established Western tradition of St. Jerome, St. Gregory, *et al*, e.g., the Book of Armagh, St. Matthew's Gospel is symbolized by the "face" of "a man" (Matt. 1:1), and the *Nicene Creed* says, "Jesus Christ ... was made man" (Matt. 1 & 17:2).

Table of Contents (indicates important reading before using commentary)*

PREFACE

Title pages.

Table of Contents pages.

* ***Common Abbreviations.***

* ***The Articles of the Creed.***

* ***The Ten Commandments or Holy Decalogue.***

* ***Transliterations of Greek letters into English letters.***

Selections potentially relevant to Vol. 4 (Matt. 26-28) from

Sydney University Greek Lectionaries 2378 & 1968.

Scripture Citations of Bishop Gregory the Great in Matt. 26-28.

* ***Rating the TR's textual readings A to E.***

The 400th Anniversary of the King James Version (1611-2011) comes and goes.

****Defence of the Received Text from "KJV friends in error" in both the Dean Burgon Society and Trinitarian Bible Society - A minor modification to Appendix 4 format.***

Sydney University Lectionaries.

Codex Illyricianus (Latin Codex P in Weber-Gryson) is named.

The new new New International Version of 2011.

"Farewell" to Manuscript Washington till Luke 8:13-24:54.

The son of a centurion.

"Thee" & "thy" etc., part of our great English literature heritage.

Christ the Rock (Matt. 16:18; I Cor. 3:11):

a) Considering issues of language genre before considering Matt. 16:18.

b) The meaning of Matt. 16:18.

Defence of Evangelical Protestant truth.

a) The danger of "ecumenical" tolerance to Roman Catholics.

b) The NT teaching that apostles, prophets, and tongues end c. 100-110 A.D., but that devil-possession and exorcists continue till Christ's return.

c) A Case Study on Bob Larson Ministries, USA.

Dedication: The Anglican Calendar.

1) Union Churches:

a) Modern Transport impacting Union churches & other churches in rural NSW.

b) Double dedication: A Piano for the 1912-2012 Centenary of Mangrove Mountain Union Church.

2) The Establishment Principle (Isa. 49:22,23):

A Christian State, not a secular state.

a) General. b) Some principles of the Protestant Christian State.

c) The Secular State: Types 1 & 2.

3) Red and Black Letter Days.

4) The 350th anniversary of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer (1662-2012).

a) St. Paul's College Sydney University Symposium;

b) Other matters.

5) Accession Day Principles.

- 6) *60 Regnal Years - Only three monarchs: George III, Victoria, & Elizabeth II.*
- 7) *The Royal Visit to Australia in October 2011.*
- 8) *An Englishman, an Irishman, & a Scotsman, at a NSW Union Church.*
- *9) *Accession Day – 60th anniversary: Diamond Jubilee.***

TEXTUAL COMMENTARY Matt. 26-28.

Appendix 1: A Table of some instances where Scrivener's Text does not represent the properly composed Received Text. Appendix 2: Minor variants between Scrivener's Text and the Majority Byzantine Text (MBT) (or another possible reading), including references to the neo-Alexandrian Text in those instances where the neo-Alexandrian Texts agree with the MBT in such an alternative reading to Scrivener's Text; where such alternative readings do not affect, or do not necessarily affect, the English translation, so we cannot be certain which reading the AV translators followed. Appendix 3: Minor variants between the NU Text or MBT and Textus Receptus (or another relevant text and the TR) not affecting, or not necessarily affecting, the English translation (some more notable variants in Matt. 26-28). Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E (Matt. 26-28). Appendix 5: Dedication Sermon for Volume 4 (Mangrove Mountain Union Church, 6 Feb. 2012). Appendix 6: Corrigenda to Former Volumes.

* *More Common Abbreviations*

- Allen's *Latin Grammar* Allen, J.B., *An Elementary Latin Grammar*, 1874, 1898 4th edition corrected, 1930, reprint 1962, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, UK.
- AV *The Authorized (King James) Version*, 1611. Being the version revised by His Majesty, King James' special command (KJV), and being the Authorized Version (AV), that is, the only version authorized to be read at the Lessons in Anglican *Church of England Churches* by the *Act of Uniformity*, 1662, which made it "Appointed to be read in Churches," via this authorization in The Preface of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer.
- ASV *American Standard Version*, 1901 (also known as the *American Revised Version*). Being a revision of the Revised Version (1881-5).
- ESV *English Standard Version*, being a revision of the Revised Standard Version (1952 & 1971). Scripture quotations are from The Holy Bible, English Standard Version, copyright © 2001 by Crossway Bible, a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved.
- Green's Textual Apparatus Pierpont, W.G. (of Robinson & Pierpont, *infra*), in: Green, J., *The Interlinear Bible*, Hendrickson, Massachusetts, USA, 2nd edition 1986, pp. 967-974.
- Hodges & Farstad Hodges, Z. & Farstad, A., *The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text*, Thomas Nelson, Nashville, Tennessee, USA, 1982, 2nd edition, 1985;
- JB Jerusalem Bible, [Roman Catholic] Imprimatur: Cardinal Heenan, Westminster, 4 July 1966; Darton, Longman, & Todd, London, 1966.
- Liddell & Scott or Liddell & Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon* Henry Liddell and Robert Scott's *A Greek-English Lexicon* 1843, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, UK, new ninth edition, 1940, with Supplement, 1996.

- Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971 & Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 2nd ed., 1994. Metzger, B.M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, first edition 1971 (A companion to the UBS Greek NT, 3rd ed.), second edition 1994 (A companion to the UBS Greek NT, 4th revised edition), United Bible Societies, Bibelgesellschaft / German Bible Society, Stuttgart, Germany.
- Migne (pronounced, "Marnya") John-Paul Migne's (1800-1875) *Patrologiae Curses Completus*, Series Graeca (Greek Writers Series), and Series Latina (Latin Writers Series).
- Moffatt Bible or Moffatt *The Moffatt Translation of the Bible*, 1926, Revised edition, 1935, by James Moffatt.
- Moulton's *Grammar of NT Greek* James H. Moulton's *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* Vol. 1, 1906, 3rd ed. 1908; Vol. 2, J.H. Moulton & W.F. Howard, 1919-29; Vol. 3, N. Turner, 1963; Vol. 4, N. Turner, 1976; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK.
- Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* Mounce, W.D., *The Analytical Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*, Zondervan (Harper-Collins), Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA, 1993.
- NASB *New American Standard Bible*, being a revision of the American Standard Version (1901). First edition, 1960-1971, second edition, 1977, third edition, 1995 (also known as the *New American Standard Version*). Scripture taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE (R), Copyright ©1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by the Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.
- NIV (2nd ed.) *New International Version*, 1st edition, 1978, first published in Great Britain in 1979; 2nd edition, 1984. Scripture taken from The HOLY BIBLE, NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION. Copyright 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved. (The NIV quoted from in Matt. 1-26 of textual commentaries; & when so specified from Matt. 27 onwards.)

- NIV
(3rd ed.) Scripture quotations taken from The Holy Bible, New International Version NIV Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984, 2011 by Biblica, Inc. Used by permission. All rights reserved worldwide.
(The NIV 3rd edition of 2011 is used in addition to the earlier NIV editions from Matt. 27. of textual commentaries onwards.)
- NJB New Jerusalem Bible, [Roman Catholic] Imprimatur: Cardinal Hume, Westminster, 18 June 1985; Darton, Longman, & Todd, London, 1985.
- NKJV *New King James Version*. [Being a Burgonite (Majority Text) revision of the Authorized (King James) Version of 1611.] Scripture taken from the New King James Version. Copyright © 1979, 1980, 1982 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by permission. All rights reserved.
- NRSV *New Revised Standard Version*, being a revision of the Revised Standard Version (1952 & 1971). The Scripture quotations contained herein are from the New Revised Standard Version Bible, copyright © 1989, by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., and are used by permission. All rights reserved.
- NU Text
(pronounced,
“New Text”) The text found in “N” i.e., Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) & “U” i.e., United Bible Societies’ (UBS) 4th revised edition (1993).
- NU Text *et al* The NU Text as well as the text in Tischendorf’s *Novum Testamentum Graece* (8th edition, 1869-72); Westcott & Hort’s Greek NT (1881); Nestle’s 21st edition (1952); the UBS 3rd (1975) & 3rd corrected (1983) editions.
- Robinson &
Pierpont Robinson, M.A., & Pierpont, W.G., *The New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform*, Original Word Publishers, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 1991 (for Textual Commentaries Matt. 1-19); Robinson, M.A., & Pierpont, W.G., *The New Testament in the ... the Byzantine Textform*, Chilton Book Publishers, Southborough, Massachusetts, USA, 2005 (for Textual Commentaries Preface & Matt. 20 onwards; unless otherwise stated).

- RSV *Revised Standard Version*, being a revision of the American Standard Version. 1st edition 1946 & 1952, Collins, Great Britain, UK; 2nd edition, 1971, Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Oxford University Press, 1977.
- RV *Revised Version*, 1881-1885 (also known as the *English Revised Version*). [Being a neo-Alexandrian revision of the Authorized (King James) Version of 1611.]
- Septuagint or LXX, or Brenton's Septuagint or LXX Brenton, L.C.L. (Editor & English translator), *The Septuagint With Apocrypha: Greek and English*, Samuel Bagster & Sons, London, UK, 1851; Reprint: Hendrickson, USA, 1986, fifth printing, 1995. Unless otherwise stated, all Greek Septuagint quotes are from this edition.
- Stelten's *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin* (1995) Stelten, L.F., *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin*, Hendrickson Publishers, Massachusettes, USA, 1995.
- Rahlfs-Hanhart's Septuagint or LXX *Septuaginta* edited by Alfred Rahlfs, 1935; second edition by Robert Hanhart, 2006, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, Germany.
- TEV For Textual Commentaries Vol. 1 & Vol. 2 (only): *Today's English Version* or *Good News Bible*, 1961, 1971, 4th edition, 1976. British usage text first published 1976. The British & Foreign Bible Society, London, UK, 1976. (This edition used in Volumes 1 & 2 of textual commentaries.)
- TEV For Textual Commentaries Vol. 3 onwards (all references): *Today's English Version* or *Good News Bible* or *Good News Translation*. Scripture quotations are from the Good News Translation Revised Edition – © American Bible Society 1966, 1971, 1976, 1992. (2nd edition 1992, Australian usage text – revised edition of 1994.)
- TR *Textus Receptus* (Latin, Received Text). TR of New Testament generally, though not always, as found in Frederick H. A. Scrivener's, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* 1894 & 1902; Reprinted by the Trinitarian Bible Society, London, England, UK.

- TCNT* *The Twentieth Century New Testament, A Translation into Modern English Made from ... Westcott & Hort's Text ...*, 1898-1901, Revised Edition 1904, The Sunday School Union, London, UK, & Fleming H. Revell Co., New York & Chicago, USA.
- Wallace's
Greek Grammar Daniel Wallace's *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 1996, Galaxie Software, Garland, Texas, USA.
- Wheelock's *Latin Grammar* or
Wheelock's *Latin* Frederick Wheelock's *Latin Grammar* 1956 (1st ed., Barnes & Noble, New York, USA), Revised by Richard LaFleur, as Wheelock's *Latin* (6th edition, revised, Harper-Collins, New York, USA, 2005).
- Young's *Greek* Richard Young's *Intermediate New Testament Greek* 1994, Broadman & Holman, Nashville, Tennessee, USA.

*** *The Articles of the Creed.***

The Apostles' Creed (named after, not written by, the apostles), is found in e.g., Luther's (Lutheran) *Short Catechism* (1529); the *Catechism* (largely written by Cranmer) in the (Anglican) *Book of Common Prayer* (1662); and the Westminster (Presbyterian) *Shorter Catechism* (*Church of Scotland*, 1648). The 12 Articles, one for each of the apostles, are as follows.

- (1) I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth;
- (2) and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord,
- (3) who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary,
- (4) suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried,
he descended into hell;
- (5) the third day he rose again from the dead,
- (6) he ascended into heaven,
- (7) and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty;
- (8) from thence he shall come to judge the quick (living) and the dead.
- (9) I believe in the Holy Ghost;
- (10) the holy catholic (universal) church;
the communion (fellowship) of saints (believers);
- (11) the forgiveness of sins;
- (12) the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting.
Amen.

* *The Ten Commandments* or *Holy Decalogue* of Exodus 20:1-17 and Deut. 5:6-21 are sometimes used in this work in summary forms of its precepts. This is in harmony with New Testament custom and practice, which sometimes cites the fuller form (Eph. 6:2,3; citing Deut. 5:16), and sometimes cites a summary form (e.g., Matt. 19:18,19; Rom. 7:7; 13:9). When the summary form is followed, it is that found in the following Table. Concerning the 3rd commandment, since NT times “the Lord’s name” includes for the Christian that of “the Lord Jesus Christ” (II Cor. 13:14). With regard to the 4th commandment, in the Greek the word, “*sabbaton*” has a contextual double meaning for both “week” and “sabbaths,” so the words that Christ rose on “the first of the week (*sabbaton*)” simultaneously mean, “the first of the sabbaths (*sabbaton*),” thus making Easter Sunday the first of subsequent Christian Sunday Sabbaths (John 20:1,19,26; Acts 2:1; 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10 cf. Ps. 118:22-24 & Acts 4:10,11). Our Lord also reintroduced the earlier antediluvian ban on polygamy (Gen. 2:21-24; 4:19; 7:13; Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:2; I Tim. 3:1), and so the 7th commandment requires Christian monogamy.

The Ten Commandments of Exodus 20 in their full form.	The Ten Commandments of Exodus 20 in their summary form.
<p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <p>And God spake all these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">II</p> <p>Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">III</p> <p>Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <p>I am the Lord thy God, Thou shalt have no other gods before me.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">II</p> <p>Thou shalt not make, bow down to, nor serve, any graven image.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">III</p> <p>Thou shalt not take the Lord’s name in vain.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">IV</p> <p>Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <p>Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VI</p> <p>Thou shalt not kill.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VII</p> <p>Thou shalt not commit adultery.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VIII</p> <p>Thou shalt not steal.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">IX</p> <p>Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p>Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">IV</p> <p>Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. OR Remember to keep the Lord's day holy.</p> <p>[Latter form from, "Remember ... to keep ... holy ... the ... day ... of the Lord," cf. "Lord's day" in application to Sunday, Ps. 118:22-24 in John 12:13 ("Hosanna" = "Save now," on Palm Sunday, John 12:1,12; Luke 19:38 // Ps. 118:26 in Luke 19:28-48 Evensong Lesson of 1662 BCP;) & Acts 4:10,11; Rev. 1:10]</p> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <p>Honour thy father and mother.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VI</p> <p>Thou shalt not kill.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VII</p> <p>Thou shalt not commit adultery.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VIII</p> <p>Thou shalt not steal.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">IX</p> <p>Thou shalt not bear false witness.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p>Thou shalt not covet.</p>
--	--

Since the Fall of man (Gen. 3), due to our fallen sinful nature (Ps. 51:5), no man, the sinless (II Cor. 5:21; I Peter 1:19) Christ except (Heb. 4:15), has ever been able to perfectly keep the Ten Commandments (Rom. 7:7-25). But they are nevertheless used to isolate sin for the purposes of repentance in the context of salvation (Luke 18:18-27; Acts 3:19; I Tim. 1:8-10), and also for the purposes of sanctification or holiness of living in the justified believer's life (Rom. 7:7). Anglican, Lutheran, and Presbyterian Protestants have historically believed in the Establishment Principle (Ps. 2:10-12; Isa. 49:22,23), i.e., a specifically Protestant Christian State, and considered that under this the Decalogue also has a function as a broad legal basis upon which the legal system should be based (Rom. 13:1-9) (e.g., Sir William Blackstone's *Laws of England & Articles 7 & 37 of the Anglican 39 Articles*).

** Transliterations of Greek letters into English letters.*

A line under the eta i.e., “e,” means a long “e.” This is the e sound of “Green” in Jay Green Sr., or the e sound of “Beza” in Theodore Beza, or the e sound of “Received” in Received Text, or the sound of the first e of “Receptus” in Textus Receptus. This line distinguishes it from the epsilon i.e., “e,” which is a short “e.” This is the e sound of “Nestle” in Nestle-Aland, or the e sound of “Westcott” in Westcott & Hort, or the e sound of the first e of “Clementine” in Clementine Vulgate, or the e sound of “Text” in Received Text, or the e sound of “Textus” and the second e of “Receptus,” in Textus Receptus. Likewise, the absence of a line under the omicron means a short “o.” This is the o sound of “Constantine” and “von” in Constantine von Tischendorf, or the o sound of the first o in “Robinson” and the “o” in “Pierpont” of Robinson & Pierpont, or the o sound of “Hodges” in Hodges & Farstad. This distinguishes it from omega which is an o with a line under it i.e., “o,” which is a long “o.” This is the o sound of “Soden” in von Soden, or the o sound of “Jerome” in Saint Jerome’s Vulgate.

English letters used for the Greek alphabet.

Alpha	A α =	A a	Omicron	O o =	O o
Beta	B β =	B b	Pi	Π π =	P p
Gamma	Γ γ =	G g	Rho	Ρ ρ =	R r
Delta	Δ δ =	D d			(sometimes P)
Epsilon	Ε ε =	E e	Sigma and	Σ σ	
Zeta	Z ζ =	Z z	final sigma	ς =	C or S c or s
Eta	H η =	H / <u>E</u> <u>e</u>	Tau	Τ τ =	T t
Theta	Θ / θ θ =	Th th	Upsilon	Υ υ =	Y u / y
Iota	I ι =	I i	Phi	Φ φ =	Ph ph
Kappa	K κ =	K k	Chi	Χ χ =	Ch ch
Lambda	Λ λ =	L l			(as in Christ)
Mu	M μ =	M m	Psi	Ψ ψ =	Ps ps
Nu	N ν =	N n	Omega	Ω ω =	<u>O</u> <u>o</u>
Xi	Ξ / ξ ξ =	X x			

(pronounced z
as in xenelasia)

**Lectionary readings potentially relevant to Vol. 4 (Matt. 26- 28) from
Sydney University (Latin, Sidneiensi Universitatis)
Greek Lectionaries 2378 & 1968.**

**GREEK LECTIONARY 2378
(11th century, Sidneiensi Universitatis)
A Gospel (Evangelion) Lectionary**

<i>St. Matthew</i>	<i>Pages</i>	<i>St. Matthew</i>	<i>Pages</i>
24-26	24:36-26:2	149a-153a	
		26	2-20
			6-16
			21-39
			57-75
			159b-160a
			155b-156a
			161b-163a
			176b-177b
26-27	26:40-27:5	163a-166a	
		27	1-38
			3-32
			3-56
			33-54
			39-43 &
			45-54
			194b-196b
			180a-181b
			187b-190b
			182b-183b
			197a-198a
			198b
			186b-187a
28	1-20	200a-201b	
	16-20	202b	
<i>St. Mark</i>	<i>Pages</i>		
15	16-41	88b-90b	

GREEK LECTIONARY 1968
(1544 A.D., Sidneiensiis Universitatis)
A Gospel (Evangelion) & Apostolos (Acts – Jude) Lectionary
for the Saturdays & Sundays of the year,
together with annual festival days.

<i>St. Matthew</i>	<i>Pages</i>	<i>St. Matthew</i>	<i>Pages</i>
24-26 24:36-26:2	149a-153a	26 2-20	159b-160a
		6-16	155b-156a
		21-39	161b-163a
		57-75	176b-177b
26-27 26:40-27:2	163a-166a	27 1-38	194b-196b
		3-32	180a-181b
		3-56	187b-190b
		33-54	182b-183b
		39-54	197a-198a
		55-61	198b
		62-66	186b-187a
28 1-20	200a-201b		
16-20	202b		

Scripture Citations of Bishop Gregory the Great in Matt. 26-28.

St. Gregory is traditionally celebrated as one of the four great ancient and early mediaeval church doctors of the Western Church.

The “apostles’ doctrine” (Acts 2:42) is of “one” “church” (Eph. 5:31,32; cf. Eph. 4:4; 5:23), that is “*kath*’ (throughout) *oles* (‘all,’ from ‘*olos / holos*’)” (Acts 9:31) i.e., catholic (Greek *katholikos* = *katholou* = *kath*’ + ‘*olos*’), thus constituting one catholic and apostolic church. However, this mystical one church thereafter contains lesser church divisions, whether by racial groupings (Rom. 16:4; Jas. 1:1), by geographical areas (I Cor. 16:1; Rev. 1:4), or by local city churches (I Cor. 1:2; I Thess. 1:1). Thus e.g., “The Preface” in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) continues this type of tradition in referring to Anglicans in the Kingdom of England, which comprised of both England and her dominions such as Wales, as the “Sons of the *Church of England*.”

The *Church of England* is a Western Church, and her Protestant *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) accordingly includes on the Calendar as black letter days the traditional four ancient and early mediaeval doctors of the Western Church, St. Ambrose of Milan (4 April), St. Augustine (28 Aug.), St. Jerome (30 Sept.), and St. Gregory the Great (12 March). Such is this latter doctor’s standing in the Western Church, that by convention, if one refers simply to “Gregory” or “St. Gregory,” without any other identifying comments then the reference is to St. Gregory the Great. (By contrast, a dissertation that is clearly on e.g., St. Gregory Nazianzus might *in that qualified context* sometimes use “St. Gregory” for Gregory Nazianzus; or a dissertation on a later Bishop of Rome, such as Gregory II, Gregory III etc., might *in that qualified context* sometimes use “Gregory” for one of these later figures; or reference to a “Gregory number,” being qualified by “number” refers to Caspar Gregory.)

A special feature of this textual commentary, not found in other textual apparatuses, are citations from St. Gregory. I find it staggering that while apparatuses such as Nestle-Aland and UBS will include citations from the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Primasius *of North Africa* (d. after 567); or both Tischendorf and UBS will include citations from the early mediaeval church Greek writer, John Damascus *of West Asia* (d. before 754); yet none of them have citations from the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great *of Western Europe* (d. 604), who is one of the four ancient and early mediaeval church doctors of the Western Church. On the one hand, I am in the first instance a son of the “one catholic and apostolic Church” (*Nicene Creed*) that knows no geographical boundaries of “east” and “west,” but is *universal* or *catholic* (Rev. 12:17). But in the second instance, in a more localized sense, I am a son of the Western Church. And as a son of the Western Church, I protest against this omission of St. Gregory!

Thus other textual apparatuses cite only the four great ancient doctors of the Eastern Church, St. John Chrysostom (d. 407), St. Athanasius (d. 373), St. Gregory Nazianzus (d. c. 390), and St. Basil the Great (d. 379); and three of the four great ancient and early mediaeval doctors of the Western Church, St. Ambrose (d. 397), St. Jerome (d. 420), and St. Augustine (d. 430). Why then do they omit reference to the fourth great

doctor of the Western Church, St. Gregory the Great (d. 604)? In fairness to these textual apparatuses, it must be said that Bishop Gregory has been badly misrepresented by the Roman Catholic Church; and possibly this factor made them reluctant to cite him. Let us consider two instances of this, the first with regard to “Gregory’s Office” (Church Service); the second with regard to the claim that Gregory was a “Pope.”

Concerning the first matter, the reader ought not to accept the veracity of the kind of thing that one finds in the Office (Service) under the name of “Gregory” in Migne’s Volume 78 (Paris, 1849), since it in fact contains alterations. Thus the King James Version’s prefatory address, “The Translators to the Reader” (Scrivener’s 1873 Cambridge Paragraph Bible, reprint in Trinitarian Bible Society’s *Classic Reference Bible*), refers to its “change” and “altering” in later mediaeval times. They say, “The service book supposed to be made by S. Ambrose (*Officium Ambrosianum* [Latin, ‘Ambrose’s Office’] was a great while in special use and request: but Pope Adrian [Pope: 772-795], calling a Council with the aid of Charles the Emperor [King of Franks, 768-814; Emperor of ‘Holy’ Roman Empire, 800-814], abolished it, yea burnt it, and commanded the service book of Saint Gregory universally to be used. Well, *Officium Gregorianum* [Latin, ‘Gregory’s Office’] gets by this means to be in credit; but doth it continue without change or altering? No, the very Roman service was of two fashions; the new fashion, and the old, the one used in one Church, and the other in another; as is to be seen in *Pamelius* a Romanist his Preface before *Micrologus*. The same *Pamelius* reporteth out of *Radulphus de Rivo*, that about the year of our Lord 1277 Pope Nicolas the Third [Pope: 1277-1280] removed out of the *Churches of Rome* the more ancient books (of service) and brought into use the Missals of the [Franciscan] Friars Minorites, and commanded them to be observed there; insomuch that about an hundred years after, when ... Radulphus happened to be at Rome, he found all the books to be ... of the new stamp.”

Thus the AV translators of 1611 here warn us of a nefarious web of Franciscan monkish “change” and “altering” to the *Officium Gregorianum*. This order has historically worked with the Jesuits to promote Popery and subvert the glorious truth of the Gospel found in Protestantism. Prominent Franciscans include the convicted Nazi war criminal, “Blessed” Cardinal Stepinatz (d. 1960, two years before the expiration of his prison sentence, having been released from prison in 1951 after serving 6 years of his 16 year sentence, and then serving the rest of his sentence under house-arrest at Krasic), who was “beatified” by Pope John-Paul II (Pope 1978-2005) in 1998. The Franciscan Order was established by Francis of Assisi (d. 1226), who was “canonized” less than two years after his death in 1228. He was a “stigmatic” and in fairness to the Papists, we cannot doubt or deny their claim that the stigmatic phenomenon of skin scars can only be reasonably explained as the exhibition of supernatural power. But given its unBiblical connection with works righteousness (Gal. 1:9; 2:16; 3:11) and Popery, we must further conclude that its supernatural source is not God, but the Devil. And little wonder, for St. Paul says the Pope’s “coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders” (II Thess. 2:9).

Therefore, with the King James Version translators sombre warning still ringing

in our ears of such “change” and “altering” of the *Officium Gregorianum* being brought about through the monkish assistance of Popish Franciscans, I hope the reader will understand that for my purposes of Gregorian Bible citations, I shall generally omit reference to Migne’s Volume 78, which is the volume containing the relevant writings attributed to “Gregory.” Not that this will be a great loss anyway, for this Volume 78 contains far fewer references to Scripture than the other Migne Gregorian Volumes 75 to 77 & 79, all of which were first published by Migne at Paris, France, in 1849.

Another way the Roman Church has very badly misrepresented Bishop Gregory, has been the way it falsely claims that godly and pious Bishops of Rome such as St. Silvester (d. 335) and St. Gregory (d. 604) were “Popes.” (Alas, it has been joined in this anachronism by many shallow-minded secularist historians also.) Indeed they make this false claim right back to the holy Apostle, St. Peter, whom they falsely depict as “*the* Bishop of Rome” holding “*the* Bishopric of Rome,” and also being “Pope.” This sometimes includes fraudulent and anachronistic artistic depictions of e.g., Peter, Silvester, or Gregory, wearing a Papal tiara. Therefore, as a good Protestant, I wish to make the following clarification, lest my introduction of citations by Bishop Gregory the Great be misinterpreted.

Since the Western Roman Emperors were “taken out of the way” (II Thess. 2:7) with the fall of Rome and the Western Roman Empire in 476 A.D., the Bishop of Rome, being “Patriarch of the West,” was then “revealed” “in the temple of God” (II Thess. 2:3,4), that is, the church (I Cor. 3:16; Eph. 2:21). He was found to be “shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4) in the form of a vice-God; for the Greek “*Antichristos* (Antichrist)” (I John 2:18) means “in the place of Christ” and this perfectly equates the Latin papal title “*Vicarius Christi* (Vicar of Christ).” While *some* bad Bishops of Rome made claims to a *universal primacy* in the church, this was just “hot air.”

In 533 A.D., the Bishop of Rome who had expanded his powers to become a governing primate in four of the five Patriarchates (Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Rome), (this still excluded governing power in more distant Western areas such as the British Isles,) was said in a letter, *not a legal enactment*, attached to Justinian’s Code, to be “head of all the holy churches.” This had no legal force, and was *an honorary titular primacy* of the Emperor, with no expanded jurisdictional power e.g., over the independent Patriarchate of Constantinople. Being nothing more than an exercise of the emperor’s discretionary prerogative for the purposes of a titular priority; it lasted only till the death of Justinian in 565. But to the extent that the Bishops of Rome from 533 to 565 (John II, 533-535; Agapitus, 535-6; Silverius, 536-7; Vigilius, 537-555; Pelagius I, 556-561; and John III, 561-574, during the first part of his bishopric till 565), were given such a titular honour as “head of all the ... churches,” they nevertheless were both a prophetic type of what was then the still future Office of Antichrist, and they also played an integral role as stepping stones to the ultimate formation of the Office of Papacy and Office of Antichrist in 607. Thus referring to this period of 533 to 565, Holy Daniel says two of “three” “horns” i.e., the Vandals (c. 533) and Ostrogoths (c. 556), were “plucked up;” even though the “little horn” had to wait till the formation of the Papacy in 607, before the third horn of the Lombards (c. 752) was “plucked up” (Dan. 7:8), and being

subdued by Pepin's Frankish armies acting on the Pope's request in 754-756, the Papacy then got the first of its Papal States in 756.

Nevertheless, for all of that, upon the death of the Emperor Justinian, this *honorary titular primacy* of 533 to 565 ceased, and so the Bishopric of Rome from 565 in fact then reverted back under John III to its pre 533 status. It remained so up till 607 (John III, 561-574, during the second part of his bishopric from 565; Benedict I, 575-579; Pelagius II, 570-590; Gregory, 590-604; & Sabinian, 604-606). Indeed, during this 565 to 607 period, such claims of a "universal" primacy were specifically repudiated by an incumbent Bishop of Rome, Bishop Gregory the Great (Bishop of Rome 590-604). For "Christ is the head of the church" universal (Eph. 5:23,32), and universal "Bishop" (I Peter 2:7,25).

But in time the claims came again, and this time were given *legal force*, as by decree of Phocas the Emperor in Constantinople, the Bishop of Rome, Boniface III, was made "universal bishop," and so at last the Bishop of Rome gained a governing primacy over the hitherto independent Patriarchate of Constantinople (which he held for *c.* 450 years till 1054); and from this base, also extended his jurisdiction in the West. Thus when the claim to be "Vicar of Christ" is added to the serious claim of "universal" jurisdiction from 607, the Bishops of Rome blasphemed against the Holy Ghost, who alone has such a universal jurisdiction as Christ's representative (John 14:26; 15:26; I John 2:27). This is the origin of the Roman Papacy as we know it; although its absolute form came with its gain of temporal power with the first of the Papal States from 756 A.D., and its associated spiritual *and temporal* control of Rome.

Such Papal blasphemy as occurred from 607 onwards is unpardonable (Matt. 12:31,32), and makes the Pope "the son of perdition" (II Thess. 2:3 cf. John 13:26,27; 17:12). This gives the Devil the capacity to possess the Popes (II Thess. 2:9); and indeed, sitting in Rome (Rev. 17:9; 18:2), the Devil has personally Devil-possessed every Pope of Rome since 607 (Rev. 12:3,9; 13:1,2; 16:13,14), rather than as per normal, leaving his host of lesser devils to do such things. Unlike God, the Devil is not omnipresent (everywhere at once,) and so must generally work through his host of devils. He organizes everything from Rome (Rev. 17:9; 18:2). Thus in the same way that Isaiah could look "the king of Babylon" (Isa. 14:4) in the eye and address the Devil who possessed him (Isa. 14:12-15), or Ezekiel could look "the king of Tyrus" in the eye and address Lucifer who possessed him (Ezek. 28:12ff); so likewise one can look the every Pope since 607 in the eye, and address the Devil himself.

Thus e.g., on the one hand, the Devil through his legion of unholy angels tempts men to commit such sins as atheism (1st commandment), fornication (7th & 10th commandments), or abortion (6th commandment). But on the other hand, if they look like they want to repent, he is there, with his great deception, the Roman Catholic Church, to say, "I'm so glad you're now repenting, you know, the Pope has always opposed these things. It's a very good work you're now doing." Thus he presents his false gospel of faith and works, and tries to get them to think that their repentance etc. is a good work meriting favour with God. Hence by either his false gospel of Roman

Catholicism (Gal. 1:8,9; 3:11), or by an overt appeal to worldly lusts, he hog-ties them for hell either way. Very few see through the two-pronged deception i.e., they think of the Pope and Devil as opposites.

St. John Chrysostom (d. 407) and St. Jerome (d. 420) both taught that “the temple of God” in which the Antichrist sits, is the church of God (Eph. 2:21; II Thess. 2:4). St. Chrysostom taught that the Antichrist’s rise must come shortly after the fall of the Western Roman Empire, which occurred in 476. St. Gregory the Great (d. 604) was a Bishop of Rome before the formation of the Roman Papacy (Boniface III, Bishop of Rome, 607; First Pope, 607, procured a decree from Phocas making him, “universal bishop”). St. Gregory stated that he was opposed to any claims of a so called “universal bishop,” and he denounced the claim of a bishop to “universal” primacy as the teaching and goal of the “Antichrist.” Therefore the subsequent adoption of this title and claim by the Bishop of Rome from 607, does, on the teaching of the church doctors, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and St. Gregory, require the conclusion that from the establishment of the Office of Pope in 607, every Bishop of Rome has held nothing less than the Office of Antichrist, foretold in Holy Writ.

The Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) Calendar remembers Bishop Gregory with a black letter day on 12 March. In doing so, it recognizes that like all men, Christ except, no saint (believer) of God is perfect. Thus in the dispute between Bishop Gregory and Bishop Serenus (Bishop of Marseille, France, 596-601), in which Gregory “didst forbide images to be worshipped,” but did not want Serenus to “break them” as he had in his Diocese (Homily 2, Book 2, Part 2), the Homily says of the “two bishops,” “Serenus,” “for idolatry committed to images, brake them and burned them; Gregory, although he thought it tolerable to let them stand, yet he judged it abominable that they should be worshipped But whether Gregory’s opinion or Serenus’ judgment were better herein consider ye, I pray you; for experience by and by confuteth Gregory’s opinion. For ... images being once publicly set up in ... churches, ... simple men and women shortly after fell ... to worshipping them ...” (Homily 2, Book 2, Part 3). Thus Gregory is certainly not regarded as being beyond criticism. Yet for all that, he was a saintly man.

Thus the writings of Bishop Gregory are used like other church writers, i.e., *critically*, for only the Bible is infallible. But this only goes to enhance the fact that these same Homilies of Article 35 in the Anglican *39 Articles* refer to, and endorse St. Gregory’s teaching on the Antichrist. This was stated when the Bishop of Constantinople sought to become “universal bishop,” and Bishop Gregory argued that no human being here on earth is “universal bishop,” and since only the Antichrist will be such a “universal bishop,” it follows that the Bishop of Constantinople was thus a “forerunner of Antichrist.” Hence when the Bishop of Rome, Boniface III later got a decree from the Emperor Phocas, making him “universal bishop,” on St. Gregory’s teachings, the Popes of Rome became the Antichrist.

“As for pride, St. Gregory saith ‘it is the root of all mischief.’ ... First, as touching that” “the Popes” “will be termed *Universal Bishops* and *Heads of all Christian*

Churches through the world, we have the judgment of Gregory expressly against them; who writing to Mauritius the Emperor, condemneth John Bishop of Constantinople in that behalf, calling him ... the forerunner of Antichrist” (Book 2, Homily 16, Part 2). Accordingly this same Article 35 teaches that all the Popes of Rome since 607 have held the Office of Antichrist (Matt. 24:24; II Thess. 2:1-12; I John 2:18; Rev. 13 & 17). Thus Article 35 states, “King Henry the Eighth,” “put away” “superstitious pharisaical sects by Antichrist invented and set up” by, e.g., “Papistical superstitions,” “Councils of Rome,” and “laws of Rome” (Homily 5, Book 1). The “bishop of Rome” “ought” “to be called Antichrist” (Homily 10, Book 1). ““Many (Matt. 24:5,24) shall come in my name,’ saith Christ,” “all the popes” “are worthily accounted among the number of” “false Christs” (Matt. 24:24)” (Homily 16, Book 2). The “bishop of Rome” is “the Babylonical beast of Rome” (Rev. 13:1-10; 17:5,9) (Homily 21, Book 2).

This type of Anglican Protestant teaching is also reflected in the Dedicatory Preface of the King James Version and prefatory remarks in the “Translators to the Reader,” *supra*. For on the one hand, these Anglican translators refer to Gregory the Great as “Saint Gregory” and defend him against changes made by the Roman Church to the *Officium Gregorianum*, *supra*. And on the other hand, in “A paraphrase upon the Revelation of ... S. John,” King James I said Rev. 13 refers to “the Pope’s arising;” and the Dedicatory Preface to the King James Version refers to how “Your Majesty’s” “writing in defence of the Truth ... hath given such a blow unto that man of sin [II Thess. 2:3], as will not be healed.”

What saith the three great doctors of the Reformation, Martin Luther (d. 1546), John Calvin (d. 1564), and Thomas Cranmer (Marian Martyr, m. 1556)? Luther refers to “when there were still bishops in Rome, before the Pope.” He says, “the Papacy did not exist before Emperor Phocas and Boniface III, and the church in the whole world knew nothing of it. St. Gregory, pious ... bishop of the Roman church, condemned it and would not tolerate it at all” (*Luther’s Works*, Vol. 41, p. 299). And Luther also says, the “Pope ... is the true Antichrist ..., who hath raised himself over and set himself against Christ This is called precisely, ‘setting oneself over God and against God,’ as St. Paul saith” (II Thess. 2:4) (*Luther’s Smalcald Articles* 4:9-11, upheld in the Lutheran *Formulae of Concord*, Epitome 3).

In his *Institutes*, Calvin’s most commonly cited writer among the ancient and early mediaeval church writers is the doctor, St. Augustine (over 300 times), and his second most commonly cited writer is the doctor, St. Gregory (over 50 times) (Lester Little’s “Calvin’s Appreciation of Gregory the Great, *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 56, 1962, p. 146). As with the Anglican Homilies, *supra*, Calvin disagrees with Gregory’s view on images (*Institutes* 1:11:5); makes the same qualification that “Gregory” taught “they ought not to be worshipped;” and like Luther describes him as “a pious man” (Calvin’s *Commentary on Jeremiah*, Jer. 10:8). Thus Calvin too looks with general favour on Gregory. John Calvin refers to how “the title of ‘Universal Bishop’ arose ... in the time of Gregory ... Gregory ... strongly insisted that the appellation is profane; nay, blasphemous; nay, the forerunner of Antichrist.” And of “the vile assassin Phocas” (Byzantine Emperor: 602-610), Calvin says, “At length Phocas, who had slain

Maurice, and usurped his place ... conceded to Boniface III ... that Rome should be the head of all the churches.” “Hence have sprung those famous axioms which have the force of oracles throughout the Papacy in the present day ..., that the Pope is the universal bishop of all churches, and the chief Head of the Church on earth.” Concerning “these ... defenders of the Roman See ... [who] defend the title of ‘Universal Bishop’ while they see it so often anathematised by Gregory,” Calvin then says, “If effect is to be given to his [Gregory’s] testimony, then they [the Romanists], by making their Pontiff ‘universal,’ declare him to be Antichrist. The name of ‘head’ was not more approved. For Gregory thus speaks: ‘... All ... are under one head members of the Church ..., the saints under grace, all perfecting the body of the Lord, are constituted members: none of them ever wished to be styled <universal>’ (Gregory, Book 4, Epistle 83).”

Calvin further says, “We call the Roman Pontiff Antichrist.” “I will briefly show that” “Paul’s words” “can only be understood of the Papacy. Paul says that Antichrist would *sit in the temple of God* (II Thess. 2:4). Hence ... his nature is such, that he abolishes not the name either of Christ or the Church, but rather uses the name of Christ as a pretext, and lurks under the name of Church as under a mask. But ... Paul foretells that defection will come, ... that that seat of abomination will be erected, when a kind of universal defection comes upon the Church, though many members of the Church scattered up and down should continue in the true unity of the faith.” “Neither,” “was” “this calamity ... to terminate in one man.” “Moreover, when the mark by which he distinguishes Antichrist is, that he would rob God of his honour and take it to himself, he gives the leading feature which we ought to follow in searching out Antichrist: especially when pride of this description proceeds to the open devastation of the Church. Seeing then ... the Roman Pontiff has impudently transferred to himself the most peculiar properties of God and Christ, there cannot be a doubt that he is the leader and standard-bearer of an impious and abominable kingdom.” (Calvin’s *Institutes*, 4:7: Sections Introduction; & 4:7:4,17,20,21,25). And in *Calvin’s Commentaries* on I John 2:18 and II Thess. 2, he further declares the Roman Papacy to be the Antichrist.

And the third great doctor of the Reformation, Thomas Cranmer, also thinks highly of Gregory. For in opposing the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation and consubstantiation, and upholding “the [true] profession of the catholic faith,” he favorably cites a number of church fathers and doctors, including in this list what “St. Gregory writeth” (“The Third Book ...,” *The Work of Thomas Cranmer*, Edited by G.E. Duffield, Sutton Courtney Press, Berkshire, England, 1964, pp. 131-3). Yet in his profession of faith that proceeded his martyrdom by being burnt to death at Oxford in 1556 at the hands of the Romish Queen, Bloody Mary (Regnal Years: 1553-1558); this first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, among other things, recited the *Apostles’ Creed*, and said, “And as for the Pope, I refuse him, as Christ’s enemy and Antichrist, with all his false doctrine” (Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*).

See then, good Christian reader, how no man, Christ except, is perfect, and that Gregory erred on the issue of images. For though he rightly said they should not be worshipped (Exod. 20:4-6), which thing occurs in Popery; nevertheless, God gave an OT

crucifix as an object lesson to us (Num. 21:8,9; John 3:14), so that upon matured reflection we might see how substantial numbers of weaker brethren are drawn into idolatry by images (II Kgs 18:4), and thus the Lord teaches us that we must ban images altogether (Rom. 14 & I Cor. 8). Therefore Bishop Serenus' judgment is to be preferred over Bishop Gregory's opinion on this issue of images. But see too, good Christian reader, how notwithstanding such imperfections and blemishes in Gregory, nevertheless, in general terms, the three great doctors of the Reformation, all speak favourably of Gregory; and all condemn the Roman Papacy which was formed in 607 under Boniface III as the Office of Antichrist. And this teaching is also found at a Protestant Confessional level in Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*. So with this historic Protestant spirit found in the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* and the teachings of Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer, let us remember with favour St. Gregory. For he was one of the last of the good Bishops of Rome, and referring back to such men, Daniel says the Antichrist who arises from 607, "shall" not "regard the God of his fathers" (Dan. 11:37) i.e., he shall be a religious apostate. Now in saying this, he also bears witness that earlier pious Bishops of Rome both before 533 and between 565 and 607, like e.g., Bishop Gregory, did indeed have "regard" for, and worship, "God" (Dan. 11:37).

The following are Scripture citations from St. Gregory the Great (d. 604). I shall itemize hereunder their citation from Migne's *Patrologiae Curses Completus* (Latin Writers Series) in Volumes 75 to 79 (Paris Editions of 1849); in which the Volume Number is followed by the page number. I have generally followed Migne's citation references; but where in these textual commentaries I consider a Gregory quotation may be either a Matthean quote or another Gospel quote, the Migne reference is marked with an asterisk, *, and Gregory is not referred to in the commentary on the basis of such a reference.

Scripture:	Migne reference
Matt. 26:61	79:576
Matt. 26:63	75:586
Matt. 27:42a	76:1173
Matt. 27:52	76:1172
Matt. 28:3a	76:1171; 79:1176
Matt. 28:19	76:925
Matt. 28:20	76:1221; 79:40,72,153,255,289,625,674

***Rating the TR's textual readings A to E.**

The evaluation of evidence for the King James Versions' Textus Receptus (TR) uses the following rating system.

“A” is the highest level of certainty (75%-100% certainty).

“B” is a middling level of certainty (65%-74% certainty).

“C” is a lower level of certainty (51%-64% certainty).

“D” means evidence for the TR's reading is about equally divided with the alternative reading(s), so that we cannot be entirely certain as to which is the better reading (50% certainty). Such a rating means the TR reading can be neither definitely affirmed as correct, nor definitely rejected as wrong. Therefore the reading is “passable.”

“E” means a reading in the KJV's underpinning text is wrong (0-49% likelihood) and does not represent the true TR. I.e., an alternative reading should be adopted. This is the only KJV textual fail grade.

Though often not used, finer break-ups may be made in the A to C ranges.

A low level “A” (in the range of 75-76%).

A high level “B” (in the range of 71-74%).

A middling “B” (in the range of 69% +/- 1%).

A low level “B” (in the range of 66% +/- 1%).

A high level “C” (in the range of 63% +/- 1%).

A solid “C” (in the range of 60% +/- 1%).

A middling “C” (in the range of 56% +/- 2%).

A low level “C” (in the range of 52% +/- 1%).

The results are summarized at the end of the volume in Appendix 4: *Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E*. In Volume 4 (Matt. 26-28), all of the TR's readings have been found to be in the A to C range. Therefore the *Textus Receptus* of the King James Version (1611) requires no changes in Matt. 26-28. Nevertheless, I have itemized in the first appendix some changes that need to be made to Scrivener's Text in order for it to properly reflect the TR of the AV.

The 400th Anniversary of the King James Version (1611-2011) comes and goes.

Last year saw the celebration of the Authorized Version's 400th birthday. As reported in Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of these Textual Commentaries (2011), this was:

celebrated in various places. E.g., I am the graduate of three tertiary institutions; and one of these is the *Diocese of Sydney* Evangelical Anglican, *Moore Theological College* in Sydney. The Library display case at Moore College varies from time to time But this year [of 2011] it is featuring the "400th anniversary of the King James translation," which, for instance, on the top shelf shows facsimile editions of Tyndale's Pentateuch (1530), Matthew's Bible (1537), and the Geneva Bible (1560), which culminated in the King James Version (1611). (A photo of the display case in 2011 may be found at my website.) I will also be attending parts of an associated *King James Bible Conference* held at Moore Theological College on Thurs. 7 July 2011¹.

That conference was entitled, "Simplicity and integrity: The King James Version of the Bible in the church and the world," and subtitled, "A conference to celebrate the 400th anniversary of the King James Version of the Bible." But signs around Moore College simply referred to it as "the King James Day Conference." It had a number of speakers giving half-hour addresses, and speakers showed varying levels of support for the King James Version e.g., it included NIV supporter, Mark Strauss of Bethel Seminary, San Diego, California, USA. He has been a member on the *Committee on Bible Translation for the New International Version* since 2005; and his long hair over the top of his ears bespoke a certain worldliness with associated feminization of males (I Cor. 11:14; Titus 2:12), consistent with the fact that the 3rd revised NIV edition of 2011 with which he was associated has adopted feminist language.

Strauss said that till the 1980s, the *Authorized Version* was the world's best selling English translation, and that though this spot was then taken by the *New International Version*, the *King James Version* remains the second largest selling Bible world-wide, and in the USA, the *New King James Version* is the third largest selling translation. This also conforms to my own experience of "more conservative" churches in Sydney, (I do not say that they are religiously conservative Protestants to the point that I think they Biblically should be,) some of which use the *King James Version*, but those that regrettably do not, seem to most commonly use either the NIV or NKJV. (Of course, especially when I hear the NIV read in such churches, but also when I hear the NKJV so read, it is a painful experience to me, that I endure, rather than enjoy².)

¹ Textual Commentaries, Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25), Preface, section "7m) Royal Oak Day Dedication."

² For any good Christian reader who finds himself in such a predicament, in order to reduce the pain, I recommend he either: a) read something else at the same time e.g., the church bulletin; or b) read over the reading in his King James Bible at the same

In a matter of some evident great interest to American Puritans, Strauss said the KJV had “little initial interest” since “The Pilgrims refused to take it on the Mayflower, preferring the Geneva Bible³.” I regard this as a side-issue, since even what Strauss says were correct, the facts of life are that the KJV took some time to replace the Puritans’ Geneva Bible and Anglican Bishops’ Bible, and I see no problem with this. But I think Strauss’s word, “refused” is too loaded. Notably, another American, Jack Moorman (presently in London, *infra*), of the USA’s Dean Burgon Society gives some other information which disputes Strauss’ comments. Moorman said there was some early usage of the KJV by the “Pilgrim Fathers” who arrived in the area forming part of modern day Massachusetts, USA, in 1620. Specifically, he said that John Alden who was one of the Plymouth Colony’s founders in Massachusetts, and thought to have been the first “Pilgrim Father” to disembark at Plymouth Rock in 1620, carried with him a King James Bible which is now at the Pilgrim Hall Museum⁴.

To some extent both Strauss and Moorman have been *selective* in what they have said. When in the USA in March 2009, I visited Plymouth (by getting a train out from nearby Boston,) seeing *Plymouth Rock* (where according to tradition the “Pilgrim Fathers” stepped ashore,) and other relevant sites, including *Pilgrim Hall Museum*. According to Charles Forman’s article, “Four Early Bibles in Pilgrim Hall,” as published by *Pilgrim Hall Museum*, five Bibles remain from the “Pilgrim Fathers” era, four of them are Geneva Bibles, and one is a King James Bible. Interestingly, Forman says two of them belonged to John Alden, who owned *both* a Geneva Bible (now at Dartmouth College) and a King James Bible (now at the Pilgrim Hall Museum). His KJV was evidently “brand new” at the time, being printed by Robert Barker, “Printer to the Kings most excellent Majestie,” in 1620⁵. On the one hand, this means that Strauss’s claim that

time (and note any particular defects in the version being read). I have had recourse to both techniques in such situations where the AV is sadly not used. Alas we live in an age of great spiritual and moral decline, in which one might simply have to attend “the best of a bad lot” of available churches. “Thou therefore endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ” (II Tim. 2:3); like other saints of God, “of whom the world was not worthy” (Heb. 11:38).

³ These words appeared on an overhead he showed with the caption, “The reception of the KJV,” and a picture of the Mayflower.

⁴ Anderson, D., “The Jack Moorman and James White Debate,” *TBS Quarterly Record*, July-Sept. 2011, p. 29; referring to Charles C. Forman’s “Early Bibles in Pilgrim Hall,” Pilgrim Hall Museum, Plymouth, Massachusetts, USA, (<http://www.pilgrimhall.org/PSNote9.htm>). See “The Jack Moorman and James White Debate,” at “*Defence of the Received Text from “KJV friends in error” in both the Dean Burgon Society and Trinitarian Bible Society - A minor modification to Appendix 4 format,” *infra*.

⁵ Forman, C.C., “Four Early Bibles in Pilgrim Hall,” Pilgrim Society Note, Series One, No. 9, April 1959, *Pilgrim Hall Museum*, USA

“The Pilgrims refused to take it on the Mayflower, preferring the Geneva Bible” clearly bespeaks an unwarranted hostility to the KJV in early American Puritan history since John Alden took with him a King James Bible; but on the other hand, the fact that Moorman mentions ONLY the King James Bible of John Alden, and this was one of five Bibles still in existence from this early Pilgrim era, means that he has overstated the early interest of the “Pilgrim Fathers” in the AV, including John Alden himself who owned both a Geneva Bible and a King James Bible. But in the final analysis I do not think the enduring worth of the AV is proved or disproved by this type of *Strauss verses Moorman* argument, since even if it took some time for Puritan Protestants to switch from the Geneva Bible to the King James Bible, and for Anglican Protestants to switch from the Bishops’ Bible to the King James Bible, the reality is that in time they did, with the consequence that the King James Version became *the* Protestant Bible, enjoying broad Protestant support from both Puritan and Anglican alike.

Thus Strauss was on firmer ground when he said that “no-one can deny” that the KJV has “enduring” qualities that continue to give it a great appeal to many people. To this end, he gave an anecdotal story about how as a boy his grandfather had given each of his grandchildren \$5.00 (five dollars) to learn a section from John 1 in the King James Version.

Strauss is a member of the *Evangelical Theological Society*, exuded a friendly demeanor, and said he was “not anti-King James Version.” But the wise and prudent must be careful not to be disarmed and lose sight of Biblical truth on relevant matters by such externals of presentation. The reality is that his friendly sounding claim to be “not anti-King James Version,” does not sit well with the fact that he is on the *Committee on Bible Translation for the New International Version* which in this same year of 2011 brought out an even worse new third edition of the NIV (see “*The new new New International Version of 2011*,” *infra*). After all, if one is promoting the usage of the NIV, then by definition one is in some sense anti-KJV since one is arguing that the NIV rather than then KJV should be being used and promoted. Therefore, under strict scrutiny Strauss is seeking to “run with the hares, and hunt with the hounds.” Like so many others who have had the wonderful spiritual heritage and privileged benefit of a *King James Version* upbringing, he has then joined up with those who have then chosen to inhibit others from a similarly rich spiritual experience by promoting some other Bible Version, in Strauss’s case, the NIV.

Let us pray for such men as Mark Strauss of California, USA, asking God that they might use what gifts and talents they have to promote, rather than subvert, the AV. Let us pray that those in “the better” and “more conservative” churches presently using either the NIV or NKJV or any other version other than the AV, may return to the King James Version. We need to pray that “with respect to Mark Strauss and others like him, that if it be thy will, O Lord, thou dost turn their hearts and minds back to the King James Bible, and with that, the promotion of the Received Text of Holy Writ; and this we pray through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.” For as our Saviour Christ taught us to pray, “Our

<http://www.pilgrimhall.org/PSNote9.htm>).

Father which art in heaven,” “Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven” (Matt. 6:9,10).

Another conference speaker was the Senior Librarian of Moore Theological College, Mr. Kim Robinson. He referred to how a number of King James Version printing had been named after printing errors, e.g., in 1611 one printing incorrectly had Ruth 3:15 read, “he went into the city,” and these became known as “The ‘He’ Bibles” of 1611; in distinction to other 1611 printings which correctly read at Ruth 3:15, “she went into the city,” and these became known as “The ‘She’ Bibles” of 1611.

The Senior Librarian also referred to a number of interesting Biblical acquisitions by the Moore College Library which were on display at this conference in July 2011, and which I later photographed. These included a 1550 print of Tyndale’s New Testament which on two-columned pages, had Tyndale’s NT in one column, and Erasmus’s Latin in the other column. This reminds us that for neo-Byzantines, not only the Greek, *but also the Latin*, is important for New Testament studies. There was also a 1602 print of the Bishops’ Bible (1558), which was largely used by Anglican Protestants before the King James Version; and a 1607 print of the Geneva Bible (1560) which was largely used by Puritan Protestants before the King James Version of 1611. And there was also a 1611 printing of the King James Version printed by Robert Barker in London, which in time became the Protestant Bible of Anglican and Puritan alike⁶. Additionally, there was a 1617 printing of the Roman Catholic Rheims New Testament (1582, which when joined with the Roman Catholic’s Douay OT of 1609/10 is becomes the Douay-Rheims Version).

A number of speakers also referred to The Geneva Bible. E.g., Kim Robinson said that the Geneva Bible was known as “The Breeches Bible,” because of its translation of Gen. 3:7. In the Authorized Version this reads that after The Fall, Adam and Eve “sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons” (AV). But in the Geneva Bible (1560) this reads, “they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves breeches.”

The Puritans greatly liked the Geneva Bible, the Anglicans were not so enthusiastic about it, not because of its value as a translation, but because of its many marginal notes. The standard of these marginal notes varies between good, bad, and indifferent. But the same sort of problem that later came to exist in the 20th century when Scofield’s Bible was more popular, (and to a much lesser extent may still exist in the early 21st century with some much reduced number of Scofield followers,) in which people have failed to distinguish between the Bible and the marginal notes, and so elevated Scofield’s marginal notes to an unwarranted high regard, also occurred in the 16th and 17th centuries with the Geneva Bible. The problem being that while many of the Geneva Bible notes are useful and good, others are, in varying degrees, inaccurate and bad.

Hence conference speaker, Michael Jensen, a Lecturer at Moore Theological

⁶ See photos on my textual commentaries website at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

College, said that The Geneva Bible was found to have inhibited many Protestants from studying Scripture, since they did not go past the marginal notes in the Geneva Bible. Thus “Protestant ends” were “subverted by Protestant means,” as there was an “exchange of the Roman Curia for a Genevan Curia.” The result was that one of the reasons for the King James Bible was that a version was sought for *without marginal note interpretations* (although notes were permitted under the KJV translation rules simply to explain a Hebrew or Greek word). Michael Jensen stressed that this was not an Anabaptist type desire of getting people to read Scripture without any reference to church tradition or Bible commentaries, but rather, a desire to get Protestants to think about the Scriptures and their meaning beyond the immediate limits of attached marginal notes.

An example of this is found in Psalm 105:15, “Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm.” Prophets only existed in, and immediately around, Bible times (Luke 11:49-51; Eph. 2:20; Rev. 11:3,4 i.e., the OT and NT cf. Ps. 118:105), so the words “do my prophets no harm,” mean for the Christian, “Do the Bible no harm.” We cannot doubt that one of those so “anointed” in OT times was the king, for “Samuel” “said unto Saul, The Lord sent me to anoint thee to be king over his people, over Israel” (I Sam. 15:1). Hence when he was self-murdered (I Sam. 31:4-6), “David said unto” the Amalekite who falsely claimed to be a regicide, “How wast thou not afraid to stretch forth thine hand to destroy the Lord’s anointed? And David called one of the young men, and said, Go near, and fall upon him. And he smote him that he died. And David said unto him, Thy blood be upon thy head; for thy mouth hath testified against thee, saying, I have slain the Lord’s anointed” (II Samuel 1:14-16). (For even though the Amalekite’s testimony was a fabrication of evidence, I Sam. 31:4-6; false testimony in such an instance was also a capital crime, Deut. 19:15-21.) The NT teaches we are to “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17); and with regard to “tribute unto Caesar,” “Render ... unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s” (Matt. 22:17,21); and so “Render ... to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour” (Rom. 13:8), for “every soul” is to “be subject unto the higher powers” (Rom. 13:1). Hence for the Christian, the words of Psalm 105:15, “Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm,” includes a meaning that we are to “Touch not” the king, “and do” the Bible “no harm.”

Unfortunately, the Geneva Bible’s marginal notes brought a very bad marginal note interpretation to Ps. 105:15, in which “my anointed” was said to mean God’s “people” in general, and this is given as the exhaustive meaning, so that the Biblical focus in this passage on being “subject unto the higher powers” (Rom. 13:1) in which we are to “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17), was sadly subverted in the minds of the mainly Puritan group who used this version (since in contemporary times the Anglicans mainly used the Bishops’ Bible). Hence e.g., conference speaker, Mark Strauss, said in connection with the Hampton Court Conference convened by James I in 1604, which gave rise to the King James Version of 1611, that King James I said, “I have yet to see a Bible well translated into English ... of all, that of Geneva is the worst.” Strauss also said that though the Geneva Bible had faded in its circulation after 1611, as the King James Bible became the only one that could be lawfully printed, during the Interregnum of the 1640s and 1650s, the Geneva Bible was again promoted under Cromwell’s

republic, “But by that time, it had lost its hold on the people.” Hence “with the Restoration of the monarchy” in 1660, “the Geneva Bible was associated with all things Puritan and rejected.”

This is seen in the Restoration Caroline Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662, whose 350th anniversary is being celebrated in 2012, the year of the Dedication of this Volume 4 (Matt. 26-28) of these textual commentaries. The “Preface” says that “portions of holy Scripture” “are now ordered to be read according to the last translation,” and so this made the King James Version of 1611 “the Authorized Version.” Significantly then, King James Day Conference speaker, Greg Anderson, a Lecturer at Moore College, spoke on “The King James Version and the English Reformation liturgies.” He referred to how “for many” the King James Version and 1662 Book of Common Prayer “go hand in hand.” Nevertheless, because at its heart the 1662 prayer book is Cranmer’s prayer book of 1552, with some small number of revisions, and because this 1552 prayer book obviously predates the King James Version of 1611, Greg Anderson also made the point that most of the Biblical quotes in the 1662 prayer book are from The Great Bible of 1539 which was edited by Coverdale and brought out under King Henry VIII (and also known as Cranmer’s Bible because this first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, and later Marian martyr, wrote a Preface for it). Nevertheless e.g., the verses at the beginning of Morning Prayer and Evening Prayer are generally from the KJV of 1611. And the Communion Readings provided in the Lectionary of the 1662 prayer book are also from the KJV.

Another conference speaker was John Harris, a historian. He said, “The first question ever asked of someone in the Inquisition, was whether the person knew the Bible in their own language,” because the Papists of the Inquisition “feared” the Bible, and “and into this subjugated world came the King James Version.” *Let us thank God for the great freedom we have to worship him, and read and use the King James Bible!*

John Harris referred to various Saxon “strong verbs” used in the AV, such as “take” (see e.g., “take also of the tree of life,” Gen. 3:22; “Take my yoke upon you,” Matt. 11:29; or “Take, eat: this is my body,” Matt. 26:26), or “live” (see e.g., “the tree of life, and eat, and live forever, Gen. 3:22; “Man shall not live by bread alone,” Matt. 4:4; “and they that hear shall live,” John 5:25). He also spoke about the rhythmic metre from the Anglo-Saxon such as, “the face of the waters” (Gen. 1:2), “the valley of the shadow of death” (Ps. 23:4), “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ” (I Cor. 16:23), or “In the beginning was the Word” (John 1:1).

With regard to such rhythmic metre in John 1:1, he made reference to the difference between John 1:1 in the AV and NEB. These read:

John 1:1 in Authorized Version (1611)	John 1:1 in New English Bible (1961)
“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.”	“When all things began, the Word already was. The Word dwelt with God, and what God was, the Word was.”

--	--

John Harris said that when the NEB first came out, his grandfather criticized its style with regard to this verse. His grandfather said that the NEB translators had, “taken a verse that ended in ‘God,’ and made it end in ‘was.’”

John Harris further referred to the fact that the first sermon preached on Australian soil was that of Richard Johnson, a “*Church of England Evangelical*,” on 3 February 1788, and that this was from Ps. 116:12 in the Authorized Version. “What shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits toward me?” (Ps. 116:12, AV). This Evangelical Christian witness standing in contrast to the fact that when shortly later convict women came ashore, there ensued “debauchery that night” among the “immoral and reprobate.” But he said there were also some other godly Christians among the marines and free settlers.

John Harris also referred to the fact that Richard Johnson’s AV is preserved at St. Philip’s Anglican Church, Church Hill, York Street, City of Sydney. He further referred to the fact that the AV of an early Governor of New South Wales, John Hunter, was in the Bible Society Collection (see below).

These references to Johnson’s Bible and Hunter’s Bible were noteworthy. Earlier in the year, I had photographed Johnson’s Bible on Accession Day (6 Feb. 2011) before a 1662 *Book of Common Prayer Service* at St. Philip’s Church Hill⁷. And just two days before this Moore Theological College “conference to celebrate the 400th anniversary of the King James Version of the Bible,” I had visited the *Bible Society of New South Wales 1611-2011 Bible Exhibition* which was open at various times throughout July 2011.

Known as, “The Book that changed the World: Bible Exhibition on the occasion of the 400th year celebration of the King James Version,” this Bible exhibition was set up in Sydney⁸; and it received some media attention⁹.

This consisted of a series of display cases showing historically significant Bibles, with a special focus on the Authorized (King James) Bible of 1611. The Bible Society Display included, e.g., an edition of the King James Bible, given out to military personnel in World War II (1939-1945) “By the British and Foreign Bible Society in Canada and Newfoundland,” under which were displayed five World War II medals. On one side

⁷ See photos on my textual commentaries website at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

⁸ Held at Village Church, Cnr. Booth & Johnston Streets, Annandale, on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Saturdays throughout July 2011.

⁹ “Not just a collection of books, this is the Good Book,” *Sydney Morning Herald*, Friday 1 July 2011, p. 5.

was a “Presented to” presentation page, which at the bottom read from the Authorized Version, “Be strong and of good courage” (Deut. 31:6,7; Josh. 1:6,9; 10:25; I Chron. 22:13; 28:20). On the other side, under the symbol of a Georgian Crown, was the following message from King George VI (Regnal Years: 1936-1952).

**A MESSAGE FROM
HIS MAJESTY THE KING**

To all serving in my forces by sea, or land, or in the air, and, indeed, to all my people engaged in the defense of the Realm, I commend the reading of this book. For centuries the Bible has been a wholesome and strengthening influence in our national life, and it behoves us in these momentous days to turn with renewed faith to this Divine source of comfort and inspiration.

September 15, 1939.

Another Display Cabinet contained a 1611 printing of the King James Version, in which a Bible society note stated it was “translated between 1604 and 1611 by 54 eminent scholars on the instructions of King James I.”

Also on display at the *Bible Society of New South Wales* 1611-2011 Bible Exhibition, was playwright William Shakespeare’s Bible, which was a 1607 printing of the Geneva Bible. It was given to the Bible Society by William Lea, who had gotten it from a descendant of William Shakespeare’s sister, Joan Hart. It includes the initials “WS” scratched on the front cover, and elsewhere inside the Bible at certain points in the margin, presumably so Shakespeare could readily identify it if it was lost or stolen. Another display cabinet had a 1571 printing of the Saxon Gospels which were handwritten sometime between c. 600 and 1066 A.D. and were used in England until the Norman Conquest, and a 1551 print of William Tyndale’s translation of the Scriptures.

Yet another Display Cabinet showed two Latin Vulgates, to wit, both a 1495 printing and a 1537 printing, of St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate. The Vulgate is an important Latin document inside the closed class of NT sources from which the neo-Byzantine New Testament *Textus Receptus* is discovered and composed, and also inside the closed class of OT sources from which the neo-Masoretic Old Testament *Textus Receptus* is discovered and composed.

Also of special interest for the purposes of this Volume 4 (Matt. 26-28) of these Textual Commentaries, since it is Dedicated on Accession Day of Queen Elizabeth II, 6 February, 2012, are some Bibles on display connected with three vice-regal representatives of the Crown in Australia, to wit, two early New South Wales Governors and also the first Governor-General of Australia.

John Hunter is referred to in these commentaries in Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14) at “Title: ‘The Gospel According to Matthew’” where I say:

... the Anglican regional Cathedral, St. John’s, Parramatta (Diocese of Sydney), Australia, was named in memory of the early (Presbyterian) New South Wales Governor, John Hunter (1737-1821); though Hunter would not be called generally “St. John” in this Anglican tradition.

He held office as Governor of NSW from 1795 to 1800 as the representative of King George III (Regnal Years: 1760-1820). A Display Cabinet showed Governor Hunter’s King James Version Bible, which had been brought out to Australia by him before he was Governor, on the First Fleet in 1788. This 1773 printed edition includes commentary and illustrations by the Reverend Henry Southwell, and it later received a new cover, made of leather, by a leather-worker and sculptor on Hunter’s convict ship, E. Allan Kelly. Inscribed at the bottom under a carving on the leather, is the name of Captain John Hunter (later Governor John Hunter).

Another early Governor of NSW was Lachlan Macquarie, who held office as Governor from 1810 to 1822 as the representative of King George III (Regnal Years: 1760-1820) and King George IV (Regnal Years: 1820-1830; Regency under George III from 1811-1820). Though there were Anglican Churches in Australia before St. Matthew’s Windsor, St. Matthew’s (in western Sydney) has the distinction of being the oldest standing Anglican Church *building* in Australia; though it is not the oldest parish, an honour that goes jointly to St. Philip’s Church Hill, York Street (inner City of Sydney), and St. John’s Parramatta (in western Sydney), both of which were simultaneously established as the first two parishes in 1802 (though their present church buildings are from a later era). The Foundation Stone of St. Matthew’s was laid in 1817 by His Excellency Lachlan Macquarie, and an inscription on the south-side entrance says it was erected in 1820 under “GR” (George Rex / King), and it then had some final finishing touches added in 1821. St. Matthew’s is thus a Macquarie era Georgian church.

One of the Display Cabinets at the *Bible Society of New South Wales* 1611-2011 Bible Exhibition, showed a Russian New Testament printed in 1821, that was given by the Czar of Russia, Alexander I (Regnal Years: 1801-1825), to Governor Macquarie. The Governor then presented it as a gift to be one of the books of the lending library established by his wife, Elizabeth, at the Reverend Mr. William Cowper’s Rectory at St. Phillip’s (later St. Philip’s) Church Hill. This Bible was open to the page where it is inscribed in the Governor’s hand with the words, “For the Biblical Library of N. S. Wales. Given by His Excellency Governor Macquarie Novem 1821.”

Also on show at one of the Display Cabinets was a 1901 print of the King James Version, which belonged to Australia’s first Governor-General, who after Federation on 1 January 1901, was His Excellency, Lord Hopetoun, Governor-General of Australia from 1901 to 1903, as the representative of Queen Victoria (Regnal Years: 1837-1901) and King Edward VII (Regnal Years: 1901-1910). This specially bound King James Bible

with silver clasps and other elaborate embellishments, includes on the front cover an engraved, gold-embossed Hopetoun Coat of Arms. This Bible was opened at a front page which gave: “an earnest prayer for the Divine Blessing on the New Australian Commonwealth. This copy of the Bible was presented to its first Governor-General and Commander-in-Chief, His Excellency The Earl of Hopetoun ... by the British and Foreign Bible Society in conjunction with the Australian Auxiliaries and Branches ... June 1901¹⁰”

There were also two 400th anniversary editions of the King James Version issued in 2012, one by Cambridge University Press in England, UK, and the other by the Trinitarian Bible Society of the UK. There was both an upside and a downside to these 400th anniversary editions, neither of which were prepared to leave the AV in its proper plenary form; but both of which sought to “fiddle at the edges” with the titles of various Biblical books.

I have previously noted that though “the *Trinitarian Bible Society* does a lot of very good and commendable work for the AV and TR; and in broad terms I support and pray for their good work;” nevertheless, “they have also made some errors,” and this includes removing the honorific titular prefix “Saint” before the Gospel names¹¹.

I lodged a complaint about this matter with the New South Wales Office of the *Trinitarian Bible Society* (TBS) at Grafton, and asked them to convey this to their London Office; as well as an enquiry as to whether or not this policy of revising the King James Bible to Puritan values was going to mar their 2012 Queen’s Jubilee Edition. In June 2011 I received an email from TBS in Australia saying, “Dear Mr. McGrath ... I have received the following response from London regarding ... the word ‘Saint’.” This included a quotation from the “Senior Editor,” “Debra E. Anderson” which said:

The [TBS] Society’s view is that all who are true believers in the Lord Jesus are saints, as opposed to the Roman Catholic (and other high church) view that only certain people who have met particular criteria (as with the late John Paul II, performing miracles after death, etc.) can become saints. Regrettably, the use of “saint” before the names of the New Testament writers comes from that tradition rather than from a true understanding and application of Scripture and tends to set the writers apart as spiritually superior to ordinary believers. Thus, the Society believes it is right and proper to remove the designation “Saint” from these names in our Scripture publications.

However, we only do this in our publications. Those published by Cambridge University Press which we circulate still retain the designation. At the moment, the editions which we plan to use for the Jubilee Bibles are

¹⁰ For Hopetoun’s Bible and Hunter’s Bible; see photos on my textual commentaries website at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

¹¹ Textual Commentaries Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25), at Matt. 25:31.

C[ambridge] U[niversity] P[ress] publications, so it is likely our Jubilee Bibles will have the word “Saint¹².”

In the first place it must be said that a woman should not be allowed to hold any such position as “Senior Editor” in the TBS. This in itself shows the TBS’s departure from Biblical standards in favour of worldly “feminist” or sex role pervert values.

With reference to male and female creation of Adam and Eve and then man’s Fall in Gen. 2 & 3, I Tim. 2:8-3:13 teaches that patriarchal structures are to apply in the church and that they transcend cultural values as they are based in the creation (I Tim. 3:13) and Fall (I Tim. 3:14). Cf. I Cor. 11:1-16. That being so, it means that patriarchal structures should more widely apply in the society (Ps. 68:12; Isa. 3:12; Luke 15:8; Titus 2:5) under the Christian Establishment Principle (Ps. 2:10-12; Isa. 49:23). Scripture makes a lone exception to this in rare and unusual circumstances seemingly emanating from necessity with Deborah as judge (Judg. 4 & 5); although even here certain powers are located in Barak who is the judge itemized in Heb. 11:32.

In applying these type of principles, King Henry VIII (Regnal Years: 1509-1547) essentially gave us the present system of male or female succession of the throne, in which a male priority upholds Biblical patriarchy; but if there is no male heir in the immediate Royal Family, then due to a necessity, the eldest female becomes a crowned Queen. Another view of Scripture, evident in pre-Henrician VIII times, looks to the closest related male outside the immediate Royal Family.

The issue of “necessity” must be applied by those with a sentiment of Biblical patriarchy, cautiously and only in rare and unusual genuine instances, rather than as “a technical legal loophole” to subvert the broad patriarchal structures of society. This issue is misconstrued in this sex role perverted society to one of “whether or not a woman can do” this or that job; rather than in terms of submission to God’s Word, and the bad effects of sex role perversion on wider sociological structures; damaging impact on male and female psychology of sex role perversion; social impact on e.g., marriage, divorce, and children of sex role perversion; and macro-economic impact of sex role perversion (e.g., the movement to two-income families in which banks take both incomes into account has led to skyrocketing house prices so that in the first instance both were forced to work to buy a house, and then prices later went beyond the reach of many couples).

Broadly speaking, there are three levels of intellectual and / or spiritual perception. Firstly, those who subject to God’s Word, using their God-given gifts of intellect, by the grace of God, and under God, understand certain matters on the basis of their own application. Secondly, those of an intellectually intermediate mind (such are those who in general control the universities or colleges, legislatures, judicature, media, etc.), who are capable of understanding certain things if these are explained to them and they are subject to God’s directive will as set forth in Scripture. In their ungodly form operating under God’s permissive will rather than his directive will, such are the masses

¹² TBS (Australia) email of Miss Cherie Onus to myself, Tues. 7 June 2011.

who are programmed for destruction as anti-white supremacist racists, anti-patriarchal sexists, pro-fornication etc., at e.g., colleges or universities via the claims of various “human rights” and libertinism programmers. Thirdly, those who lack the requisite intellectual and / or spiritual gifts to understand a matter even if it is explained to them repeatedly.

Most people in contemporary Western society, including most lawmakers and educators in contemporary Western society, lack the intellectual and / or spiritual sensitivity to even begin to understand the damaging effects of anti-patriarchal sex role perversion (or the other “human rights” and libertine matters that have become so “politically correct” in the post World War Two era). But even if some of them did, there is also a necessary element of moral strength to do the right thing. Thus we find the “the scum has floated to the top of the water,” as in colleges, universities, legal courts, legislatures, etc., those of an intellectually and morally inferior mould have thus come to be politically powerful over their intellectual, spiritual, and moral betters. “And the people shall be oppressed, every one by another,” “the base against the honourable” (Isa. 3:5). *Their one and only chance to do the right thing is to do what the Bible says, seeking by the grace of God to live their lives under God’s directive will.*

God has designed the mind of man in such a way that if it is not subject to his Word, or rejects his Word, it goes on the path of destruction. (Prov. 1:1-7; Rom. 1:22; I Cor. 1:21; II Cor. 1:12; Col. 2:8) The typical type of “feminist” or sex role pervert rhetoric about “whether or not a woman can do” this or that job, is a statement of the general intellectual inferiority and moral putridity of those in universities or colleges, legislatures, the media, or elsewhere. *One can only move towards getting the right answers, when one first asks the right questions.* The question is not, “What *can* certain persons do?;” but “What *should* certain persons do?” That a socio-legal edifice would be constructed around this type of philosophical paradigm, and people in society programmed to think this way, and taught to regard their intellectual superiors and moral betters who are sexists (and e.g., white supremacist racists, Gen. 9:27 & Matt. 8:5-13; or Jewish Semite supremacist racists, Gen. 9:25,26 & Matt. 15:21-28,) as “bigots,” and those against whom the programmed masses then exercise their so called “human rights,” is a damning indictment of the incompetence of such “educators” and lawmakers. They are blind guides, “and if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch” (Matt. 15:14). *Their one and only chance to do the right thing is to do what the Bible says, seeking by the grace of God to live their lives under God’s directive will.*

Alas, in seeking to promote sex role perversion values, TBS has here clearly chosen to do the wrong thing. TBS are clearly not making requisite efforts to put the right people in their power structure, and have accordingly given themselves over to the “old wives’ fables” of Debra Anderson, rather than exercising themselves “unto godliness” (I Tim. 4:7). The AV became *the* Protestant Bible of the English speaking world because it had a broad Protestant support, so that in time it replaced both the Geneva Bible which had mainly Puritan Protestant support, and the Bishops’ Bible which had mainly Anglican Protestant support. Seeking to tamper and change the AV to pander to more extremist Puritan elements risks losing this type of broad Protestant

sentiment for TBS publications. I am quite happy for TBS to state in e.g., a footnote that “St.” in the Gospels is a stylized form by the King James Version translators, rather than a title present in the TR. But TBS should desist from revising the AV, and follow their professed position of seeking to publish the AV *without revising it*.

This sex role pervert’s first claim contains a mix of truth and error. I.e., that “all who are true believers in the Lord Jesus are saints, as opposed to the Roman Catholic (and other high church) view that only certain people who have met particular criteria (as with the late John Paul II, performing miracles after death, etc.) can become saints. Regrettably, the use of ‘saint’ before the names of the New Testament writers comes from that tradition rather than from a true understanding and application of Scripture and tends to set the writers apart as spiritually superior to ordinary believers.”

While it is certainly the case that Scripture teaches a universal sainthood of all believers (e.g., Eph. 1:1; Philp. 1:1; Col. 1:2); it is also the case that Scripture sometimes isolates certain saints to hold them up as worthy examples. Sometimes this is done corporately of a local group of saints e.g., St. Paul says the “faith” of the Christians at Rome was “spoken of through the whole world” (Rom. 1:8), which he later defines as the north-east Mediterranean “world” of “Jerusalem” up to “Illyrucum” on the north east coast of the Adriatic Sea in the Balkans; and then over to “Rome” (Rom. 1:7,8). So too, he says the Thessalonians “were ensamples” NOT to those who DO NOT BELIEVE, but “to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia” (I Thess. 1:7).

Sometimes this is done of both an individual and a group. Hence the holy Apostle, St. Paul, says to these same Thessalonians, that he is part of a group who “make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us” (II Thess. 3:9). And in Philp. 3:17 he says, “Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an ensample” (Philp. 3:17). Here St. Paul addresses fellow saints as “Brethren,” and isolates both himself individually in the words, “Be followers together of me,” and also others in the words, “for an ensample” or example.

Sometimes simply an individual saint is isolated as an example to the wider body of saints. Hence St. Peter says, “Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement” (I Peter 3:6). Indeed, a series of such examples are given in Heb. 11, e.g., “Abel” (Heb. 11:4), “Enoch” (Heb. 11:5), “Noah” (Heb. 11:7), “Abraham” (Heb. 11:8), “Sarah” (Heb. 11:11), or “Moses” (Heb. 11:23).

Against this backdrop, Anglicans and some other Protestant have traditionally used the honourific titular prefix “Saint” for some selected saints from the wider universal sainthood of all believers. By tradition, such Old Testament saints are called “Holy” e.g., “Holy Moses,” and such New Testament saints are called “Saint” e.g., “Saint John.” To the extent that the church has found this practice to be useful and good, we Anglicans would justify it on the basis that in it “nothing” is “ordained against God’s Word” (Article 34, 39 Articles). In the Anglican context, this usage of the honourific titular prefix “St.” has sometimes been joined with the liberty to either keep (Anglican

Protestant tradition), or not keep (Puritan Protestant tradition), various feast and fast days (Rom. 14:5,6), as seen in the various saints days in e.g., the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662. Here the Collects (Prayers) focus on the example or ensample of the saint so remembered, in harmony with Biblical teaching, *supra*.

More widely, the Reformed and Evangelical Anglican tradition considers that from the universal sainthood of believers, the honorific title “St.” may be used before the name of those from NT times; or prominent figures in post NT times to the 5th (or less commonly 6th) century; and for those coming later than the 5th or 6th century in a localized context such as a church dedicated to the glory of God and in their memory. (See Commentary, Volume 1, Matt. 1-14, at “Title” ‘The Gospel According to Matthew’ ... stylized ... to read, ‘... St. Matthew’ ...”).

Thus this TBS claim that the Anglican Protestant Bible translators of the King James Version would use “St.” with e.g., the Gospel writers, for Romish or Puseyite reasons, is highly anachronistic and quite erroneous. It reminds me of 17th century Puritan propagandists claiming various Anglican things were “Romish,” and how later Puseyites of the 19th century then picked up such Puritan propaganda and falsely claimed its was correct, as a mechanism to catapult Anglican Churches into Puseyism or semi-Puseyism. E.g., the claim of a Puritan in 1604 that the Anglican surplice of a Minister was a “mass vestment,” was taken up by Puseyites of the 19th century who grabbed hold of such erroneous terminology to claim “chasubles” were being worn, and then they introduced what really was a Romish *mass vestment* in the chasuble¹³. It seems this type of foolhardiness and danger in misrepresenting Anglican Protestant views for as part of Puritan propaganda, is not properly appreciated by at least some of those in the TBS. The Anglican King James Bible translators used “St.” inside an Anglican Protestant tradition which entirely repudiates the false notions of Romanism. This fact needs to be clearly understood. It also needs to be clearly understood, that if at some point in the future, Puseyites point to the fact that the TBS has removed the honourific titular prefix “St.” from the Gospel names, “because they knew that the King James Bible translators held the same doctrine of ‘Saints’ that the Roman Catholic Church does, and that Anglicans should therefore accept that Roman Catholic teaching;” then those so involved in this TBS decision must bear their share of the guilt in this lie, and any damage that occurs to men’s spirituality and souls because of it!

Likewise, the Cambridge University Press’ Transetto Edition (2011) also changed titles. E.g., “The First Book of Moses called Genesis” (AV) becomes simply, “Genesis;” or “The Gospel according to St. Matthew” (AV) becomes simply, “Matthew.” In their instance, the motive appears to have been to give the titles “a modern” appearance” more like the various “new” versions; though once again, these were unwarranted changes. This type of desire for a so called “modern” appearance was also reflected in their three

¹³ *Hierurgia Anglicana*, or Documents & extracts illustrative of the ritual of the church in England after the Reformation, Edited by Members of the Ecclesiological Late Cambridge Camden Society, J.G.F. & J. Rivington, J. Masters, London; Deightons Macmillan, & Co., Cambridge; J.H. Parker, Oxford; 1848, p. 153.

cover colour options which together with a more traditional looking blue cover, included two non-traditional colours in purple or green.

I am privileged to have in my library, a British Library print edition of 2000 A.D. of William Tyndale's 1526 New Testament, with a Preface by David Daniell who is a biographer of Tyndale¹⁴. I purchased this when I was in London at the bookshop of the British Library, and in size it is like the traditional "pocket-book" editions of Tyndale as it small enough to fit in the normal sized pocket of a man's trousers (although it is bigger than the modern pocket-size New Testaments designed to fit into a shirt pocket¹⁵). This refers (in its archaic spellings) to "The Gospell of. S. Mathew;" "The Gospell of. S. Marke;" "The Gospell of. S. Luke;" and "The Gospell off Sancte Jhon;" and the final book of the NT is called, "The revelacion off sanct John the devine." It includes opposite its title page a full colour reproduction of the original first page for "The Gospell off Sancte Jhon" in Tyndale's 1526 NT edition. The issue of modernized spellings aside, it is clear that the AV stands in the Tyndale tradition in its usage of the honorific titular prefix "St.," and I for one am opposed to those who seek to remove these elements of the AV through either a Puritan value system which misrepresents the Anglican Protestant theology of the King James translators (TBS claims), or seemingly for reasons of a so called, *modernized appearance* (Cambridge Transetto edition).

But lest these criticisms I make of both the TBS's or Cambridge University's 400th anniversary editions of 2011 be misconstrued through an emphasis decontextualization, I would also add that *we must see the wood from the trees, and as an overall package deal, these two 1611-2011 editions do far more good than harm*. Thus there was also clearly an upside to these two 400th anniversary editions of the KJV since in broad terms they *both remembered the big thing* of the 1611-2011 anniversary. Thus I would not want my comments *on the relatively little thing* of their most regrettable alteration of KJV book titles, to result in the reader thinking we should not *see and celebrate the relatively big thing* that both the Trinitarian Bible Society's 1611-2011 edition and also Cambridge University's 1611-2011 Transetto edition were *wonderful instances of celebrating the 400th anniversary of the KJV*. As such, notwithstanding their blemishes and imperfections, *let us thank God for the overall good that is in this two*

¹⁴ *The New Testament*, Translated by William Tyndale, The Text of the Worms edition of 1526 in original spelling, edited for The Tyndale Society by W.R. Cooper, with a Preface by David Daniell, The British Library, London, UK, 2000 (ISBN 0-7123-4664-3). Daniell's is author of *William Tyndale: A Biography*, Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, USA. 1994.

¹⁵ This "pocket-book" edition of Tyndale's 1526 NT is about 4 inches (") or 10 centremetres (cm) wide, about 6" or 15 cm long, and about 1½" or 3 cm thick; whereas my TBS print of the AV's NT & Psalms is about 2¾" or 6 cm wide, about 4" or 10 cm long, and just under about ½" or 1.5 cm thick. By way of further comparison, in between these is my pocket-book 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* (Cambridge University Press, UK, 2004, reprint 2008,) which is just over 3½" or 9 cm wide, just over 5½" or 14 cm long, and just over ¾" or 2 cm thick.

*1611-2011 King James Version Editions*¹⁶. In short, let us by the grace of God learn to “refuse the evil, and choose the good” (Isa. 7:16; cf. Heb. 5:14). It is in this context, that I have placed a photo of myself with these two 400th anniversary editions on my website, taken on *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*, Sat. 5 Nov. 2011, in remembrance of the fact that the Romanists sought to kill King James of the King James Bible in the Gunpowder Treason Plot of 1605, in which they sought to blow up the Protestant King and Parliament¹⁷.

Looking at the Cambridge University’s Transetto Edition of 2011, one finds on both the cover and also the title pages, a 400th anniversary logo. This consists of a square box, inside of which is written, “KJV” then at right-angles to this “400”, then a line underneath all of this, and then “1611 · 2011”. This is a clear and wonderful statement about the KJV’s 400th anniversary from 1611 to 2011. This Transetto Edition is the first Bible in the English language to use a new type of book format which allows it to be put down on a flat surface, and opened without the normal level of book-binding pressure to “spring” to another page. It comes in three different coloured covers: purple, green, or light blue; and of these three colour options, (as one who normally uses a black covered AV with gold print,) my selection was for the light blue cover.

Its title pages include the words, “The Holy Bible King James Version,” “Appointed to be read in Churches;” above the Royal Coat of Arms the words, “Rights in the Authorized (King James) Version of the Bible are vested in the Crown,” and under the Royal Coat of Arms the words, “This Bible is published by Cambridge University Press, the Queen’s Printer, under Royal Letters Patent.” A special Preface to this edition is entitled, “The King James Bible and Cambridge University Press.” It says, e.g., “To stand for four centuries with undiminished vigour and vitality is an extraordinary achievement, and one of the strengths that we celebrate as the King James Bible reaches its 400th anniversary is its continuing capacity to inspire and excite.” Reference is made to the “authorization” of “the Authorized Version” as the one “being ‘Appointed to be read in Churches,’” (in the Preface of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*). “As well as being the most widely accepted rendering of the Scriptures for four hundred years, the King James Version ... has become a classic of the English language.” “Its history and that of Cambridge University Press are intimately interwoven. Cambridge first printed the King James Bible in 1629 and has been publishing it ever since. As the KJV enters its fifth century, the Cambridge commitment continues.”

We thank God for this continuing commitment by Cambridge University Press to publish the Authorized Version; and we thank God that Cambridge University Press chose to remember this 400th anniversary of the King James Bible in 2011.

The Trinitarian Bible Society’s 400th anniversary edition also has much to

¹⁶ This celebratory theme is also taken up in “Appendix 5: Dedication Sermon for Volume 4 (Mon. 6 Feb. 2012).”

¹⁷ See photos on my textual commentaries website at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

commend it. If, like myself, one wants the logo, it comes only in a burgundy colour. It has a coloured photograph logo of Hampton Court Palace in London on the front of it, above which is written, “Holy Bible,” and below which is written, “Authorized (King James) Version 1611-2011 Commemorative Edition.” *This is a wonderful recognition of the AV’s 400th anniversary, and the important place played in the background to this translation by the Hampton Court Conference.* On one of its title pages there is a black and white form of the Hampton Court Palace photo, above which are the words, “Holy Bible Published in commemoration of the first edition of the Authorised (King James) Version in 1611,” and below which are the words, “Hampton Court, the site of the 1604 Conference during which the decision to translate the Authorised Version was made.”

As with other TBS editions, the title page includes reference to the fact it is “Appointed to be read in churches,” which manifests the words of The Preface of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* that “portions of holy Scripture” “are now ordered to be read according to the last translation,” which thus made the King James Version “the Authorized Version.”

Also of interest, TBS produced a special 1611-2011 bookmark which I also got. This includes the words, “2011 commemorating the first edition of the Authorised (King James) Version in 1611;” and a citation from Isaiah 40:1, “The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.” *We thank God for this excellent witness by TBS to the doctrine of the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture.* Once again there is a picture of Hampton Court Palace, with the words, “Hampton Court, the site of the 1604 conference during which the decision to translate the Authorised Version was made.”

The Bishops’ Bible of 1568 was produced by the Archbishop of Canterbury, His Grace, Matthew Parker (Archbishop 1559-1575), together with eight Anglican Bishops, several Anglican Deans, and some other learned persons. Matthew Parker was a Marian Confessor, having been forced under the Romish Queen, Bloody Mary (Regnal Years: 1553-1558), to resign his position at Cambridge University because of his Protestantism. He is thus one of “the Professors of the truth of Christ’s religion” who suffered “discomfort” under “Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God,” referred to in the 1559 Act of Uniformity traditionally printed at the front of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. Under Elizabeth I (Regnal years 1558-1603) referred to in the Dedicatory Preface to King James I (Regnal Years: 1603-1625) of the King James Bible as, “that bright Occidental Star, Queen Elizabeth of most happy memory,” the Protestant Christian, Matthew Parker was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury.

In 1563 Matthew Parker also composed Parker’s *Table of Consanguinity and Affinity* setting forth the correct prohibited degrees of incest in Leviticus 18 & 20 as they exist in Christian monogamous times (which has some differences to how they applied in OT polygamous Jewish times)¹⁸. But Matthew Parker also reminds us of Anglican-

¹⁸ Parker’s Table was thereafter attached to the Anglican prayer book. So maintained in England till 1946; Australia till 1981, and Sydney Diocese till 1982; I have

Puritan conflict during the Great Rebellion of the 1640s and 1650s. He was buried in Lambeth Church at Lambeth Palace in London. In 1648 Puritan revolutionaries shockingly beat down his tomb, vilely desecrated his human remains, and stripping the Chapel they were in of pictures they regarded as “idols,” such as one the Western Church’s four great ancient and early mediaeval doctors: St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory; or one containing a Latin title, “The *Ecce Homo* (Latin, ‘Behold the man’)” based on John 19:5; they then turned this desecrated Chapel into a secular hall. Later under Archbishop William Sancroft (Archbishop of Canterbury: 1678-1690), the remains of Parker’s desecrated bones were recovered by Sir William Dugdale and reburied at the holy Table under the Latin epitaph, “*Corpus* (The body) *Matthaei* (‘of Matthew’ = ‘Matthew’) *Archiepiscopi* (of Archbishop) *hic* (here) *tandem* (‘at length’ or ‘finally’) *quiescit* (‘it rests’ = ‘rests’)” i.e., “The body of Archbishop Matthew finally rests here” (with the “*tandem*” containing an oblique reference to its absence due to its former desecration).

Certain elements of the TBS 1611-2011 celebration exhibited defects, including a strong Puritan Protestant influence in the TBS which does not appear to have a strong Anglican Protestant presence. For instance, the TBS “2011 Commemorative Bible” page to the TBS 1611-2011 edition again reminds us of civil war issues and the Great Rebellion of the 1640s and 1650s, through reference to Puritan figures from this era. This 2011 Commemorative Bible” page is marred by unqualified favorable references to one Puritan who supported the regicides (Milton), coupled with another Puritan who first fought as a Roundhead soldier and then showed complacency about the denial of religious freedom to Anglicans under the Solemn League and Covenant from 1643-1660 (Bunyan). While I consider we must learn to “refuse the evil and choose the good” (Isa. 7:16; cf. Heb. 5:14), and in this context I accept that there is good to be found in the figures of both Milton and Bunyan, I would also have reservations about both with respect to the bad that was in them. It must be admitted that raising figures or issues connected with the 1640s and 1650s in an Anglican-Puritan context potentially poses the difficulties of intra-Protestant sectarian disagreements. Thus in the absence of a close contextual reference to some clearly Anglican figure e.g., John Foxe (Anglican) who is buried with John Milton (Puritan) at St. Giles’ Cripplegate in London, or James Ussher (Anglican Archbishop of Armagh ejected by the Puritans) who was a contemporary of Milton and Bunyan, then I think this combination of two Puritan figures in close proximity to each other who in various ways supported the Puritan republic of the 1640s and 1650s, seems to indicate either some level of support or sympathy towards, or at least complacency towards, unBiblical values (Matt. 22:21; Rom. 13:1-10; I Peter 2:17).

While the Puritans “scream loud” about the denial of religious tolerance to Bunyan under the 1662 Act, and in my opinion justifiably so, since I think the 1689

now found it necessary to glue a photocopy of this Table (gotten from an earlier 1662 BCP) in the back of my working copy of the 1662 BCP in order to have the correct table. (My working copy of the BCP is the 2004 “Standard Edition” by Cambridge University Press, reprinted in 2008.)

religious tolerance should have come earlier back in the 1660s; they are very “shut mouth” about his contextual lack of preaching any such reciprocity to Anglicans during the Interregnum. Is it “a justification” to say, “If Bunyan had spoken out for Anglican religious freedom during the Interregnum he could have been imprisoned under the Solemn League and Covenant which sought ‘the extirpation of prelacy’;” by those who would simultaneously glorify Bunyan for so seeking Puritan religious freedom under the 1662 Act of Uniformity? *Should not Protestant Christians seek the basic religious freedom of all fellow Protestant who accept the broad basic tenets of the Reformation? I for one answer in the affirmative!*

Against this backdrop, I think it is worth remembering that whereas the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560) was largely (I do not say exclusively) a Puritan Protestant Bible, and whereas the Bishops’ Bible (1568) was largely (I do not say exclusively) an Anglican Protestant Bible, the King James Bible (1611) succeeded in creating a broad Protestant Bible thereafter used by both Anglican Protestants and Puritan Protestants. It thus became *the Protestant Bible*. The fact that 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* supporting Anglican Protestants such as myself, and non-prayer book using Puritans such as those who seem to dominate the TBS, unite to uphold the central truths of Protestantism and unite to uphold the King James Version, thus reminds us that that KJV has traditionally been widely accepted by Puritans, as much as Anglicans, as a *Protestant Bible*, and indeed historically, *the Protestant Bible* of the English speaking world.

Let us thank God for this Protestant unity. “Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell in unity!” For “upon the mountain of Zion,” “the Lord commanded the blessing, even life for evermore” (Ps. 133:1,3). This “blessing” of “life for evermore” reminds us that the doctrine of everlasting life is found in the Old Testament, as well as the New Testament. Let us praise God for the open Word, and the glorious gospel of *justification by faith alone* springing from Christ’s atoning work at Calvary, recovered at the time of the Reformation and upheld by all Protestant Christians.

Let us remember that the threefold Reformation Motto: “*sola fide* (faith alone), *sola gratia* (grace alone), *sola Scriptura* (Scripture alone),” expands out to the fivefold form which then also includes “*solo Christo* (Christ alone¹⁹)” (Gal. 3:13; Philp. 4:8,9; I Tim. 2:5; Heb. 12:24) and “*Soli Deo Gloria* (Glory to God Alone).” Hence we read in Romans 4:2,3,20, “if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.” “He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God.” Let us remember that it is only in the Bible that we learn of the wonderful plan of salvation. Let us remember to give glory to God alone for our salvation, for “we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law” (Rom. 3:28)! Therefore, well may we say: *Soli Deo Gloria!*

¹⁹ Some prefer to decline (the ablative form) “*solo Christo* (Christ alone)” as (the nominative form) “*solus Christus*.”

****Defence of the Received Text from “KJV friends in error” in both the Dean Burgon Society and Trinitarian Bible Society - A minor modification to Appendix 4 format.***

I have previously discussed the erroneous views of “KJV friends in error” in both the *Dean Burgon Society* and *Trinitarian Bible Society*²⁰. In specific terms, the *Dean Burgon Society* based in the United States of America, erroneously claims that the New Testament Received Text of the King James Version is the same as the majority text; whereas the *Trinitarian Bible Society* based in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland published a two part by article by Albert Hembd in its *Quarterly Review* of Oct-Dec. 2007 and Jan.-March 2008, erroneously claiming the New Testament Received Text of the King James Version is the majority text except for “Greek minority readings in eight places²¹.”

A recent alliance of convenience has now catapulted the two groups closer together. The *Trinitarian Bible Society’s Quarterly Review* of July-Sept. 2011 includes an article entitled, “The Jack Moorman and James White Debate²².” This followed the publication of James White’s book, *The King James Only Controversy*. There was then a televised debate in the UK in “Revelation TV” on 2 February 2011 between James White, and Jack Moorman of the *Dean Burgon Society* – a Baptist Minister at Wimbledon in London. The *TBS Quarterly Record* of July-Sept 2011 refers to:

... Jack Moorman presenting his reasons for supporting the Authorized Version and its underlying texts. ... It is very accurate to the Greek and Hebrew texts which God had originally inspired and which have been providentially preserved. These texts are based in the New Testament on the majority of manuscripts which have been found throughout the medieval world rather than on a small group of manuscripts from Egypt. ... Furthermore, printed editions of the Greek New Testament text representing this majority – which in time came to be acknowledged as the Received Text – have been produced almost since the very beginning of the printing process. Printed editions of the Alexandrian texts, however, did not become available to the church until the late 19th century²³.

In further describing this debate, the *TBS Quarterly Record* says it included the neo-Alexandrian James White claiming, “In Revelation 16:5, Beza made a conjectural emendation – he changed wording without Greek support – producing a reading unknown

²⁰ See Textual Commentaries Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, “*Determining the representative Byzantine Text.”

²¹ Hembd, A., “An Examination of the New King James Version,” *TBS Quarterly Record*, Jan.-March 2008, Part 2, p. 39.

²² Anderson, D., “The Jack Moorman and James White Debate,” *TBS Quarterly Record*, July-Sept. 2011, pp. 26-30.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 27 (emphasis mine).

until his 1598 edition of the Greek text²⁴.” It is curious that White selected this example, since it so happens that in my Volume 2 Preface in 2009, led by the Spirit of God, I selected it in order to critique Moorman’s *Dean Burgon Society* claims that the Received Text is the Majority Text²⁵. My work here included what, to the best of my knowledge, is the first recorded time of St. Jerome’s citation of Rev. 16:5 in a textual context. E.g., I say:

... Herman Hoskier’s work may be fairly celebrated. Moorman rightly recognizes this important status of Hoskier’s work. ... But when e.g., we go to Moorman’s collations of manuscripts for Rev. 16:5, he lists for the “O Lord” (Greek, *Kurie*, masculine singular vocative noun, from *Kurios*), only two minuscules from Hoskier, 296 & 2049, though says it is also found in the Clementine Vulgate, Coptic Bohairic, and Ethiopic Versions. This data comes from Hoskier²⁶. Concerning these two Greek manuscripts, Minuscule 296 (Hoskier’s 57) ... a 17th century manuscript is too late in time and so outside the closed class of sources. Minuscule 2049 (Hoskier’s 141) is dated variously at the 15th or 16th centuries, and Hoskier undertakes a stylistic analysis of it to show that while it is quite similar to the 16th century neo-Byzantine texts of Erasmus (A.D. 1516, 1519, 1522, 1527, 1535), Aldus (1518 A.D.), and Colinaeus (1534 A.D.), it nevertheless has a number of dissimilarities from them, and appears to pre-date them²⁷. On this basis, we can say that Minuscule 2049 (15th / 16th century) is Byzantine, and thus shows that the *Textus Receptus* (TR) here follows a minority Byzantine reading at Rev. 16:5. While none of the other sources Moorman mentions are inside the closed class of sources, the Latin of the Clementine Vulgate manifests its support as a minority Latin reading. Though Moorman does not refer to any Latin sources, this is found in, for instance, *Codex Armachanus* or the *Book of Armagh*, (Latin Codex D, early 9th century), as Latin, “*Domine* (masculine singular vocative noun, from *Dominus*).” It is also supported in the Latin by the ancient church father and doctor, St. Jerome (d. 420)²⁸.

The reading “O Lord” at Rev. 16:5 thus has support as both a minority

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ See Textual Commentaries Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, “*Determining the representative Byzantine Text.”

²⁶ Hoskier, C., *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, Bernard Quatrich, London, UK, 1929 (2 volumes), Vol 2, p. 419, citing for the reading, “57 141 bohG aeth.”

²⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, pp. 474-477.

²⁸ St. Jerome in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1846 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 29, p. 863 (B. Joannis Apostoli Apocalypse, Cap. XVI, D) (Latin).

Greek Byzantine reading and a minority Latin reading. It therefore clearly entered the Received Text on the basis of textual analysis, and while I shall leave more detailed discussion of the matter till the relevant volume on Rev. 16:5, suffice to here say that I agree with the propriety of including this in the TR, and consider that this is the correct reading.

The significant point to emerge from this for our immediate purposes, is that it shows both the error of the *Dean Burgon Society's* claim that the Received Text is the Majority Text, and the error of the *Trinitarian Bible Society's* claim of Hembd that the Received Text is the Majority Text other than “Greek minority readings in eight places”; and also shows the error of neo-Alexandrian James White’s claim that, “In Revelation 16:5, Beza made a conjectural emendation – he changed wording without Greek support – producing a reading unknown until his 1598 edition of the Greek text.” In fact, the reading is found in the Latin in St. Jerome (d. 420) and the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.); and in the Greek in the 15th or 16th century (Minuscule 2049). It can thus be shown to exist inside the closed class of sources over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. Beza was not some religiously liberal “form critic” who simply concocted readings from thin air, as James White mischievously alleged. Moreover, I note that its usage among neo-Byzantines precedes its manifestation in Beza (1598) and Elzevir (1633), since it is manifested at Rev. 16:5 in both the Greek and Latin *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of Erasmus (1516 & 1522); and the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) edition of Stephanus (1550).

[UPDATE 2016: I was contacted by email of 23 August 2016 from Nick Sayers saying he was “doing a study on Revelation 16:5” and from the internet “came across ... your statements,” *supra*. He said, “I would like to clarify ...,” “Were you focusing on the *Kurie*, or ... *esomenos* From my understanding White was debating for *osios* against *esomenos*.” I replied in email of 30 Aug. 2016, “The reference here is to ‘O Lord’ found in the Greek (Greek, *Kurie*, masculine singular vocative noun, from *Kurios*), of Minuscule 2049 (Hoskier’s 141) at Rev. 16:5; and the Latin, ‘*Domine* (masculine singular vocative noun, from *Dominus*)’ in the Book of Armagh, and St. Jerome ... in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1846 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 29, p. 863 (B. Joannis Apostoli Apocalypse, Cap. XVI, D) (Latin). I was not making any reference to *esomenos* (<shalt be,> AV). But thanks for pointing out the ambiguity of White’s statement ..., ... without having now looked into the matter exhaustively, once again, it is clear that White would still be off target as the Latin *futurus* of Beatus (referred to in Hoskier at Rev. 16:5), equates the Greek *esomenos*, and so this reading does have manuscript support within the closed class of Greek and Latin sources used for the TR.” Beatus is an 8th century Latin writer and in *The Apocalypse Text of the Spanish Commentary of Beatus*, from a manuscript in the Morgan Library of New York, USA, at page 52 one finds Beatus’s Latin reading of *futurus*, cited by Hoskier, *supra*. A copy of this may be found at the British Library in London, shelf mark 3042aac4.]

In this *Jack Moorman verses James White* television debate of 2011, the *TBS Quarterly Record* of July-Sept 2011 says “Moorman” said “that he wanted to know that his Bible was produced, both in its Biblical languages bases and in its translation, by

sound believers²⁹.” I have also previously discussed the issue that being “truly saved men ... is not a requirement for the normative operative requirements of Divine Preservation by (at least primarily) Gentiles of the NT text, as seen by the Divine Preservation of the OT text by (at least primarily) apostate Jews (Rom. 3:2-4; 9:1-5, 11:29)³⁰.” Thus e.g., the work of both Latin scribes in the religious apostasy of Roman Catholicism, or Greek scribes in the religious apostasy of Eastern Orthodoxy, no more intrinsically inhibits their value than the work of Old Testament Hebrew scribes in the religious apostasy of a Judaism that has rejected the Messiah, Jesus Christ³¹. E.g., was not Erasmus a Roman Catholic who sadly rejected the Reformation, and therefore not what Moorman calls, a “sound believer”? Was not the Bomberg Text gotten from Jews who sadly rejected the Messiah, and therefore not what Moorman calls, “sound believers”?

Another issue that arose as recorded in the *TBS Quarterly Record* of July-Sept 2011, was that of I John 5:7,8. Two elements of Moorman’s response here are notable. Firstly, in describing his response, the *TBS Quarterly Record* says he said that, “the Latin ... strongly supports I John 5:7-8.” And secondly, in describing his response, the *TBS Quarterly Record* says, “regarding I John 5:7-8, if their words are omitted, their footprint is still seen in the Greek in the mismatched genders that occur without them³².” Does this indicate that Jack Moorman is now moving away from the “Majority Text” claims of the *Dean Burgon Society*, and moving to something more akin to the *Trinitarian Bible Society* claims of Hembd that the Received Text is the Majority Text other than “Greek minority readings in eight places,” of which I John 5:7,8 is one of these “eight places”? Though the inaccurate claim that the Received Text is the Majority Byzantine Text other than “eight places” is not far removed from the *Dean Burgon Society* claim that the Received Text is the Majority Byzantine Text *per se*, it is still a notable difference with clear ramifications for those “eight places” that are so itemized such as I John 5:7,8.

Once again, I have previously discussed the issue of I John 5:7,8, and the correctness of its inclusion in the Received Text³³. My earlier discussion includes no reference to the matter raised by Moorman of “the mismatched genders.” That issue,

²⁹ *TBS Quarterly Record*, July-Sept. 2011, *op. cit.*, p. 27 (emphasis mine).

³⁰ Textual Commentary Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” at “2) The Monastic legacy.”

³¹ Textual Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, “(1) Textual Commentary Principles,” at “* b) The Received Text (Latin, Textus Receptus),” subsection “*ii) New Testament.”

³² *TBS Quarterly Record*, July-Sept. 2011, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-28.

³³ Textual Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, “(1) Textual Commentary Principles,” at “* b) The Received Text (Latin, Textus Receptus),” subsection “*ii) New Testament.”

was e.g., raised in 1815 by Frederick Nolan (1784-1864), a Low Church Evangelical Anglican Minister from Ireland, who was in the Established *United Church of England and Ireland*, and who sought to oppose the unwelcome inroads of Puseyism³⁴. I shall leave discussion of “the mismatched genders” issue till the relevant textual commentaries volume on I John. But for our immediate purposes, the point is that I have previously shown why, on the basis of textual analysis, the TR’s reading of I John 5:7,8 is correct.

Nevertheless, this *Jack Moorman verses James White* TV debate of 2011 recorded in the *TBS Quarterly Record* (2011), once again highlights the problem of “KJV friends in error” claiming that the Received Text is the Majority Text (*Dean Burgon Society*) or near Majority Text other than in “eight places” (*Trinitarian Bible Society* magazines of 2007 & 2008). With such errors among those identifying themselves as “supporters” of the King James Bible and Received Text, I have decided that a minor modification may be profitably made to “Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR’s textual readings A to E (Matt. 26-28),” and comparable sections in other volumes. This will allow a reader to quickly identify those parts of the main commentary that deal with instances where the reading is something other than the Majority Byzantine Text; although such a reader should also consult Appendices 1 & 2 in each volume.

I have come to this conclusion as an important corrective since we have one group claiming there are no differences between the NT Received Text and Majority Byzantine Text (*Dean Burgon Society*, USA); a second group claiming in an official publication of theirs that there are less than a dozen differences between the NT Received Text and Majority Byzantine Text (*Trinitarian Bible Society Quarterly Review* of Oct-Dec. 2007 and Jan.-March 2008, UK); and a third group radically understating the number of differences by using a very inadequate textual apparatus that gives a false impression of a much higher level of agreement between the NT Received Text and Majority Byzantine Text than actually exists (*New King James Version*). The common theme of all these three groups is that they claim, or in the case of the third group, infer by their very inadequate NKJV footnotes, that the Received Text is a lot closer to the Majority Byzantine Text (in practice the same as the Majority Text,) than what it really is; and they also lack any proper appreciation for the Neo-Byzantine School of textual analysis that formally compiled the Received Text as we now have it in the 16th and 17th centuries.

Yet paradoxically, all three groups have a much higher regard for the Received

³⁴ Nolan, F., *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, or Received Text of the New Testament*, Printed by R. & R. Gilbert, London, UK, 1815, pp. 253-4, 257, 259-60. The Established *United Church of England and Ireland* combined the *Church of England* and *Church of Ireland* under the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* from 1801 to 1871, and is referred to on the title page of this work by the abbreviated term of, “The United Church.” Cf. my comments on Nolan at Textual Commentaries Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, “* Old Papists & New Papists: The Clementine Vulgate & Neo-Vulgate.”

Text than they do for the neo-Alexandrian texts, and there is some truth in what they all claim since it is true that the Majority Byzantine Text is a lot closer to the Received Text than the neo-Alexandrian texts are. While both the *Dean Burgon Society* and *Trinitarian Bible Society* have a healthy high regard for the King James Version, and even the NKJV translators have a higher regard for the KJV than many, it nevertheless needs to be clearly stated that amidst the similarities between the Received Text and Majority Byzantine Text, there are also numerous differences. The Majority Byzantine Text is the starting point for textual analysis of the New Testament for neo-Byzantines, but not the finishing point, since the representative Byzantine Text is only followed if there is no clear and obvious textual problem with it. This is more often the case than not, but there are certainly cases where such a textual problem does exist in the Majority Byzantine Text, and that at a much higher level of frequency than any of these three groups are prepared to readily admit; although in the case of the New King James Version translators, the fact that they somewhat vaguely say in their Preface that their “Majority Text” comes from the “Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text,” means that one could from that point locate Hodges & Farstad’s Text (they do not mention these Editors names in the Preface), and determine the fuller extent of such variations. But the average NKJV reader would be unlikely to so consult Hodges & Farstad’s Majority Text, and would in practice rest on the very inadequate NKJV Majority Text footnotes which the NKJV Preface says “corrects” “the Textus Receptus.”

Thus the need for the enhanced ability in these textual commentaries to locate those readings where the Received Text and Majority Byzantine Text. In the first place, such an interested reader should always consult Appendices 1 & 2 in every volume. But in the second place, I have now introduced in all internet copies, and in both the printed library copies and internet copy from Volume 4 on, a modification to the Appendix 4 of each volume. There is now an asterisk after a rating which is also put in bold print, where the TR’s reading is something other than the representative Byzantine reading. E.g., the readings in the Appendix 4 of this Volume 4 (Matt. 26-28) include the following:

Matt. 26:20 {A}
 Matt. 26:22 {B}
Matt. 26:26b {B}*
 Matt. 26:27 {A}
 Matt. 26:28b {A}
Matt. 26:33b {B}*
Matt. 26:38 {B}*
 Matt. 26:42a {A}

Looking at this, the reader can thus immediately tell that Matt. 26:26b; Matt. 26:33b, and Matt. 26:38 are something other than majority Byzantine text readings.

Leaving aside matters in the Appendices (for instance, in Vol. 1, App. 3, see Matt.

5:45; 8:13; 10:28a; 12:28; Matt. 13:3³⁵; in Vol. 2, App. 1, see Matt. 19:5c; App. 3, see Matt. 15:32a & Matt. 18:4); those in this category in the main part of the first three volumes of the textual commentary are as follows. In Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14): Matt. 3:8; 3:11; 4:10; 4:18; 5:11a; 5:27; 5:31a; 5:39b; 5:47a; 6:18; 7:2; 7:4; 7:14a; 7:15; 8:5; 8:8a; 8:15; 8:25a; 9:4a; 9:5b; 9:27b; 9:36; 10:8; 11:16b; 11:23a; 12:6; 12:8; 12:35a; 13:14; 13:15; 13:28b; 14:19c; & 14:22c. In Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20): Matt. 15:4b; 15:25; 18:6; 18:19a; 19:5b; 22:23; 20:22b (Component 1); & 20:26c (Component 1). In Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25): Matt. 21:7c; 21:28a; 21:30b; 21:33; 22:23; 23:13,14 Component 2; 23:21; 23:25; 24:27; & 25:44.

Sydney University Lectionaries.

It is clear from Matt. 1-28 that in broad terms both Lectionaries 2378 and 1968 fit the general picture of Greek Lectionaries following the representative Byzantine Greek Text. Thus notwithstanding the fact that von Soden's collation work was basically on Greek Codices and Minuscules, with less than a dozen Greek Lectionaries consulted; and while precision calculations of manuscript strength for readings are not possible on von Soden's generalist group figures, though "rubbery" calculations which give a sufficient general guide are³⁶, one can still use von Soden's work to construct a majority Byzantine text as both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont have done. Significantly then, these two samples of Greek Lectionaries generally fit the overall pattern of the representative Byzantine text that one would expect to find based on the statistical projections of the majority Byzantine text from von Soden's K group of c. 1,000 manuscripts of which more than 90% are Byzantine text as found in Robinson & Pierpont's majority text (2005), or von Soden's I and K groups of c. 1,500 manuscripts of which more than 85% are Byzantine text as found in Hodges & Farstad's majority text (1985).

But I also state in Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20) that, "I am open to the possibility that if a careful study of the Lectionaries was undertaken, then some readings may be increased in number as minority Byzantine readings, or come into existence as minority variants not previously documented in the Byzantine textual tradition³⁷." Here in

³⁵ See my comments at Matt. 28:10, in Appendix 1.

³⁶ Depending on what I am calculating, von Soden's "rubbery figures" are sometimes used by me to give a broad-brush picture with an even wider error bar since I may do a calculation that excludes manuscripts not classified outside of von Soden's system, rather than including them on the basis of statistical projections as to what their proportions would be. While this is done at, for instance, Mark 15:34c as discussed in this commentary at Matt. 27:46b & Mark 15:34c, when I do so, for my broad generalist purposes of simply getting a rough guide this type of thing is sufficient. But even when one uses von Soden's figures as precisely as one can, they are still always "rubbery."

³⁷ Textual Commentary Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, "*Determining the representative Byzantine Text;" and Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25), Preface, "Sydney University Lectionaries."

Volume 4 (Matt. 26-28) we have some further evidence of this type of thing.

For instance, in a previously known variant not further discussed in this commentary, at Matt. 26:36, both Lectionaries 2378 (p. 73a) and 1968 (p. 162b) add “*autou*” and so read, “*tois* (the) *mathetais* (disciples) *autou* (of him),” i.e., “his disciples.” Or in a previously undocumented variant, at Matt. 26:42 the TR’s “*apelthon* (He went away)³⁸,” instead reads in Lectionary 2378, “*proselthon* (He went)³⁹.” See also at e.g., Matt. 26:8 at Matt. 26:9a (ftn. for Lectionary 2378); Matt. 27:12 (Lectionary 1968, 3rd of three readings, p. 195a); Matt. 26:26a (Appendix 3, Lectionary 1968), Matt. 26:31 (Appendix 3)⁴⁰, Matt. 26:35b (Appendix 3, Lectionary 2378)⁴¹, Matt. 26:38 (Lectionary 2378), 26:44b (Appendix 1, Lectionary 2378, in one of two readings, p. 84a, column 2)⁴², 26:45b (Appendix 3, Lectionary 2378), Matt. 26:52a (Appendix 3, Lectionary 2378), Matt. 26:53a (Lectionary 1968), Matt. 26:59b (footnote in Appendix 1, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), Matt. 26:67 (Appendix 3, Lectionary 2378, *Variant 2* in one of two readings, p. 81a), Matt. 26:70 (Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), Matt. 27:3b (Lectionary 2378 in two of three readings, p. 82b, column 1 & p. 86b, column 2), Matt. 27:45,46a (Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings), Matt. 27:52 (Appendix 3, Lectionary 1968, in one of three readings p. 183b), Matt. 27:58 (footnote on Lectionary 2378), Matt. 27:64 (Lectionary 2378), Matt. 27:65 (Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), Matt. 28:9a (Lectionary 1968), Matt. 28:10 (Appendix 1, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), or Matt. 28:17 (Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings, p. 97a, column 2, & p. 119b, column 1).

We are also reminded that even generally good scribes such as the one of Lectionary 1968, could still occasionally make the odd copyist’s mistake (Appendix 3, Matt. 26:65a, 2nd reading of Lectionary).

We are also reminded again that a textual apparatus is nothing new (Lectionary 1968, Matt. 27:41, second of three readings)⁴³.

³⁸ Masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *aperchomai*.

³⁹ Masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *proserchomai*.

⁴⁰ Inside von Soden’s K group, this variant found in both Lectionaries 2378 and 1968 has the support of less than *c.* 10% of manuscripts, and so on any reasonable statistical projection, less than *c.* 10% of the Byzantine Greek texts.

⁴¹ Previously (as found in textual apparatuses used by me,) known only in Minuscule 69 (15th century, mixed text type in e.g., Matthew’s Gospel).

⁴² Previously (as found in textual apparatuses used by me,) known only in Codex Phi 043.

⁴³ See my comments on the textual apparatus of Lectionary 1968 (Matt. 19:21c & Matt. 21:2a) in Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25), Preface, section “Sydney University Lectionaries.”

Once again, these facts highlight the desirability of getting *more work done on the c. 2,000 uncollated Greek Byzantine Text Lectionaries!*

Codex Illyricianus (Latin Codex P in Weber-Gryson) is named.

One of the Latin textual apparatus's I use is that found in the Latin Vulgate of Weber & Gryson's *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* (2007)⁴⁴. This includes reference to Latin Codex P (e.g., Textual Commentaries Vol. 3, at Matt. 24:39; or Textual Commentaries Vol. 4 at Matt. 26:20). To the best of my knowledge, this 6th / 7th century manuscript from The Split in Croatia has no Latin name, and if it does, neither Weber-Gryson nor any other sources I have seen refer to it. Therefore, for the purposes of these textual commentaries, in this Volume 4 (Matt. 26-28) of these textual commentaries, from Matt. 27:35 on, I have honoured this formerly "no name" manuscript with a name, *Codex Illyricianus*. If perchance I am wrong, and a generally unknown and obscure Latin name is already applied to this manuscript, then it does not matter since Biblical manuscripts sometimes have more than one Latin name⁴⁵.

I have bestowed this honour upon *Codex Illyricianus* from, but not before (see commentary at Matt. 26:20), Matt. 27:35 (see commentary at Matt. 27:35), in recognition of its honourable support for the *Textus Receptus* at Matt. 27:35. The area of the ancient Roman province of Illyricum (Rom. 15:19) included modern day Slovenia and Croatia, thus making this an appropriate Latin name for Codex C which is found in Croatia.

I thank God that I was privileged to visit both Slovenia and Croatia in April 2004. While both Slovenia and Croatia are predominantly Roman Catholic lands, when visiting them I was particularly interested to consider matters of interest to Protestant church history, which in the specific context of the Balkans is very largely Lutheran church history. E.g., the holy confessor Primoz Trubar (1508-1585), brought the holy Protestant faith to Slovenia before being forced to leave under Popish persecution. But he is remembered in a couple of plaques I saw thanking God for him in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Slovenia's capital city of Ljubljana (Ljubljana) e.g., one of them remembered the 400th anniversary of Primoz Trubar's death in 1986. I also there saw Trubar's old residence (now the *Café Abecedarium*), "Trubar Street (*Trubarjeva cesta*),"

⁴⁴ Robert Weber & Roger Gryson, *Biblia Sacra, Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, 1969, 5th edition, 2007, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft / German Bible Society (in the United Bible Societies), Stuttgart, Germany.

⁴⁵ For instance Greek Codex Gamma ("Γ") 036 (10th century, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, UK, Byzantine text) is known in these commentaries and in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) as *Oxoniensis Bodleianus*; although some refer to it as *Tischendorfianus* (Kurt Aland *et unum*, *The Text of the New Testament, An Introduction to the Critical Editions & to the Theory & Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, translated by E.F. Rhodes, 2nd ed., Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1989, p. 118).

and a statue of “TRUBAR” (then largely covered up as it was being repaired).

So too in Croatia I saw various sites of importance to Protestant church history, including e.g., the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the capital of Zagreb. Inside this church the central stained-glass window is of Christ the Good Shepherd, and on his right hand is a stained-glass window of Martin Luther, and on his left hand is a stained-glass window of Philip Melanchthon. This reminds us that while Reformed Protestants such as myself recognize John Calvin as *the second man of the Reformation* after Martin Luther as *the first man of the Reformation*, by contrast, Lutherans give this honour of *the second man of the Reformation* to Philip Melanchthon. And in the north-east of Croatia I also saw Osijek Evangelical Lutheran Church where in 1941 Protestants of Serbian descent were persecuted. During World War Two (1939-1945) the Nazi Ustashi worked with the Roman Church to establish the Croatian Inquisition, and as part of this, a Lutheran school teacher at Osijek was told she must convert to Roman Catholicism from Protestantism if she wanted to keep to keep her job as a state school teacher, and thus she became a confessor of the holy Protestant faith⁴⁶.

In this context, the issue sometimes arises, *Why do I think so highly of Latin manuscripts preserved over time by the Roman Catholic Church which is in such apostasy, or Greek manuscripts preserved over time by the Greek Orthodox and other Eastern Orthodox Churches which are also in apostasy?* The answer is the same as why I think so highly of Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts preserved over time by the Jews who in the main are also in apostasy for having wickedly rejected the Messiah (Matt. 23:37-39) (although there are a small number of Jewish Christians). *For these specific purposes of the Divine Preservation*, it does not matter that the Jews are in apostasy (II Cor. 3:14,15), for in broad-brush terms “unto them were committed the” Old Testament “oracles of God” (Rom. 3:2), and such “gifts” “are without repentance” (Rom. 11:29). So too, it does not matter that the Gentiles of Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy are in apostasy by denying the gospel of justification by faith (Gal. 1:6-9; 2:16; 3:11), and engaging in various forms of “idolatry” (Gal. 5:20) such as Mariolatry and invocation of saints, since it is clear that in broad-brush terms God has likewise very largely committed the New Testament oracles to the Gentiles, and his “gifts” “are without repentance” (Rom. 11:29).

Providing Jews for the Old Testament Oracles (although some Gentiles may also be involved in this process), or Gentiles for the New Testament Oracles (although some Jewish Christians may also be involved in this process), have a sincere and diligent commitment to copy out the text of Scripture, (unlike a corrupter scribe who willfully

⁴⁶ See my work *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006, 2nd edition 2010), With a Foreword by the Reverend Sam McKay, Secretary of the Protestant Truth Society (1996-2004) (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>), “Part 3: Convicted Nazi war criminal, “Blessed” Stepinatz,” “Chapter 4. The trial and sentencing of the war criminal Archbishop Stepinatz in 1946,” at “Issue 1: The establishment of the Ustashi regime in April 1941,” under “Analysis of Issue 1.”

sets about to change the Word of God,) and a requisite level of intellectual competence, (so that by incompetence, including the frailty of human nature common to all we fallen sons of Adam, some copyist errors may accidentally occur,) then God will honour their work and efforts, *even if they are unsaved or in some forms of religious apostasy*. (And this is also why I also think so highly of the work of the Roman Catholic Complutensians or Erasmus.) The power of the Divine Preservation of Holy Writ (Isa. 40:8; Jer. 36:22-32; Matt. 5:17,18; 24:35; I Peter 1:25) rests not upon man's inadequacies, but upon God's sovereign will and power. Gladly then do I thank God for, and honour the work of, both Greek and Latin scribes involved in copying out relevant manuscripts for the New Testament, such as those Latin scribes of *Codex Illyricianus*.

The new new New International Version of 2011.

In these sad days of so much superficial Christianity, the *New International Version* (NIV) has become more and more accepted, and I sadly sometimes find myself hearing Evangelicals quoting from it. I do not say they are unsaved. Rather, I say that in Scripture we read of "Abraham" who was "justified" by "faith" "before God" (Rom. 4:2,5); and who then later came to put his life under God's directive will in sanctification, so that he also serves as an example in the context of church discipline as one who was "justified by works" *before the body of believers* by his acts when he "offered Isaac his son upon the altar" (James 2:21). And we also read of "just Lot" who was thus also a saved man (II Peter 2:6,8). But Lot chose to live in Sodom, a choice that meant he had to ultimately be extracted or "delivered" from a city in which he was "vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked" (II Peter 2:7); and at the great personal expense of losing his unfaithful wife (Gen. 19:26), and being tied up with faithless daughters whose characters were so influenced by the evil in Sodom that they would mischievously set about to get their father drunk, and then commit incest with him (Gen. 19:13-38). One can say, "But God saved Lot from Sodom," and one can say, "but God can still save these superficial NIV and NKJV Bible users." And one is undoubtedly correct. But what of all the pain they inflict on better persons who visit their church by their reading of the NIV or NKJV? And what about all the lack of spiritual depth and superficiality they foster in their midst with translations such as the NIV and NKJV? It is true that we Evangelical Protestants put a focus on the Gospel, so that we return to its basic saving message again and again, "not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (II Peter 3:9), and hence our name of "Evangelical" which means, "Gospel"⁴⁷; but it is also true that we believe in sanctification, and moving from the "milk" to the "meat" of God's Word (Heb. 5:12-14).

As I have already noted, the NIV now ranks in "the top three" Bible translations used, together with the King James Version of 1611 (KJV) and New King James Version (NKJV)⁴⁸. The more earnest Bible student needs and benefits from the literal qualities of

⁴⁷ See Textual Commentaries Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25), Preface, section *"I'm an Evangelical – I hope you are too!"

⁴⁸ See comments on Strauss at, "The 400th Anniversary of the King James Version (1611-2011) comes and goes," *supra*.

the King James Version which in conjunction with Strong's Concordance (and any other relevant Bible aids,) allows him to get as close to the underpinning Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek as he possibly can, without actually going to those languages. It also shields him from the imported meaning of many dynamic equivalents (even though occasionally any translation, including the AV, may find the need to use a dynamic equivalent).

I know from long personal experience the difference between the more earnest Bible student who thanks God for his King James Version, and the less earnest and less diligent one, who sees nothing wrong with a translation such as the NIV or NKJV. Those who would deny the congregations of various churches the AV, also deny them the encouragement and greater opportunity to proceed to greater depths of Biblical understanding and maturity in Christ. How farcical it then is that they claim to be making the Word of God "better understood." See e.g., the NIV at "Christ the Rock (Matt. 16:18; I Cor. 3:11)," "b) The meaning of Matt. 16:18," *infra*.

In this context, I entirely agree with my fellow Evangelical, Martyn Lloyd-Jones (1899-1981). In addressing an *Evangelical Alliance* meeting at London's *Royal Albert Hall* in the UK on the occasion of the 350th anniversary the King James Version (1611-1961), he set about "to remember and commemorate the printing of the Authorized Version of the Bible in 1611," and "to call back ... people ... to the Bible." He said, "we are told," that the Bible "must be put in such simple terms that anybody taking it up and reading it is going to understand all about it. My friends, this is nothing but sheer nonsense! *What we must do is to educate the masses of the people UP to the Bible, not bring the Bible DOWN to their level.* One of the greatest troubles in life today is that everything is being brought down to the same level; everything is being cheapened. The common man is made the standard and the authority; he decides everything, and everything has got to be brought down to him; everywhere standards are coming down and down. Are we to do this with the Word of God? I say, No! What has always happened in the past has been this: an ignorant, illiterate people ... coming to salvation, have been educated UP to the Book and have begun to understand it, and to glory in it, and to praise God for it. I am here to say that we need to do the same at this present time. *What we need, therefore, is not to replace the Authorized Version We need rather to train people up to the standard and the language and the dignity and the glory of the ... Authorized Version*⁴⁹."

I for one have never liked the NIV due to its loose'n'liberal translation style relative to the underpinning Greek of the New Testament and Hebrew of the Old Testament. Its "dynamic equivalents" have always registered with my mind as a debasement of Scripture which locked its rich treasures away from the more discerning reader, and "dumbed down" things to a more spiritually and intellectually mediocre reader. Admittedly, in various ways and in varying degrees, I would make similar

⁴⁹ Lloyd-Jones, D.M., *Knowing The Times*, Addresses Delivered on Various Occasions 1942-1977, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, & Pennsylvania, USA, 1989, chapter 8, "How Can We See a Return to the Bible?," pp. 106-117.

criticisms about all the so called “modern” versions. Nevertheless, I regard those “modern” neo-Alexandrian versions which use the prolific “dynamic equivalents” of e.g., the NIV and TEV to be worse than the more literal “modern” neo-Alexandrian versions such as the ASV and NASB. Sadly, I have sometimes been subjected to the pain of listening to some of my fellow Evangelicals reading from the NIV (or another “modern” version). It seems that due to their not spending time studying such matters under the directive will of God, a number of my fellow Evangelical Christians now sadly lack the spiritual and intellectual insight of Christian maturity to jettison such “modern” versions as the NIV. Alas, we live in days of deep spiritual, moral, and intellectual, decline. “The lights are dim,” and “the times are ungodly.”

Strange to say, I got my first copy of the NIV as a gift. It was the NIV’s 1st edition of 1978. Though I never liked the NIV, my Mother bought it one day when she was shopping in Parramatta (in western Sydney) because she had been told by a bookseller (I forget the exact words, but something like the following,) that ‘this version was replacing the King James Version’ and was ‘the version of the future.’ Hence she thought I ‘might like it.’ I told her what she had been told was wrong, but I kept it since it was a gift from her, well intentioned, albeit somewhat misguidedly purchased. It sat in a bookcase with virtually no usage at all till I started work on these textual commentaries, at which point I finally found a use for it. I was then quite glad and grateful that my Mother had bought it about 25 to 30 years earlier, because this first edition of 1978 was out of print and could no longer be bought.

Thus I then purchased the second edition of 1984, so that I could use both in these textual commentaries. But now we find a third edition of 2011 has come out, in general even worse than the former two editions. This bad and sad third edition uses feminist language, so that to its many other bad features, it adds the lust of sex role perversion.

Other changes include the fact that the footnote found at “was” in the 1st & 2nd editions of Genesis 1:2, “now the earth was formless” etc. (NIV 2nd ed.), namely, “Or possibly ‘became’” (NIV 2nd ed. ftn), has now been removed. As one who on the Gap School model of e.g., the Congregationalist theologian, Pye Smith (d. 1851), or the Anglican clergyman, Henry Alcock (d. 1915)⁵⁰, considers that there is a gap of undisclosed time between the first two verses of Genesis, I am happy with either the rendering “was” or “became” in Gen. 1:2, since I consider context shows the same meaning either way (e.g., see this terminology in Jer. 4:20,23 referring to a “destruction” event “for the whole land”). Nevertheless, this alteration in the NIV’s new 3rd edition bespeaks a movement of it moving further and further away from Biblical truth. In this context, I note that the reference to the succession of “worlds” (Heb. 1:2; 11:3, AV) in the gap which was removed in the NIV’s 1st and 2nd editions, is likewise removed in the

⁵⁰ Smith, J.P., *The Relation between the Holy Scriptures and some parts of Geological Science* (1839, Jackson & Walford, London, fifth edition 1852); Alcock, H.J., *Earth’s Preparation for Man*, An exposition on the lines suggested by the late Rev. Dr. Pye Smith, James Nisbett, London, UK, 1897. I locate Eden in a region now under the waters of the Persian Gulf.

NIV's 3rd edition, with all three editions here wrongly reading, "universe" (NIV 2nd & 3rd editions).

Similar perversions occur at Gen. 2:4, with the Biblical description of what was occurring during the gap between the first two verses of Genesis, "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens" (Gen. 2:4, AV; cf. Eccl. 1:4, "One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh: but the earth abideth forever"). Remaining in the NIV's 3rd edition with the same inaccurate reading of the 1st and 2nd editions, is the so called "translation" of Gen. 2:4 as, "This is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created" (NIV 3rd ed.); although the third edition now admits it was wrong in its 1st and 2nd editions to try and separated this from the rest of verse 4 by a paragraph, so that its 3rd edition now at least completes the verse following a comma, with "when the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." Thus it is clear that in passages such as e.g., Gen. 2:4 and Heb. 11:3, the NIV is tampering with the Word of God in order to deny the teaching of a gap between the first two verses of Genesis. Such are the type of problems that come from its so called translation style of, "dynamic equivalence," with its associated excessive number of "dynamic equivalents," which inject a theological interpretation into the text of Scripture, rather than allow the Scriptures to speak for themselves as God intended them to.

In a sermon I preached in February 2011, I critiqued an erroneous footnote in the NIV at Num. 5:21,22,27⁵¹. E.g., I say:

The second error of interpretation that I'll deal with has to do with abortion. Around the mid 1990s a woman who at the time would have been about 30, spoke to me after she had been chatting with another woman she knew. She told me of how these two women had purportedly worked out from the Bible that it was okay to have an abortion or take a morning after, the night before, abortion pill. She turned to "The Law of Jealousies" in Numbers 5, which was an Old Testament Test of adultery, no longer applicable for we Christians, although like fornication, adultery remains a sin. Numbers 5 verse 18 refers to an accused woman coming before a Jewish priest, who in the Old Testament supernatural power of the Lord, gives her "bitter water that causeth the curse." And this curse in verse 21 is said to "make thy thigh to rot, and thy belly to swell." And in verse 27 we read, "And when he hath made her to drink the water, then it shall come to pass, that if she be defiled, and have done trespass against her husband, that the water that causeth the curse shall enter into her, and become bitter, and *her belly* shall swell, and her thigh shall rot: and the woman shall be a curse among her people."

⁵¹ My sermon, "Exposition of I & II Thessalonians 3/3: The doctrine of Scripture – The 'Word,'" (Short title: "The Pure Word,") Mangrove Mountain Union Church, N.S.W., Australia, Thursday 17 February, 2011; recording at <http://www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible>; printed copy at Textual Commentaries Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25), "Appendix 8: A Sermons' Bonus."

Now the key words were those of Numbers 5:21, which says in the Authorized Version, “*her belly shall swell.*” But this woman I spoke to back in the 1990s, quoted to me from the highly unreliable *New International Version*, in which Numbers 5:21 says in a footnote reading, “causes you to have a *miscarrying womb* and barrenness.” And the NIV has similar footnote readings at verses 22 and 27. And on the basis of these three *New International Version* footnote readings about “*a miscarrying womb,*” this woman and her friend considered that they had a Biblical basis for supporting a morning after, the night before, abortion pill; or any other abortion to get rid of an unwanted child.

Now I spoke to this woman on a couple of occasions about this matter. And during these discussions this woman described me in her terminology, as a “Rah, Rah,” “conservative.” Well, let me just say that in this woman’s terminology, I am a “Rah, Rah,” “conservative;” Thankyou very much, I make no apology for that. But let me also say that this woman’s reading from the *New International Version* is an error of interpretation. It rests on an error of translation by the highly unreliable NIV. In the words of Numbers 5:21 which says, “the Lord doth make thy thigh to rot, and thy belly to swell,” the word here translated “to swell,” is the Hebrew *tsabeh*, which is derived from Hebrew *tsabah*. And the Hebrew Lexicon of Brown, Driver, and Briggs, says these words refer to something “swelling” or “swollen,” or that will “swell” or “swell up.” So this Hebrew word refers to a swelling, and does not refer to a miscarriage. The Hebrew words for a miscarriage, rendered in Exodus 21:22 as “her fruit depart from her,” are very different to the Hebrew words for a “swollen” belly here in Numbers 5 verses 21,22, & 27.

And in fairness to this woman, it must be said that she came to a point in these discussions with me, where she admitted to me that she had gotten the wrong interpretation of this passage, and that I had clarified its actual meaning to her. I thank God that he convicted her of this truth, because I have no power to convict anyone of any truth. All I can ever do is present the truth as found in the Bible. Only God can convict. And let me also say in passing, that this is yet another reason why people should not be using the highly unreliable *New International Version*. The best English translation, based on the most accurate text, and the one I recommend, is the Authorized King James Version of 1611, which is by far, the best available English translation.

When I made these comments I had no idea of what was on these passages in the new 2011 3rd edition of the NIV. But I now find that this new 3rd edition *has gone from bad to worse!* That is because it now adopts this error in its main text at Num. 5:21,22,27, with no footnote alternative. E.g., Num. 5:22 reads in the main text, “so that ... your womb miscarries” (NIV, 3rd ed. 2011).

Given that this new 3rd edition of the NIV greatly embraces the worldly lusts of the sex role perverts commonly called “feminists” in its usage of feminist language, this

rendering in Num. 5:21,22,27 may also reflect a similar desire to pander to the feminists, in this case, seeking to help them in their ruthless and mass murderous “demands” for “abortion upon request.”

There are also some other changes in the 3rd edition (see commentary at Matt. 26:16,17). Thus it seems that the problem I mentioned in the Preface of Volume 2 of these textual commentaries, in the section entitled, “*Here again, Gone again, versions,*” is once again writ large, this time with the NIV. The *New International Version* of 1978 was “gone,” and then “here again” with the new *New International Version* of 1984; and then in turn, the new *New International Version* of 1984 is now “gone,” and then “here again” with the new new *New International Version* of 2011.

This new new *New International Version* of 2011 became available while I was working on this Textual Commentary Volume 4 on Matt. 26 to 28. I shall use it from Matt. 27 onwards. When I cite the NIV 2nd ed., then unless otherwise stated, it should be understood that it is the same as the earlier 1st ed. . Where the *New International Version* of 1978, the new *New International Version* of 1984, and the new new *New International Version* of 2011 are all in agreement, I shall simply refer to the “NIV” or “New International Version.” If there is some disparity, I shall refer to them separately.

Of course, this is the same type of thing I already do with the *New American Standard Bible*, which has likewise had three editions, namely, the *New American Standard Bible* of 1960-1971, the new *New American Standard Bible* of 1977, and the new new *New American Standard Bible* of 1995.

As we look at all these “new” versions, it seems to me we would do well to heed the words of Jer. 6:16, “Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for you souls.” By the grace of God, let us seek the “the old paths” and “the good way” of the King James Bible!

The son of a centurion.

A 1969 black’n’white photograph which includes Father as one of twenty-four army officers in Patrol Blue uniforms with Sam Browne belts, taken at the 3 Signals Regiment Officer’s Mess, Melbourne, has sat on the mantle-piece for years⁵². Compared to the brighter blue colour of e.g., the blue eyes of my father, the army’s “patrol Blues” are such a dark hue of blue that they are sometimes wrongly thought to be a “black” uniform. At the time, Father was a Captain in the army. But when he later became a Major, the patrol blues’ cap with a red cap band that he wore with this patrol blues’

⁵² A third of these 24 army officers were from units other than 3 Signals Regiment, but were at this same depot and so were members of the 3 Signals Regiment Mess. E.g., half of these eight were from 126 Signals Squadron, and one was from the *Royal Australian Electrical & Mechanical Engineers Light Aid Detachment* (RAEME LAD).

uniform, additionally had a gold trim on the cap brim. This gold trim on the brim historically gave rise to the term, “brass hat,” a colloquial term for higher ranking officers.

Father was not in a field unit. However, the significance of ranks in the Australian army are determined relative to their place in fields units. Before Father retired in 1976 (at 55 years of age), in an Australian army field unit, a Lieutenant was a platoon commander (a platoon is 30 men), a Captain was a Company Commander (a company is three platoons), a Lieutenant Colonel the Commanding Officer of a Battalion (a battalion is three companies), and a Major the 2nd-in-command (2-I-C) of the Battalion. But after he retired with the rank of Major, this was changed, and Company Commanders became Majors. In this photo at 3 Signals Regiment Officer’s Mess as a Captain, he was a Quartermaster; and as a Major he was a Staff Officer at army Headquarters in Canberra. Nevertheless, for the purposes of understanding rank relative to the Roman army, the field unit ranks are relevant. A Roman centurion of Bible times was in charge of about a hundred men (e.g., Mark 15:39,44,45; Luke 23:47; Acts 10:1,22). Therefore, when a Captain, Father held the same approximate rank as a centurion; when a Major in the army, he held a rank one higher than the equivalent of a centurion i.e., the equivalent of a 2-I-C of three Roman centurions (about 300 men); and when a retired Major, he originally held a rank that was one higher than a centurion, but after this rank was then later down-sized, he again held a rank approximating that of a centurion. There is thus a sense in which I might be called, *the son of a centurion* (or something close to it).

It is notable that the New Testament twice uses Roman centurions to type the white Caucasian Children of Japheth. In the Book of Acts, “a certain man in Caesarea called Cornelius, a centurion of the band called the Italian, band, a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway” (Acts 10:1,2), is used to type the Gospel going out to the white Japhethites. This compares and contrasts with the Gospel going out to light brown Semites in the form of Samaritans, who though on one level were mixed race, were nevertheless still inside the wider Semitic race (Acts 8:14-25); and the Gospel going out to black Hamates in the form of the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8:26-40). This is thus the normative Biblical depiction of racial universality from Noah’s three sons summarized in the form of a white Japhethite, a light brown Semite / Shemite, and a black Hamite. It manifests the Great Commission of Matt. 28:18-20, where Jesus teaches the racial universality of the Gospel, to persons of all racial “families” / “kindreds” / “nations” (Gen. 12:3; Acts 3:25; Gal. 3:8), saying, “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost” (Matt. 28:19).

Furthermore, when we consider St. Matthew’s Gospel, we find that reference in it is made to two centurions. The first centurion is used to show that white Japhethite Gentiles whom God created to be a master race, i.e., to be the masters of a “servant” race, such as “Canaan” (Gen. 9:27), can have faith in Christ. This contextually is compared and contrasted with a Hamitic Gentile whom God created to be a servant race to Jews and Caucasians (Gen. 9:25-27), namely, “a woman of Canaan” (Matt. 15:21-28), who in a

very similar situation, also shows “great” “faith” (Matt. 15:28). But she must first put the sin out of her life of seeking racial equality for Hamitic servant races, and wrongly seeking the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. She must recognize that as “a woman of Canaan,” she is a servant to her Jewish “masters” from Shem (Gen. 9:26; Matt. 15:22,27). But her sin problem first dealt with, “Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that very hour” (Matt. 15:28)⁵³.

Thus in Matt. 8:5-13, the Roman “centurion,” whose white Japhethite Roman empire was “in the tents” (Gen. 9:27) of Semitic Palestine with its Hamitic Canaanites, and who was a military man, says in stereotypical Genesis 9:27 Aryan manner, “I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I say to this man, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it.” In stereotypical Gen. 9:25-27 form, this Roman Japhethite is also depicted with a “servant” (Matt. 8:6).

But here the stereotype ends. Unlike some white supremacists who have greatly abused the positions of power which are the fruits of their Aryan race’s racial gifts, this particular Roman centurion shows care and compassion for his “servant,” who “lieth at home sick of the palsy, grievously tormented” (Matt. 7:6). He says to Jesus in a humility given him by the Holy Ghost, “I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof” (Matt. 8:8). He has clearly been given the gift of faith by the Holy Ghost, for he recognizes that even as he is a temporal military commander, so Christ is a spiritual military commander. He recognizes that even as he as a centurion can command Roman temporal “soldiers” or a “servant” (Matt. 8:9), so Christ can issue spiritual commands. He recognizes that there is power in “the word” of Christ (cf. Rev. 1:16). Hence he says to Christ, “speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed” (Matt. 8:8). The Roman centurion is thus acknowledging Christ as his *spiritual* Commanding Officer.

“When Jesus heard it, he marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the [Jewish racial] children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. And Jesus said unto the centurion, Go thy way; and as thou hast believed so be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour” (Matt. 8:10-13).

The third centurion we will consider, who is the second centurion we read of in St. Matthew’s Gospel, appears in Matt. 27:54 at the cross. “Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost. And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom: and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent: and the graves were opened: and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of

⁵³ Cf. my comments on this passage in Appendix 5: “Dedication Sermon for Volume 4 (Mon. 6 Feb. 2012).”

the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many. Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God” (Matt. 27:50-54).

We know from St. Luke’s Gospel, that “when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, certainly this was a righteous man” (Luke 23:47). And we know also from St. Mark’s Gospel, that “when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the Son of God” (Mark 15:39). Thus three gospels refer to elements of this centurion’s faith in Christ as part of their evangelistic message that we also need to so acknowledge Christ!

Looking more specifically at St. Matthew’s Gospel, we thus learn an important element of why this Gospel was written. We too are meant to have “faith” in Jesus (Matt. 8:10). We are to “Repent” (Matt. 3:3; 4:17), “confessing” our “sins” (Matt. 3:6), as set forth most especially in the *Ten Commandments* (Matt. 5:21-30; 6:24; 19:18,19; Exod. 20:1-17; 34:28,29). We are to be spiritually baptized by Christ with the Holy Ghost (Matt. 3:11). This spiritual baptism or regenerating work of the Spirit gives us a “pure” “heart” (Matt. 5:8 cf. Titus 3:5). For Christ came “to give his life a ransom for many” (Matt. 20:28). Hence in the symbols of the Lord’s Supper, Christ says of the bread, “This is my body” (Matt. 26:26); and of the wine, “This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins” (Matt. 26:28). Thus Christ’s body was given and his blood was shed “for the remission of sins” (Matt. 26:28) and “a ransom for many” (Matt. 20:28), as he hung on the cross and died (Matt. 27:27-66). But this new “testament” or “covenant” of which he spoke (Matt. 26:28) contains within it “the everlasting covenant” (Heb. 13:20; cf. Gal. 3:11-25; Gen. 6:8,9,18 & Heb. 11:7), is effective, for he was “raised again” on “the third day” (Matt. 16:21; 17:23; cf. Rom. 4:25), coming forth from the grave (Matt. 28); and indeed is coming again a second time in power and great glory (Matt. 26:64, *et al*). Thus like the Gentile Roman “centurion” who was “watching Jesus” die, we are to proclaim, “Truly this was the Son of God” (Matt. 27:54); for “whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God” (I John 4:15).

I think it would be truly sad for any man to read my textual commentary, and have only a dead formal religion, and not a living faith in Christ my Lord. While this work on the *Textus Receptus* and King James Version is important, we should never forget that the power is the Word of God itself. The Bible is the “sword” of the Lord (Eph. 6:17; Heb. 4:12; Rev. 1:16). Some professed Christians treat the sword of the Lord as a great museum piece. They like to look at, and tell people what a great sword it is. They like to tell about how *long ago* it was wielded in various battles with great success, such as at the time of the Reformation.

But they do not want anyone to wield it today. They do not want people to use it to convict men of their sins, especially sins that are very common and accepted, even in many churches. They do not want the Sword of the Lord to cut into men’s hearts and convict them of sins such as e.g., not protecting the gospel of justification by faith against

churches that do not believe it (Gal. 1:8,9; 3:11) e.g., against the Roman Catholic or Eastern Orthodox Churches; and indeed these same Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches are also far gone in “idolatry” (Gal. 5:20), and a syncretism with one form of “witchcraft” (Gal. 5:20) in regard to communication with the dead such as practiced by the Witch of Endor who invoked the dead Samuel (I Sam. 28:7,11,15), since they also engage in “invocation of the saints” contrary to e.g., Deut. 18:9-12; I Tim. 2:5 and Heb. 12:24. So too, some professed Christians do not want the Sword of the Lord to convict men of sins such as e.g., gluttony, drunkenness, and mixed marriages (Matt. 24:37-39 cf. Matt. 11:18,19; 24:49; Gen. 6:1-4; Dan. 2:43); or “covetousness, which is idolatry” (Col. 3:5, cf. Matt. 6:24; 19:20-22; Exod. 20:2-6,17).

“For crying out loud,” they say e.g., “Don’t start quoting I Cor. 11:1-14,14:34; I Tim. 2:8-15! We’ve got women with short hair, men with long hair, women with short-dresses above their knee and tops below their breast-line, and we’ve got women who teach in our church. The Apostle Paul was a misogynist. We don’t care if a man is what the old King James calls a ‘heretick’ (Titus 3:10, AV), and promotes what the old King James calls ‘heresies’ (Gal. 5:20, AV). We believe in ‘seeker friendly’ churches, ones that don’t put the hard word on people about their sins. Opposite to what the old King James says, we say with the modern versions say. We say don’t be ‘factious’ (Titus 3:10, Moffatt Bible) and so stop causing ‘dissension’ over what we do (Gal 5:20, Moffatt Bible), by telling us we shouldn’t keep up with worldly values. Just don’t be divisive! Stop causing ‘dissension’ (Gal. 5:20, Moffatt Bible)!” Though aided and abetted by modern versions which do away with warnings about heresy, and in fact turn these passages on their head by making them condemn anyone who is concerned about heresy, what they’re really saying, is “We like our sin. We like the world telling us we’re great guys. SO SHUTUP!!! We like our sin.”

This is the same kind of attitude that Holy Noah faced in antediluvian times. When he stepped into the ark, most of the antediluvians did not. Judged by worldly standards, he was “an unsuccessful preacher.” But judged by God’s standards, he was “a preacher of righteousness” (II Peter 2:5), and an “heir of the righteousness which is by faith” (Heb. 11:7).

Our task is to faithfully proclaim the Word of God. That is the standard by which we are to judge a preacher or evangelist, not the issue of “How many people are or are not saved?” (or at least we think are “saved,”) under his ministry, or “How large?” his congregation is. We are to say, “I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God” (Acts 20:27).

Brethren in Christ, and any reader who knoweth not the Lord, I say unto ye, we must “Repent” (Matt. 3:3:2; 4:17), “confessing” our “sins” (Matt. 3:6), and turning in “faith” to Christ (Matt. 8:10). God’s grace says, “I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance” (Matt. 9:13). We must, by the grace of God, look with faith to Christ, and like the centurion standing at the cross, declare, “Truly this was the Son of God” (Matt. 27:54). “May God give us the grace to do it,” is my prayer “in Jesus name. Amen.”

“Farewell” to Manuscript Washington till Luke 8:13-24:54.

It might be remarked that Manuscript Washington or Codex W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) has been an important ancient Byzantine text manuscript used in Volumes 1-4; and that it is a good complement to A 02 which does not start till Matt. 25:6. This means that between them, we have in Manuscript Washington (W 032) and Manuscript London (A 02), two 5th century Byzantine texts that cover most of the four Gospels.

I have no real interest in the non-Byzantine text parts of Manuscript Washington, other than as a proof for showing that the Byzantine School evidently co-existed along side non-Byzantine text scribes. Thus as with Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) which I will not generally be making usage of again till St. Luke’s Gospel, I will not again be making general usage of W 032 till St. Luke 8.

Both of these manuscripts are valuable for showing us how a scribe might “stitch together” portions of his work from multiple text types, both in ancient times (Codex W 032) or mediaeval times (Minuscule 28). This in turn shows the presence of rival text types competing alongside one another from ancient times, with the Byzantine Text type then be clearly adjudged the better one from these other selections of the Alexandrian Text and Western Text, and hence becoming the dominant Greek New Testament text type up till the 16th century, when the neo-Byzantines of the Western Churches then subjected it to the rigours of textual analysis. Of course, we do not know the reason as to why different text types were so combined in Codex W 032 or Minuscule 28. E.g., was it an accidental redaction of different text types by a scribe who did not understand this issue of diverse text types? Or was it a deliberate redaction of different text types by a scribe who chose “some of both” as a type of political compromise with differing factions? Were some instances accidental and others deliberate?

“Thee” & “thy” etc., part of our great English literature heritage.

“Modern” Bible translations that fail to distinguish between the singular forms of you (Thee, thou, thy, thine) and plural forms (ye, you, your) do not put a premium on accuracy, but they do put a premium on ignorance. They pander to the worldly spirit of the age, which is one of debasement and superficiality. Historically, English retained these distinctions for poetry, the Bible, and prayer, long after they had ceased to be used in normal conversation. The post World War Two era (1939-1945) saw an accelerated decline away from Christian values and high moral standards in the western world, and as one manifestation of this wider trend the plethora of “new” versions which do not make the distinction between “you” singular and plural.

E.g., in St. Matthew’s Gospel, let the reader consider the words of Matt. 26:63,64 in the *New King James Version* of 1979-1982 (NKJV). “But Jesus kept silent. And the high priest answered and said to him, ‘I put *you* under oath by the living God: tell us if *you* are the Christ, the Son of God!’ Jesus said to him, ‘It is as *you* said: nevertheless, I

say to *you*, hereafter *you* will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of the power, and coming on the clouds of heaven” (NKJV, emphasis mine). The reader of this passage would naturally understand that our Lord is addressing the high priest on every occasion that he refers to *you*. But now let the reader note the subtle nuance of the Greek, more accurately rendered in the *King James Version* of 1611. “But Jesus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure *thee* by the living God, that *thou* tell us whether *thou* be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, *Thou* hast said: nevertheless I say unto *you*, Hereafter shall *ye* see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven” (AV, emphasis mine).

Thus the greater clarity of the AV means that we realize here that Christ individually addresses the high priest, “Thou hast said,” but then refers to the wider group with, “I say unto you” and “shall ye see.” Such verses of Scripture remind us of the wisdom of the King James Version translators. They used language that in their own day in 1611 was archaic, since the distinction between “thee,” “thou” etc. as a singular form, and “ye,” “you” as a plural form, had given way to a French-type distinction of “thee” (French, *tu*) etc. in a more informal context, and “you” (French, *vous*) in a more formal context, which is how one finds it in Shakespeare’s works. This is also evident in the Dedicatory Preface of the KJV to “Your Majesty” (not “Thy Majesty”).

Likewise in Matt. 23:36-39, there is a transition between the Jews being literally addressed, “Verily I say unto you” (Matt. 23:36), then a transition to a singular plural in the metaphoric usage of “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings,” and then leaving the metaphor, back to the literal plural, “and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate” (Matt. 23:37,38). The Greek nuance is beautifully captured in the AV, but totally lost in modern versions such as the NASB, ESV, NIV, and NKJV, where the transition from the plural literal “you” (Matt. 23:36), to the metaphoric singular “thou,” “thee,” and “thy” (Matt. 23:37), back to the literal plural “ye,” “your,” and “you” (Matt. 23:37,38), is totally lost. *Far from clarifying the Word of God, such modern versions conceal its proper meaning and nuance.*

Thus as seen in e.g., the Authorized Version, English retained these distinctions for poetry, the Bible, and prayer, long after they had ceased to be used in normal conversation. Indeed, the usage of the singular forms of “you,” such as “thee” and “thy” etc., form part of the great heritage of English literature that we are beneficiaries and custodial guardians of. These are found in some great pieces of English literature, that we would be much poorer off for not having, and which are only diminished in literary beauty if “revised” and “modernized.”

In this context, let us consider one such great piece of English literature by the Anglican clergyman, John Donne (1572-1631). He was Dean of St. Paul’s *Church of England* Cathedral, London (1621-1631). Born of Roman Catholic parents, and reared in the Roman religion, God graciously opened John Donne’s eyes to gospel truth and he converted to Protestantism and became a member of the Established *Church of England*.

He was ordained to Anglican holy orders of deacon and priest in 1615, and became a Royal Chaplain to King James I of the King James Bible (Regnal Years: 1603-1625). In 1621 he was appointed Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, and he continued in this appointment under King Charles I (Regnal Years: 1625-1649) till his death in 1631. He was regarded as a favourite preacher by both James I and Charles I. A marble effigy of John Donne survived the Great Fire of London in 1666 and still stands in the Cathedral of which he was Dean.

John Donne uses "thy" twice in this great poem (in the first and last verses); and the associated terminology of "mine own" (my own). Let the reader consider the rich theology in his poem, "Hymne to God my God, in my Sickness," in which he passes "through (Latin, *per*) the strait (*fretum*) of fever (*febris*)." Though I do not consider "Adam's tree" and "Christ's cross" stood in the same geographical place, there is a theological sense in which they metaphorically did since the cross reverses the effects of the fall for the redeemed. Though I have modernized some of the spellings, I have left others such as e.g., "quire" (found in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer) for "choir;" or "Japhet (Japheth)," "Cham (Ham)," and "Sem (Shem)," referring to the initial movement of the races from the three great fountain heads of Noah's three sons into Europe and parts of west Asia (Japheth), Africa and parts of west Asia (Ham), and Asia (Shem) (Gen. 10).

But before we consider Donne's poem, the reader should also consider the words of St. Peter, "God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble. Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time (I Peter 5:5,6). In the *Homily Against Strife and Contention*, in the First Book of Homilies, Homily 12 (Part 3), in Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, reference is made to I Peter 5:6. "And whereof cometh this contention, strife, and variance, but of pride and vainglory? Let us therefore (I Peter 5) *humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God*, which hath promised to rest upon them that be humble and low in spirit. If we be good Christian men, ... (Rom. 15) *with one mouth and mind we may glorify God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. To whom be all glory now and ever. Amen." When Donne says that "to others' souls I preach'd thy Word, Be this my text, my sermon to mine own, Therefore that he may raise the Lord throws down," in the first place he seems to be referring to I Peter 5:6; but in the second place, given the Anglican thinking of this *Church of England* clergyman when he puts this verse in the context of having "preached thy Word" i.e., God's Word, *some allusion to this Homily may also be present*, in which I Peter 5:6 is interpreted in terms of not being contentious, but giving glory to God.

May the good Christian reader enjoy this excellent poem.

Since I am coming to that holy room,
Where, with the quire of saints forevermore,
I shall be made thy music; As I come
I tune the instrument here at the door,
And what I must do them, think here before.

Whilst my physicians by their love are grown
 Cosmographers, and I their map, who lie
 Flat on this bed, that by them may be shown,
 That this is my south-west discovery
Per fretum febris, by these straits to die,

I joy, that in these straits, I see my West;
 For, though their currents yield return to none,
 What shall my West hurt me? As West and East
 In all flat maps (and I am one) are one,
 So death doth touch the resurrection.

Is the Pacific Sea my home? Or are
 The eastern riches? Is Jerusalem?
 Anyan, and Magellan, and Gibaltare,
 All straits, and none but straits, are ways to them,
 Whether where Japhet dwelt, of Cham, or Sem.

We think that Paradise and Calvary,
 Christ's cross, and Adam's tree, stood in one place;
 Look, Lord, and find both Adam's met in me;
 As the first Adam's sweat surrounds my face,
 May the last Adam's blood my soul embrace.

So, in his purple wrapp'd receive me Lord,
 By these his thorns give me his other crown;
 And as to others' souls I preach'd thy Word,
 Be this my text, my sermon to mine own,
 Therefore that he may raise the Lord throws down.

Christ the Rock (Matt. 16:18; I Cor. 3:11):

- a) *Considering issues of language genre before considering Matt. 16:18.*
- b) *The meaning of Matt. 16:18.*

a) *Considering issues of language genre before considering Matt. 16:18.*

Before considering Matt. 16:18, I would draw the readers attention to two matters. Firstly the issue of male and female gendering acting to distinguish words via a cultural loading; and secondly, the issue of word-plays not constituting synonyms.

With respect to the first matter, Greek and Latin have male and female gendering. This is also reflected in Latin languages such as French (which I studied at school⁵⁴),

⁵⁴ I did some French in First Form (Year 7) at Macquarie Boys' High School, Sydney, NSW (1972), and in Second to Fourth Forms (Years 8-10) at Belconnen High

Spanish, and Italian.

Depending on context, the gendering can make quite a difference with respect to associated cultural loadings. For example, let us consider the Spanish words from Cuba in the Americas, “Guantanamo” and “Guantanamera.” Guantanamo is a place name in Cuba⁵⁵.

In March 2009 I visited parts of the Americas on the North American Continent. This included the Pentagon just outside of Washington D.C., USA, where there was a “9/11” (September 11, 2001) Mohammedan terrorist attack, and a memorial to this; and also New York, USA, where I again saw the place of a “9/11” (September 11, 2001) Mohammedan terrorist attack, and some memorials to this. These Mohammedan terrorist attack were an important component in a contemporary usage of “Guantanamo.”

For in contemporary times, the masculine form of the name, “Guantanamo,” (generally pronounced in English, Gwan-tanamo) immediately conjures up thoughts of the Guantanamo Bay detention centre (or camp) used by the United States of America under the Administration of President George Bush (US President 20 Jan. 2001 to Jan. 2009). It is located at the USA’s Naval Base in Guantanamo Bay⁵⁶, and was opened in October 2001 and operational under USA President Bush’s administration. This was connected with Mohammedan fundamentalists being fought in Afghanistan, and Mohammedan terrorists in the wake of the September 11, 2001, Mohammedan terrorist attacks on the USA. The detention centre has often been referred to simply as, “Guantanamo.”⁵⁷

School, Canberra, ACT (1973-5).

⁵⁵ Cuba is one of the last surviving Communist countries. As a Christian, I strongly oppose Communism. E.g., its teaching about “revolutions” is contrary to the Biblical teaching opposing “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:21). Not only is its teachings condoning “murderers” (Rev. 21:8) in a revolutionary context a violation of the sixth commandment, “Thou shalt not kill” (Exod. 20:13; Matt. 19:18; Rom.13:9), its teachings about state ownership is a violation of the eighth commandment, “Thou shalt not steal” (Exod. 20:15; Matt. 19:18; Rom. 13:9). There are also many other problems with Communism (Marxism).

⁵⁶ The presence of a USA Naval Base in Communist Cuba may at first seem rather strange. (Although British Hong Kong survived for 50 years under Communist China.) It stems from the *Cuban-American Treaty* (1903), which gave the USA territorial control over Guantanamo Bay (the USA had established a naval base there in 1898,) *in perpetuity*, while recognizing Cuban sovereignty. The Communist regime which took over in 1961 has unsuccessfully tried to dispute the legality of this 1903 treaty, and the USA has successfully maintained its territorial jurisdiction of the Guantanamo Bay naval base.

⁵⁷ The work at Guantanamo has brought successful convictions of: 1) David Hicks (b. 1975) of Australia, who fought as a rebel soldier with the Taliban in

By contrast, the feminine form of the name, “Guantanamera,” (generally pronounced in English, One-tun-a-mere-o), conjures up thoughts of the refrain in the Cuban song, “Guantanamera.” In Spanish the suffix, “era” means *a person from* (feminine), and so “Guantanamera” means *a female person from Guantanamo*⁵⁸. In Cuban music, a “guajira” (generally pronounced in English, wa-ear-a), refers to a particular music genre. It also refers in Cuban Spanish (but not Spanish more generally,) to *a country girl*. Both meanings seem to be present in this song, so that it is a contextual *double entendre*. Thus in the refrain, the words “guajira Guantanamera” is an introduction to *a particular genre of music* (guajira), *about a woman from Guantanamo* (Guantanamera); and also a statement that this is about *a country person* (guajira) who is *a female from Guantanamo* (Guantanamera). Some variation in verse numbers and verse content occurs, but the form I know has only one English verse, and then the Cuban Spanish Refrain.

Refrain: Guantanamera, guajira Guantanamera,
Guantanamera, guajira Guantanamera.

Verse: For I am simple and truthful,
And from a land rich with palms,
Before my days end,
I sing my song,
I sing the verses of my soul.

Refrain: Guantanamera, guajira Guantanamera,
Guantanamera, guajira Guantanamera.

The music for this song, with its well known Spanish Refrain, is usually attributed to the Cuban songwriter and singer, Jose Fernandez Diaz, commonly known as Joseito Fernandez (1908-1979).

But the salient point I make is this. When in English we here the masculine form, “Guantanamo” (pronounced “Gwan-tanamo”), we think of a USA detention centre in Cuba for Islamic terrorists and Islamic fundamentalist rebels in Afghanistan, operating

Afghanistan; 2) Salim Hamden (b. 1970) of Yemen, who worked as a chauffeur driving Osama bin Laden (b. 1957, founder of Al-Qaeda, the Muslim organization that launched the attacks on the USA of September 11, 2001; d. 2011 when shot dead by USA SEALs [acronym for **S**Ea, **A**ir, & **L**and teams] operating with the USA CIA [acronym for **C**entral **I**ntelligence **A**gency] in Pakistan); and 3) Ali al Bahlul (b.1969) of Yemen, who made a video celebrating the Al-Qaeda attack of suicide bombers in Oct. 2000 on the USS Cole, a missile destroyer attacked while in port at Aden, Yemen, damaging the ship and killing seventeen sailors.

⁵⁸ In Spanish, the suffix, “ero” means *a person from* (masculine), and so “Guantanamero” would mean *a male person from Guantanamo*.

during the administration of US President George W. Bush (2001-2009). But when we here the feminine suffix form, “Guantanamera,” (pronounced “One-tun-a-mere-o”), referring to *a woman from Guantanamo* (that the songwriter is evidently interested in), we think of the refrain of the Cuban song, “Guantanamera (One-tun-a-mere-o), guajira (wa-ear-a) Guantanamera (One-tun-a-mere-o).” Thus the contextual cultural loading we have for the same Spanish word in the masculine place name form (Guantanamera) and feminine form conjugated for *a person from* this place (Guantanamera), is very different indeed.

If e.g., some fool were to come along, and suggest that the Cuban song, “Guantanamera,” was “intended to anticipate the presence of a female prisoner at Guantanamo Bay prison,” he would be rightly laughed at. For as the holy apostle St. Paul teaches us, we should not “suffer fools gladly” (II Cor. 11:19).

In the Greek, the masculine gendering of “*Petros* (Peter)” refers to a specifically male person, whereas the feminine gendering of “*τῆ πέτρα* (the stone)” does not refer to a specifically female entity; and in Cuban Spanish, the feminine gendering of “Guantanamera” refers to a specifically female person, whereas the masculine gendering of “Guantanamo” does not refer to a specifically male entity. Nevertheless, in both the Greek and Spanish the gendering of these words does distinguish them as being different. Therefore, I ask the good Christian reader to keep these thoughts in mind, when in the following section on Matt. 16:18, we consider how in the Greek, a distinction is made between the masculine form, “*Petros* (Peter, ‘a stone’ or ‘a pebble’),” and the feminine form, “*τῆ πέτρα* (‘the stone’ or ‘the rock,’ referring to Christ).” The contextual loading between these masculine and feminine forms in the Greek of Matt. 16:18, is quite distinctive; and in this sense, resembles the differing cultural loading we have between the masculine place name form of the Spanish word, “Guantanamo” (Gwan-tanamo), and the feminine form of this Spanish word conjugated for *a person from* this place, “Guantanamera (One-tun-a-mere-o).”

With respect to the second matter, it should be remembered that word-plays do not intrinsically constitute synonyms. The word for “black” in a number of Latin languages e.g., Spanish, is “negro.” Negroids are descended from Noah via Ham’s son, Cush (Gen. 10:6,7), and like the leopard’s black “spots,” their black “skin” is a distinctive racial feature (Jer. 13:23)⁵⁹. Hence in the NT, the Greek word for “Ethiopia” (Acts 8:27)

⁵⁹ I understand Nimrod to have been Sargon I, king of Accad. Extra-Biblical data is silent on his father’s race, simply saying that “his mother was a priestess” and “his father an unknown wanderer.” (*Cambridge Ancient History*, 3rd ed., 1971, Vol. 1, Pt 2, pp. 418-9,425-6,431.) But on the basis of Gen. 10:8, Sargon’s father was a Negroid, and thus Sargon was a half-caste. If as with some other names on *The Table of Nations*, “Nimrod” (*brave / valiant*) is a *double entendre* containing a colour word-play, it may be playing on “NaMeR” meaning “to filtrate” and “thus spot” / “stain” and so it means “a leopard” (from its black spots); and “RuWd” meaning to “have the dominion.” I.e., a person of mixed race seeking racial amalgamation of diverse racial groups created by

is *Aithiops*, meaning *burnt-face*, referring to the Ethiopian's black skin, and possibly also their wide noses and everted lips. Negroids also have relatively slight male facial and body hair, for which reason Isaiah refers to those of "Ethiopia," as being "smooth of skin;" and as artistically typed by Ethiopians, Negro Negroids are also of tall stature, and Isaiah also refers to this racial trait of those from "Ethiopia," saying they are "a nation" of "tall" people (Isa. 18:1,2, NKJV), or calling "Sabeans, men of stature" (Isa. 45:14, NKJV). Nature teaches Negroids have other traits such as tight curly hair.

These Negroes from Ethiopia (Biblical Ethiopia is larger than the modern African state of this name,) were thus known from ancient times as being, on average, tall people. The question is sometimes asked, "Why are black African basketball players so tall?" To which the answer is jokingly given, "Because their (they're) knee grows (negroes)."

Contextually, only a fool would think that these word-plays between "their" and "they're," and "knee grows" and "negroes" respectively, meant that these words were synonyms. I ask the good Christian reader to keep these thoughts in mind, when in the following section on Matt. 16:18, we consider how in the Greek, a word-play is made on the masculine form, "*Petros* (Peter, 'a stone' or 'a pebble')," and the feminine form, "*te petra* ('the stone' or 'the rock,' referring to Christ)." This contextual word-play does not make these words synonyms, any more than the word play on "their" and "they're" or "knee grows" and "negroes," makes these contextual synonyms.

Christ the Rock (Matt. 16:18; I Cor. 3:11):

b) The meaning of Matt. 16:18.

The four volumes of the *Textual Commentary* on St. Matthew's Gospel, covers the Biblical passage of Matt. 16:18. The matter is of some importance, since on the one hand its proper understanding formed a significant element of the Protestant Reformation, but on the other hand, a number of the neo-Alexandrian versions, e.g., the *New English Bible* and its successor, the *Revised English Bible*, though not all neo-Alexandrian

God to be separate and distinctive. Derivative from this, the reference to the "spots" of "the leopard" in Jer. 13:23, may be a euphemism for a Negroid admixed person. I.e., "Can the Ethiopian" – a full-blooded negro "change his skin," or the leopard" – a mulatto, quadroon, or octoroon "his spots?" Then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil. This type of thinking in which the black skin of a negro is used as a synonym for "evil" in Jer. 13:23, also fits well with the context of Gen. 9 & 10 in which the *Curse on Canaan* is a manifestation of the *Curse on Ham*; and since in the colour word plays, "Ham" means "black," the *Curse on Ham* links with black skin emanating from his sin. Thus this also indicates that Canaan's skin was darkened from this curse; although since the other Hamites of North Africa were simply Mediterranean Caucasoids (the Egyptian "Mizraim" or Lybian "Phut"), they were evidently not part of this Hamitic racial curse; though the black skin of the southern African Capoids indicates that they were. See Appendix 5: "Dedication Sermon for Volume 4 (Mon. 6 Feb. 2012)."

versions, have greatly perverted the verse, going so far as to make it falsely seem to support elements of the Papists' claims that Peter, rather than Christ, is the rock upon which the church is built.

Historically, the Roman Catholic Church has claimed that when Christ said, "... And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church" etc. (Matt. 16:18), that he meant "Peter" was the "rock." On this basis they claim that Christ here made Peter his "vicar" or representative on earth. This is integral to their further claim, that St. Peter then went to Rome, and the Bishops of Rome are his "successors" as "vicars of Christ." This gives rise to the Latin title, "*Vicarius Christi*." The Latin "*vicarius*" here means "instead of another," a "substitute," or a "deputy;" and *Christi* means "of Christ." It is thus synonymous with the Greek *anti* meaning *in place of* or *instead of*, and *Christos* meaning "Christ." Thus if one were to render the Latin, "*Vicarius Christi*," into Greek, it would be "*Antichristos* (Antichrist)" (I John 2:18,22; 4:3; II John 7). E.g., the Vatican II Council (1962-5) Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents said "the Roman Pontiff" was "Peter's successor" and so "Vicar of Christ," claiming "that the office of binding and loosing" "was given to Peter (Mt. 16:19)" for Christ "made Peter alone the rock-foundation and the holder of the keys of the Church (cf. Mt. 16:18-19)⁶⁰."

As one who has thrice visited Rome (in 2001 and 2002), let me say that in the Papal Rome of the Vatican City, I found the papal crest of the Papal tiara over "the keys of St. Peter," *absolutely everywhere*. This Papal insignia is e.g., over the door of the Vatican Museum (*MUSEI VATICANI*), on various pictures inside the museum e.g., the Coat of Arms of Sixtus V (Pope 1585-1590) outside the Sistine Chapel; on the crest of Pope Pius IV (Pope 1559-1565) over one of the doors to the Vatican (now sealed closed) at the opposite end of the Vatican to St. Peter's Basilica; on the crest of Pope Alexander VII (Pope 1655-1667) in the main part of the modern St. Peter's Square; on the Papal crest of Pope Clement XII (Pope 1730-1740) over one of the doors to the Lateran Palace (an extra-territorial holding of the Vatican City State); and at a number of places inside the Lateran Palace e.g., the Room of Seasons. It is on the Papal crest of Pius XI (Pope 1922-1939), over the door just after St. Anne's Gate on the way into the courtyard containing the entrance into the Vatican Library; and on many other places, including the official Flag of the Vatican City State. Wherever I went in the Vatican, I kept coming across this crest of the Roman Papacy, symbolized by the heraldic Papal tiara over the heraldic "keys of St. Peter."

This type of spurious teaching is also found in footnotes at Matt. 16:18 in the Papists' *Douay-Rheims Bible* (1582 & 1609/10), *Jerusalem Bible* (1966), and *New Jerusalem Bible* (1985). E.g., in a footnote at Matt. 16:18, the *Douay-Rheims Version* claims, that by "Thou are Peter" etc., "Christ ... here declares ... the dignity to which he is pleased to raise him [Peter]: viz ... signifying a rock The words of Christ to

⁶⁰ Flannery, A. (Ed.), *Vatican Council II, The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, Costello, New York, USA, 1977, p. 375, *Dogmatic Constitution of the Church*, 22.

Peter, ... were the same as if he had said in English, *Thou art a Rock, and upon this rock I will build my church ...*.”

On the basis of these claims, the Roman Pontiff, “sitteth in the temple of God” i.e., the church, “shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4) in the form of a vice-God, for as “vicar of God” or “vicar of Christ” he claims as a vice-God to represent God on earth as his deputy. On this basis, he claims *universal jurisdiction* in the church, and this is not e.g., like the hot-air claim of some lunatic, but a seriously real claim as seen by e.g., the Decree of the Emperor in Constantinople, Phocas, giving the Pope such universal jurisdiction in 607 A.D., as “universal bishop.”

This claim to be “universal bishop,” is referred to in Book 2, Homily 16 (Part 2), Article 35, of the Anglican *39 Articles*, as manifesting “the Pope’s intolerable pride.” The Homily also upholds the godly Bishop of Rome, “St. Gregory” (Bishop of Rome 590-604), saying that, “as touching that they will be termed *Universal Bishops* and *Heads of all Christian Churches* through the world, we have the judgment of Gregory expressly against them; who ... condemneth John Bishop of Constantinople in that behalf, calling him ... the forerunner of Antichrist.” Thus Bishop Gregory understood the claim of “universal bishop” to be that of the then future Antichrist. Addressing this same core issue, Article 37 of the *39 Articles* then says, “The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.”

Thus the claim of the Roman Popes that in the first place, St. Peter is the rock of Matt. 16:18 on which the church is built; and in the second place, that the Bishops of Rome are St. Peter’s successors; in the third place, specifically, as “vicars of Christ,” are foundational claims to their spurious claims of a universal jurisdiction in the Church of Christ. Without this claim the Pope could not on his throne, be he that “sitteth in the temple of God” (II Thess. 2:4), that is, the church (I Cor. 3:16,17; II Cor. 6:16).

These claims, present at the foundation of the Roman Papacy in 607 A.D., continue to be foundational claims of the Roman Papacy. E.g., the *Second Vatican Council* of 1962-5 claimed, “the Roman Pontiff” as “Peter’s successor” has “primatial authority” “over all.” “For the Roman Pontiff, by reason of his office as Vicar of Christ ... of the entire Church, has full, supreme, and *universal power* over the whole Church, a power which he can always exercise unhindered⁶¹.” “In this Church of Christ the Roman Pontiff, as the successor of Peter, ... has ... supreme, full, immediate and *universal power ... of the universal Church* and the particular good of all Churches⁶².”

An example of the exercise of this purported power, is e.g., found in the persecution of Protestants by Papists, under a Roman Pontiff subsequently first “declared venerable” (“Venerable” Pius V), then “beatified” (“Blessed” Pius V), and then

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 375, *Dogmatic Constitution of the Church*, 22 (emphasis mine).

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 564, *Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops in the Church*, 2 (emphasis mine).

“canonized,” as a Romish “Saint,” who thus continues to be upheld as role model for Papists, namely, “Saint” Pope Pius V (Pope 1566-1572). Before he became Pope Pius V, the Bishop of Sutri, Michele Ghisleri, was made a Cardinal and appointed as Grand Inquisitor General over the entire Roman Church’s Inquisition.

As Pope Pius V, in opposition to Protestantism, he applied the decrees of the *Council of Trent* (1545-63). In his *Papal Bull Against Elizabeth* (1570), the Protestant Queen of England and Ireland (Regnal Years: 1558-1603), Pope Pius V said that God “entrusted the government of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church ... to one man alone on the earth, namely to Peter,” “and to Peter’s successor, the Roman Pontiff.” “Resting” “upon” this “authority,” he denounced “Elizabeth” as “a heretic” and said, “we declare,” “the nobles, subjects and peoples of the” “realm” of England and Ireland “and all others who have taken an oath of any kind to her,” “to be absolved for ever of such oath,” “fidelity and obedience,” and “we enjoin and forbid all” “that they presume not to obey her admonitions, commands, and laws. All who disobey our command we involve in the same sentence of anathema.” Moreover, “Saint Pope Pius V” called upon France and Spain to carry out his Bull and from that time till the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, there was essentially a state of warfare between the Protestants in the Kingdoms of England and Ireland and the Papists in the Counter-Reformation⁶³.

By contrast, Holy Scripture does not say that St. Peter has such keys, let alone any of his so called “successors.” Rather, in the Bible Jesus says, “I ... have the keys of hell and of death.” What does he do with the key “of death”? We are told clearly, that with “the key” Jesus is “he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth” (Rev. 1:18; 3:7). This passage alone demolishes the Romish interpretation of Matt. 16:18,19, in which it is claimed that the Pope has power to admit or bar people from entry into heaven, or to release them from “purgatory.” This claim was related to the issue of Papal indulgences, repudiated by Martin Luther in his 95 Theses of 1517⁶⁴.

In Matthew 16:18 Jesus said to the Apostle Peter, “thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church.” Taken in isolation this text has a degree of *prima facie* ambiguity in it. But it is notable that in the immediate context, St. Peter first says of Jesus, “Thou art the Christ” or Messiah (Matt. 16:16), and the passage then ends with the statement that Jesus “charged ... his disciples that they should tell no man that *he was* Jesus *the Christ*” (Matt. 16:21). Thus the contextual emphasis on the passage (Matt. 16:13-20) from go to woe, is on the fact that Jesus is “the Christ” (Matt. 16:16,20), and in this context our Lord says, “upon this rock I will build my church” (Matt. 16:18) i.e., the Rock is “the Christ,” and the passage makes it clear that “Jesus” is “the Christ.”

Thus the words of Matt. 16:18, “and upon this rock I will build my church,” are a contextual expansion of the recognition found in Peter’s confession, that Jesus is “the

⁶³ Bettenson, H., *Documents of the Christian Church*, 1943, 2nd edition, 1963, Oxford University, UK, 1977 (hereafter called, Bettenson’s *Documents*), pp. 240-1.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 185-91.

Christ” (Matt. 16:16). Christ says, “Thou art Peter (*Petros*)” (Matt. 16:18) to make the point that *from Peter’s lips* came the confession, “Thou art the Christ” (Matt. 16:16), but then to further develop this by saying that “upon this rock (*petra*)” (Matt. 16:18) i.e., “the Christ” who has just been confessed (Matt. 16:16), “I will build my church” (Matt. 16:18).

When other Scriptures are consulted, it is also clear that Jesus Christ is the rock upon which the church is built, since the Apostle Paul said “other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ” (I Cor. 3:11), and “Jesus Christ” is “the chief corner stone” (Eph. 2:20). Indeed, the New Testament applies Ps. 118:22 to Christ consistently and repeatedly, “The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner” (Matt 21:42; Mark 12:10; Luke 20:17; Acts 4:11; 1 Peter 2:7). The usage of “head” stone here also reminds us that Christ is the *head* of the church (Eph. 1:22; 5:23; Col. 1:18). In Matt. 21:42-44, “Jesus saith ..., Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner ...? Therefore I say unto you ... whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.” There can be no doubt that this “stone” is Christ, for “when the chief priests and Pharisees ... heard ..., they perceived that he spake of them,” and “they sought to lay hands on him” (Matt. 21:45,46). Matt. 21:42-46 thus qualifies Matt. 16:18 so as to contextually require that Christ is the stone / rock on which the church is built, and the head of the church.

This was recognized by Martin Luther, and was an important plank of the Christian Reformation ignited when Luther nailed his 95 Theses to the chapel door of Wittenberg Castle. Leipzig University in Germany had been founded by followers of John Huss, who had embraced the teachings of John Wycliffe, the Morning Star of the Reformation. They had exited Prague University (Charles University) in Czech, when the Bohemian king, sometimes known as “Wenceslas the Drunkard” (King of Bohemia, 1378-1419), moved to inhibit the hitherto international character of Prague University in 1409. The proto-Protestant martyr, John Huss (martyred in southern Germany by order of the Papist *Council of Constance*, 1415), had served as the Rector of Prague University. When his followers had founded Leipzig University, many of them took with them his and Wycliffe’s teachings.

In the *Leipzig Disputation* of 1519, Martin Luther (1483-1546) as the leader of the Protestant Reformation, debated John Eck (1486-1543), the Professor of Roman Catholic Theology at Ingolstadt, Germany, who acted as the spokesman for the Roman Catholic Church. Thus the selection of the debating venue of Leipzig University, appears to have been designed by the Papists in order to “taint” Luther with the followers of Huss and Wycliffe, and thus pronounce him, like them, a “heretic.”

It was here in 1519, at the *Leipzig Disputation*, that Luther boldly repudiated the claim of the Roman Catholic Church, that by the words of Matt. 16:18 the Church was built on St. Peter as “the rock.” His knock-down proof text, which he said was greater than any claims to the contrary by any church writer, church council, or Roman Pope, was St. Paul in I Cor. 3:11, “other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is

Jesus Christ⁶⁵.”

This was a fundamental teaching of the Protestant Reformation in its repudiation of the claims of jurisdictional authority by the Roman Pontiff. E.g., in 1523, in answer to the question, “Has Christ built his congregation or church, on Peter and the succeeding Popes?” Luther declared, “No, [the church] is built only on Jesus Christ, the Son of God.” For his “proofs,” he again cited e.g., I Cor. 3:11. Firstly, with respect to Matt. 16:18, “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it,” Luther said, that “Peter and the Popes cannot be this ... rock,” because, “the ‘gates of hell’ have prevailed against Peter and the Popes when they have fallen and sometimes sinned Therefore a foundation or rock is needed which does not waver at any time, nor is able to waver, does not sin, nor is able to sin,” and this is met in “Christ alone.”

Secondly, Luther continued, the *Apostles’ Creed* says, “I believe in ... the holy catholic (universal) church.” But this refers to the invisible church of Christ everywhere, and requires “faith” to perceive it (Heb. 11:1). “How then,” asks Luther, “can Peter or the Popes rule or preserve this church if they cannot know who is holy, can never see this church, but can only believe as we do all?” Thus concludes Luther, because “Christ alone sees this” universal “church; he alone” is the only one who “gathers and keeps it together, and he alone preserves it.” Therefore, once again, Christ must be the rock upon which the catholic (universal) church is built.

Thirdly, “neither Peter nor the Popes can give to this church faith, love, and the other gifts of the Holy Spirit; they also cannot take away these gifts nor change them.” “Thus Christ alone rules his congregation. Therefore also he alone is” the church’s rock. And finally, “Peter and the Popes were in need of this foundation; they needed faith, love, and the Holy Spirit.” Therefore, once again it follows that “there is no other foundation of this church in the whole world than ... Christ⁶⁶.”

Of course, even if one was, for the sake of argument, to erroneously claim that “Peter is the rock” in Matt. 16:18, there is nothing in this verse that then says, “And the bishops of Rome are his successors.” Nevertheless, it is important to the first part of the Papists’ claim, to establish the falsehood that Peter, not Christ, is the “rock” upon which the church is built.

Therefore it is with both sadness and horror, that we learn that neo-Alexandrian versions such as the 20th Century NT (TCNT, 1st ed. 1898-1901, 2nd ed. 1904), Moffatt Bible (1st ed. 1913, 2nd ed. 1935), New English Bible (1st ed. 1961, 2nd ed. 1970), and Revised English Bible (1989), are in agreement with the notes in the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version (1582 & 1609/10), Jerusalem Bible (1966), and New Jerusalem

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 191-2.

⁶⁶ *Luther’s Works*, Concordia, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, USA, 1972, Edited by G.G. Krodel & H.T. Lehmann, Vol. 49, pp. 61-2.

Bible (1985), claiming that Peter is the rock upon which the church is built.

It is to be hoped that the apostate Protestant translators in these neo-Alexandrian versions, do not agree with the second plank in the Papists' claim i.e., that the Popes of Rome are St. Peter's successors. But *possibly* at least *some* of them were fifth columnists who covertly harboured such views. We just do not know. But even if we could be satisfied that all of them did not accept the second plank in the Papists' claim, it is clear that they are *still dancing with the Devil*. That is because in claiming that Peter was "the rock" on which the church is built, they are attributing Divine Attributes to Peter, which as Luther showed, *supra*, he could not possibly have had. I.e., like the Papists, they depict St. Peter as a "Pope" type figure with this Divine Attribute of being "the rock" upon which the church is built. Thus whether or not they intend to do so, they are in fact helping to pave the way for the further second follow up claim of the Papists that there are successors to St. Peter with similar Divine Attributes, and the yet further third follow up claim that these successors are the Roman Popes. Thus the Devil here is up to his old tricks, for these are both forms of the old Devilish deception, "Ye shall be as gods" (Gen. 3:5)

Thus Matt. 16:18 is rendered in e.g., the TCNT as, "Your name is 'Peter' – a rock, and on this rock I will build my Church" etc. . Or Moffatt renders it, "Now I tell you, Peter is your name, and on this rock I will build my church" etc. (Moffatt Bible). But Moffatt then has a footnote claiming, "English fails to bring out the play on the Greek word for 'rock.' The French version reproduces it: '*Et [And] moi je [I myself⁶⁷] te [(unto) thee⁶⁸] dis (say) aussi (also) que (that) tu (thou⁶⁹) es (art) Pierre (Peter), et (and) sur (on) cette (this) pierre (stone) je (I) bâtirai (will build) mon (my) église (church)*'" (Moffatt Bible ftn). Moffatt's footnote claims at Matt. 16:18 are thus precisely the same as those of the footnote claims in the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version, which claims at Matt. 16:18 that, "The words of Christ to Peter, ... were the same as if he had said in English, *Thou art a Rock, and upon this rock I will build my church ...*."

The words of Christ as we have them are in Greek. Whether Christ originally spoke them in Greek or Aramaic is unclear. But to the extent that they are given to us in Scripture in the Greek, it is clear that the Holy Ghost thereby signifies that we are to understand them through reference to the Greek. Contrary to the claims of e.g., Moffatt and the Douay-Rheims, Christ says at Matt. 16:18, "... thou art Peter (*Petros*, 'a stone' or 'a pebble,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *Petros*), and (*kai*) upon this rock (*te* *petra*, 'the stone' or 'the rock,' or with definite article, *te*, regarded by the AV translators as redundant in English translation, 'rock,' feminine singular dative noun, from *petra*) I will build my church"

⁶⁷ In French, *moi* = "me," in a strong way, *je* = "I," and *moi + je* = "I myself."

⁶⁸ The informal French, 'you' singular (*tu*), in the objective case.

⁶⁹ The informal French, 'you' singular (*tu*), in the subjective case.

Finding *precise* English equivalents for Greek is not always possible, and these words at Matt. 16:18 are a case in point. A “rock” (*petros-petra*) can be of varying sizes. The *sense* of Matt. 16:18 is something like saying, “thou art *little* Rocky, but (*kai*) upon this the *big* rock I will my church” Or put another way, it is something like saying, with a linguistic emphasis on the “b” and “l,” “thou art a *pebble*, but upon this *boulder* I will build my church.” There is certainly a word-play between “*Petros* (Peter)” and “*te* (the) *petra* (rock),” but it is the *contextual* word-play of a *contrast*, not a synonym. The *contrast of opposites* is achieved by the gendering difference of “*Petros* (Peter)” as a *masculine* noun, and “*petra* (rock)” as a *feminine* noun. Contextually at Matt. 16:18, it is something like saying, “thou art *Arthur*, but the church will be built upon *Martha*.” Greek does not necessarily, or even usually, have this sort of connotation to its grammatical gendering, since something may be grammatically masculine feminine, or neuter gender, but it is not thereby necessarily a masculine, feminine, or neuter entity. For example, *petra* is always a feminine noun, it is never a masculine or neuter noun, so it is not a specifically female entity, and indeed here refers to the male entity of Christ; though by contrast, the personal pronoun, *autos* (masculine) – *autē* (feminine) – *auto* (neuter) would be used for such diverse entities e.g., “*to* (the) *Biblion* (Bible) *autou* (of him)” i.e., “his Bible,” as opposed to, “*to* (the) *Biblion* (Bible) *autēs* (of her)” i.e., “her Bible.” Nevertheless, *in the context* of Matt. 16:18, the gendering is being used *as a wordplay* highlighting a contrasting difference. It is thus saying something like, “thou art a *pebble*, but upon this *boulder* I will build my church.”

Hence when at Matt. 16:18, the *New International Version* (1st ed. 1973-1978, 2nd ed. 1984, 3rd ed. 2011) (NIV) reads, “... you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church” (NIV), with a footnote saying, “‘Peter’ means ‘rock’” (NIV ftn), there is an immediate technical sense of the Greek language in which what the NIV claims may be *prima facie* “correct.” I.e., in *some contexts*, the Greek *petros* (stone) might have the meaning of “rock.” But it is contextually *WRONG*, as *in the context of Matt. 16:18 this is not the meaning of “Petros.”* Thus in the context of Matt. 16:13-20, the NIV has badly distorted the Greek, since by failing to convey the “Arthur-Martha” or “*pebble-boulder*” distinction of the gendering which contextually acts to create a stylistic contrast of opposites, the NIV fails to convey the idea that Jesus is here contrasting two different types of “stones” i.e., “Peter” and “the rock,” which in some sense are contextual *opposites*. Therefore, if keeping within the metaphor, one might say the contrast is between a stone that is *little rock* or *pebble* (Peter), and a stone that is a *big rock* or *boulder* (Christ). Thus using the wider meaning found in this passage (Matt. 16:13-20), in specific terms, Christ “the rock” is the Divine “Son of ... God” and “the Christ” (Matt. 16:16,20), whereas Peter is one of the frail, human “disciples” of this “Jesus the Christ” (Matt. 16:20).

This means that integral to a proper understanding of Matt. 16:18, are the words of Matt. 16:16, “Thou art the Christ,” and the words of Matt. 16:20, “he was Jesus the Christ.” Matt. 16:20 is Greek, “*estin* (he is) *Iesous* (Jesus) *o* (the) *Christos* (Christ).” These same words are found at I John 2:22 as “*Iesous* (Jesus) ... *estin* (he is) *o* (the) *Christos* (Christ),” in the words, “Who is a liar but he that denieth that *Jesus is the Christ?* He is Antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son.” Since at Matt. 16:13-20, the teaching that Christ is “the rock” (Matt. 16:18) upon which the church is founded is

so intimately bound up with the declaration of St. Peter, “Thou art the Christ” (Matt. 16:16), and the words of Matt. 16:20, “he was Jesus the Christ,” it becomes very significant that Scripture teaches that “Antichrist” “denieth that Jesus is the Christ” (I John 2:22). That is because, the claim of the Roman Pontiffs, supported here at Matt. 16:18 by various neo-Alexandrian versions, that Peter is “the rock” of Matt. 16:18, in fact “denieth that Jesus is the Christ” (I John 2:22) in the Biblical sense that to understand “he was Jesus the Christ” (Matt. 16:20), is to understand that he is “the rock” upon which the church is built (Matt. 16:18).

Hence it should not surprise us to further learn that the Roman Pontiff is guilty of great “blasphemy” (Rev. 13:1,6; 17:3). For he takes the very name of God the Father, spoken by God the Son when he called him, “Holy Father” (John 17:11), and wickedly applies it to himself, as a Papal title of address. In the [Roman] *Catholic Concise Encyclopedia* (1956), Broderick says “Holy Father” is a “title of reverence accorded to the pope as spiritual father of the universal church⁷⁰.” Thus we find that the Roman Pontiff, who “denieth that Jesus is the Christ” (I John 2:22) by his denial of the Biblical teaching in Matt. 16:13-20 that “the Christ” is “the rock” upon which the church is built (Matt. 16:16,18,20); is he “that denieth the Father and the Son” (I John 2:22).

Certainly this is *not the only element of recognizing that Jesus is the Christ* or Messiah, but here at Matt. 16:13-20 it is a key contextual element in understanding that Jesus is the “Christ” (Matt. 16:16,20; I John 2:22). It is thus with alarm we learn that the neo-Alexandrian versions are also attacking these words at Matt. 16:20 (see commentary at Matt. 16:20c). It is certainly a sobering thought to consider, that at Matt. 16:18, Bible versions such as e.g., the neo-Alexandrians’ Moffatt Bible, New English Bible, Revised English Bible, or New International Bible; and Roman Catholic Bibles such as the old Latin Papists’ Douay-Rheims Version or the new neo-Alexandrian Papists’ Jerusalem Bible or New Jerusalem Bible, all *contain what on the authority of I John 2:22 is the very teaching of “Antichrist” himself*. For they all deny “that Jesus is the Christ” (I John 2:22), with respect to that element of his Messianic role prophetically foretold in Ps. 118:21, and clearly taught in the wider context of St. Matthew’s Gospel at Matt. 21:42, namely, that the church is built on “the stone” (Matt. 21:42) or “the rock” (Matt. 16:18) of “the Christ” (Matt. 16:16,20).

Thus Matt. 16:18 is decontextualized by those claiming it means that Peter, rather Christ, is “the rock.” In the OT, we read of how King David was aware that “Rizpah ... took sackcloth, and spread it” “upon” a “rock” (II Sam. 21:10,11), and he then later declared, “The Lord is my rock” (I Sam. 22:2), and “who is a rock, save our Lord?” (II Sam. 22:32). It would be *a radical contextual distortion* of I Sam. 22:32, “who is a rock, save our Lord?” (II Sam. 22:32), to first claim that “David here acknowledges only one rock, the ‘Lord,’” and then to say, “that because ‘it was told David what Rizpah ... had done,’ when she ‘took sackcloth, and spread it ... upon the rock’ (II Sam. 21:10,11), it

⁷⁰ Broderick, R.C., *The [Roman] Catholic Concise Encyclopedia*, Simon & Schuster, New York, USA, 1957; Imprimatur: Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, 1956, p. 184, “Holy Father.”

follows that the only ‘rock’ of II Sam. 22:32 is ‘the rock’ of II Sam. 21:10, and so David here teaches we should worship rocks.” Not only would this be a *contextual misinterpretation* of II Sam. 22:32, it would clearly be contrary to other Scriptures, which in the Second Commandment (Exod. 20:4-6) prohibit all forms of idolatry, including the worship of rocks. Thus the type of thing claimed at Matt. 16:18 by e.g., the NIV, though on one level of the Greek is a technically “correct” possible *prima facie* meaning, is likewise in the wider context of Matt. 16:13-20 an *inaccurate* and so misleading meaning of the Greek, *petros*.

Therefore Christ, (or the Holy Ghost in the Greek translation of Matt. 16:18 if what Christ said was originally in Aramaic,) here uses the *petr* of “*Petros* (‘Peter,’ masculine)” and “*petra* (‘rock,’ feminine)” as a stylistic literary device, which with different gendering means the alliteration indicates opposites. It is something like saying, “*Peter* and *the rock* are like *chalk* and *cheese*.” The phrase “chalk’n’cheese” deliberately uses alliteration, but what fool would thereby suggest that “chalk” and “cheese” are not really antonyms, but synonyms? To be perfectly blunt, I think those who agree with e.g., the neo-Alexandrians’ Moffatt Bible, or New International Bible, or New English Bible, or Revised English Bible, or Jerusalem Bible, or New Jerusalem Bible at Matt. 16:18, are every bit as ridiculous as someone who tries to claim of Christ’s Aramaic words, “Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? That is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” (Matt. 27:46), that because Christ used “Eli (My God),” that therefore “this man calleth for *Elias*” or “*Elijah*” (Matt. 27:47).

The reality is, that those “of them that stood there” near the cross, who “when they heard” Christ say, “Eli (My God), Eli (My God),” then thought, “this man calleth for Elias” (Matt. 27:46,47), did so because of their preconceived notions about what Christ might say. So too, those who find in Matt. 16:18 the claim that “Peter” is “the rock,” do so because of their preconceived notions, rather than the *contextual* Greek of Matt. 16:18. Moreover, we can rest secure in the teaching of Matt. 4:6,7 (citing Ps. 91:11,12), that “the church” or any of its members, should not “so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another” (Article 20, Anglican *39 Articles*). The Word of God is clear that Christ is the foundation “stone” upon which the church is built (Matt. 21:42; citing Ps. 118:22). For as Martin Luther so rightly pointed out at the Papist-Protestant debate at the time of the *Leipzig Disputation* (1519), greater than what any man might claim, whether e.g., a neo-Alexandrian Bible translator or a Roman Pontiff, are the words of Holy Scripture in I Cor. 3:11, “other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.”

Thus the claims of the Roman Pontiffs, and neo-Alexandrian versions such as e.g., the Moffatt Bible or Revised English Bible, that the Apostle Peter, not Christ, is the rock upon which the church is built, is actually a serious attack upon orthodox Christianity. As Luther notes, the first part of Article 10 of the *Apostles’ Creed* says, “I believe in ... the holy catholic (universal) church.” The apostolic teaching is that “there is one body” (Eph. 4:4), not many “bodies.” If it were otherwise, the monogamous imagery of Christ as “the husband” of “the church” as his “wife” (Eph. 5:23-25), would have to be made polygamous. But Scripture teaches that the Christian monogamy of

“Christ and the church” (Eph. 5:32), is an example to Christians to be monogamous in marriage (Eph. 5:22-33). Thus on the one hand, there is a mystical or invisible singular *universal or catholic church*, “the church of the firstborn” (Heb. 12:23), so that Christ says, “I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church” - NOT “churches” - “will I sing praise unto thee” (Heb. 2:12). But on the other hand, this is not an organic unity of earthly temporal structure, and so at the local level one can talk about multiple “churches” e.g., “the churches of Asia” (I Cor. 16:19), or “the churches of Galatia” (Gal. 1:2), or in terms of ethnic and racial segregation, e.g., churches of “Hebrews” (Epistle to the Hebrews) and “the churches of the Gentiles” (Rom. 16:4).

Luther rightly makes the point, that only God himself i.e., in Matt. 16:18 God the Son, could be “the rock” of such a “holy catholic (universal) church.” No mere man, such as St. Peter, could ever hope to sustain it. That in fact to purport otherwise is to wickedly claim a Divine Attribute for Peter as some kind of “Pope” figure, is further evident from various Scriptures. E.g., we read in Ps. 92:15, “the Lord (Jehovah) ... is my rock.”

This misuse of Matt. 16:18 by the Roman Church to first claim a Divine Attribute for Peter; is connected to concomitant claims of Divine Attributes for the Popes. It is further connected to the claim of a Divine Attribute for Peter and the Popes to forgive sins. For the Jews were certainly correct to ask, “Who can forgive sins, but God alone” (Luke 5:21), even though they failed to recognize that Christ could do so, because he was, and is, God. Hence in the *Lord’s Prayer*, Christ teaches us to pray to God “Our Father,” “forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors” (Matt. 6:9,12), or as he said when giving a form of the *Lord’s Prayer* on another occasion, “Our Father, ... forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us” (Luke 11:2,4). The words of Matt. 16:18, “I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind in earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven,” do not mean that either Peter or the Popes can forgive sins. Rather, “the keys of the kingdom of heaven” that Christ gave to St. Peter, are found in the Gospel (Matt. 28:18-20). These words about binding and loosing, are like the words of John 20:23, “Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained” (John 20:23).

They mean that when the gospel is preached and proclaimed, one can authoritatively say, “He that believeth ... shall be saved” (Mark 16:16) i.e., *his sins are forgiven on authority of Scripture*; “but he that believeth not shall be damned” (Mark 16:16) i.e., *on authority of Scripture his sins are retained*. This is a *declaration and pronouncement* of what God in Christ has done, based on the authority of Scripture. A Gospel Minister thus has Biblical authority “to *declare and pronounce* to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins.” He can declare that “God ... pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel.” He can exhort them, “Wherefore let us beseech him to grant us true repentance, and his holy Spirit, that those things may please him, which we do at this present; and that the rest of our life hereafter may be pure, and holy; so that at the last we may come to his eternal joy, through Jesus Christ our Lord” (The Absolution, or

Remission of sins, to be pronounced by the Minister, *Matins & Evensong*, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662).

So likewise, if the humblest Christian shares the gospel message with some poor sinner, he too may authoritatively *declare* and *pronounce* that *on the authority of Scripture*, if a man truly repents and believes the Gospel, his sins are forgiven. For “hear what comfortable words our Saviour Christ saith unto all that truly turn to him. ‘Come unto me all that travail and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you.’ St. Matthew 11:28. ‘So God loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, to the end that all that believe in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.’ St. John 3:16. Hear also what Saint Paul saith. ‘This is a true saying, and worthy of all men to be received, That Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.’ I Timothy 1:15. Hear also what Saint John saith. ‘If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins.’ I St. John 2:1” (The Communion Service, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662).

The proposition that a mere man, whether the Pope or a Popish priest (in the confessional), has the power to forgive sins, attacks the gospel of justification by faith. “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast” (Eph. 2:8,9). It is God, through Christ, who forgives us our sins, on the basis of what Christ did in his vicarious substitutional atonement on the cross of Calvary. Therefore the claim that Peter or the Popes can “forgive sins,” or the Pope “holds the keys to the kingdom of heaven,” is an attack on the Biblical teaching of salvation by God’s *grace alone* accepted through *faith alone*. “*Grace*” is the *unmerited favour of God*. If we are “saved” “by grace” (Eph. 2:8), we cannot be saved on the basis of what some Pope says. In the Roman Catholic claim connected with their misinterpretation of Matt. 16:18, that the Pope is “the vicar of Christ” with a “universal” jurisdiction in the church, and “the successor of the Apostle Peter,” there is a further attack on the authority of Scripture, for in the place of *Scripture alone* we find the purported “authority” of the Pope (to which the Papists also add various councils and “visions” / “miracles” of their “Saints”).

Therefore, to falsely claim, as the Roman Church does, that Matt. 16:19 bestows a further Divine Attribute on Peter and the Popes, namely, the capacity to forgive sins, is an attack on the Biblical teaching referred to in Article 11 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, “I believe in ... the forgiveness of sins;” and also an attack on the Biblical truths summarized in the Reformation Motto, “*sola fide* (Latin, faith alone), *sola gratia* (grace alone), *sola Scriptura* (Scripture alone).” In the claim of the Roman Church that the Divine Attribute of being the “rock” on which the church is built belongs to Peter, and the further claim that the Popes as his “successors” have power to forgive sins and grant or bar people admission to heaven, we see that the Popes of Rome claim multiple Divine Attributes for the Roman Papacy. They claim to be vice-Gods, exercising all the powers of God himself. And so, in this sense of being a vice-God, we find that with regard to Matt. 16:18,19, the Roman Pope “as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4).

Good Christian reader, *this is very serious indeed!* As Martin Luther rightly pointed out, the “church” of Matt. 16:18 is none other than “the holy catholic church” of the *Apostles’ Creed*, and therefore to be the “rock” of this church requires the supernatural powers of no-one less than God himself. Thus on general principles the “rock” must be Christ, as further shown by both immediate context in Matt. 16:13-20 and also other Scriptures. *The claim that Peter is the “rock” upon which the church is built, and that Peter and / or the Popes have power to forgive sins and admit or bar people entry to heaven, strikes like a dagger at Biblical truths both protected in Articles 10 & 11 of the Apostles’ Creed, and also the Reformation Motto: sola fide, sola gratia, sola Scriptura!*

We should remember that the Protestant Reformation was at its heart the *Christian Reformation*. It was *Christ centred, Christ focused, Christ glorifying*. It is the “*solo Christo* (Christ alone)” of the Reformation (e.g., Philp.3:8,9; I Tim. 2:5), when the threefold *Reformation Motto* is stated in elucidation in the fivefold form: “*sola fide* (faith alone), *sola gratia* (grace alone), *sola Scriptura* (Scripture alone), *solo Christo* (Christ alone), *Soli Deo Gloria* (Glory to God Alone).” In the *Ten Commandments*, the Eighth Commandment is, “Thou shalt not steal” (Exod. 20:15; Matt. 19:18; Rom. 13:9). But “thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal?” (Rom. 2:21). Wouldst thou stand idly by if thy mother, or brother, or friend, was being robbed? Yet at the time of the Reformation, it was recognized that Christ’s glory is being stolen from by the Roman Church. It was recognized that *all the Christian needs is Christ*.

Christ is our redeemer (Gal. 3:11-13; 4:4,5; I Tim. 2:6), so there can be no such thing as the Romanists’ “Mary co-redeemer.” Christ is our mediator (I Tim. 2:5; Heb. 12:24) at the right hand of God the Father (Heb. 10:12; 12:2), so there can be no such thing as the Papists’ “Mary co-mediator” or other mediatory “Saints.” Christ is our righteousness (Rom. 4:3; 10:4; Gal. 2:21; Philp. 3:8,9), so there can be no such thing as the Roman Church’s justification by works in its many forms (Gal. 3:11). Christ holds the keys of heaven (Rev. 3:17) and hell (Rev. 1:18), so there can be no such thing as Peter or the Popes holding such keys. And Christ is the rock (Matt. 16:18; I Cor. 3:11; 10:4 cf. Deut. 32:3,4,15,18,30), so there can be no such thing as Peter being “the rock” of the church. “But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord” (I Cor. 1:30,31). We have it all, “in” (e.g., II Cor. 1:21; 3:14) and “through” (e.g., II Cor. 3:4) Christ. *All you need is Christ; Good Christian brethren, Christ is all you need.*

The false claims about Peter being “the rock” and Peter or the Popes being able to forgive sins, is thus one element of a move away from a Biblical focus on Christ. It requires that Divine Attributes be ascribed to fallen sinful men, whether Peter or the Popes. It is a deification of man (Gen. 3:5), and thus violates the First Commandment of the Holy Decalogue, “I am the Lord thy God.” “Thou shalt have no other gods before me” (Exod. 20:2,3). It robs Christ of his proper glory, and thus violates the Eighth Commandment, “Thou shalt not steal” (Exod. 20:15). It is a radical violation of “the apostles’ doctrine” (Acts 2:42) set forth for us in Holy Scripture.

Is this error that Peter, not Christ, is the rock, so serious as to constitute heresy? I concur with the traditional Anglican definition of “heresy,” as defined in Ecclesiastical Law, as “An ecclesiastical offence, consisting in the holding of a false opinion repugnant to some point of doctrine essential to the Christian faith⁷¹”. I thus distinguish between various *errors*, and *heresies*.

Examples of errors which a person may hold while I still embrace them as brethren in Christ include, for instance, the Baptist belief that babies should not be baptized; or the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* belief that those who use public transport as an essential service on Sundays, including fellow Reformed Protestants visiting their church when the Lord’s Supper is administered, should be barred from receiving Communion on the basis that they are “sabbath-breakers” – which I regard to be a most serious error of overly strict Puritan Sabbatarianism, for “The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath” (Mark 2:27); and our Lord exhibited righteous “anger” at such overly strict Sabbatarianism (Mark 3:2,5). So too, while I agree that apostles and prophets ceased around the close of the New Testament (Luke 11:49-51; Eph. 2:20), I entirely repudiate the erroneous FPCS claim found in “The Form of Presbyterial Church-Government” (1645)⁷² that so did “evangelists” (Eph. 4:11), found in their claim, “apostles, evangelists, and prophets ... are ceased.” Indeed, as an Evangelical Protestant I strongly support e.g., the *Great Protestant Missionary Movement* that started in the late 18th and early 19th century. While the fact that the FPCS engaged in southern African missionary work in Rhodesia / Zimbabwe indicates they have managed to side-step elements of this “evangelists ... are ceased” nonsense by including their work under “pastors, [and] teachers” which they rightly say have continued⁷³, I think calling such persons something like “missionary teachers” but NEVER “evangelists,” is an error. I would not wish to be in this silly position of denying the ongoing need and validity of “evangelists” (Eph. 4:11) as either a joint office with the office of a pastor, or as a separate office God may call a man to in the first place. E.g., numerous missionaries on the Mission Field have been such evangelists, for instance, Captain Allen Gardiner (d. 1851) of the Royal Navy, who as part of the *Great Protestant Missionary Movement* established the first Protestant Mission in South America in 1844.

But in contrast to *errors*, *heresies* deny some fundamental teaching of the Christian faith. E.g., if any Presbyterians were to interpret “The Form of Presbyterial Church-Government” (1645) claim of the 1640s Puritans that, “apostles, evangelists, and prophets ... are ceased,” so as to mean that they considered there should be no more

⁷¹ *Osborn’s Concise Law Dictionary*, 1927, 6th ed. by John Burke, Sweet & Maxwell, London, UK, 1976.

⁷² *Westminster Confession of Faith*, With a Foreword by Alexander McPherson, Free Presbyterian Publications, Bell & Bain Ltd., Glasgow, Scotland, UK, pp. 395-416 at p. 398.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

evangelism *per se*, then I would see this as so fundamentally at variance with the need for evangelistic work till the end of time (Matt. 24:14; Mark 13:10) as commanded by Christ in the Great Commission (Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:15,16), that I would consider such persons to be in *heresy*. Or heresy is found in e.g., the Arian heretic's denial of Christ's Divinity. Thus while I disagree with the errors of the Baptists or Free Presbyterians, *supra*, and find e.g., the Free Presbyterian imposition of a strict Puritan Sabbath on Communicants including non-Free Presbyterian visitors to their churches to be an unnecessary and undesirable division within the body of Christ; nevertheless, I still embrace such Baptists and Free Presbyterians as my brethren in Christ, since I do not think that their *errors* are so bad as to deny the fundamental teaching of the Christian faith⁷⁴. And in fairness to e.g., those in the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*, it must be said that most Protestants have gone too far the other way and are far too lax with regard to keeping Sunday as a Sabbath (e.g., Exod. 20:8-11; John 20:1,19,26; Acts 20:7).

I am not opposed to, indeed I endorse, the denouncing of heresy. But I think we should only use the term "heresy" with great reserve, if the error is of such a type and kind as to be repugnant to an essential element of Christianity. Thus we should look to broad standards of teaching such as e.g., the three creeds, the Reformation Motto, the

⁷⁴ 2015 update: see my work, *Creation, Not Macroevolution – Mind the Gap* (2014), Vol. 1, Part 1, Chapter 7, section c, subsection iii, subdivision D, heading, "Is it possible to get Hugh Ross's Day-Age School out of its hot-bed of heresy?," subheading: Point 1 Illustration. From "Indeed, up until the events of 2012 and 2013, this is broadly how I did understand FPCS" to "FPCS has recently released a new 'Catechism' (2013) that among other things glorifies the *Solemn League & Covenant* in Appendix 3, which it says calls for 'the extirpation of ... Prelacy' i.e., Anglicanism, describes as 'fiendish' the fact 'King Charles II' 'in 1661' did 'cause' this document 'to be burnt by the hand of the' 'hangman' (Rom. 13:4), and criticizes 'the infamous Recissory Act' 'of King Charles' II 'by which' things the Puritan 'Church had done' 'in the interval between 1638 and the Restoration, had been stigmatised as treasonable and rebellious.' If this glorification of the *Solemn League & Covenant* calling for 'the extirpation' of Anglicanism is not an example of 'heresies' that are 'divisions' or schisms (I Cor. 11:18,19), then what I ask is?" (citing McGrath, G. {myself}, "Heresies," *English Churchman* 23 & 30 Aug. 2013 {EC 7878}, p. 2). Thus I have now come to the realization that in fact the FPCS is in schismatic heresy, a fact therefore leading me to a reassessment of the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* (FPCS) which is more critical of them as promoting "damnable heresies" (II Peter 2:1). And when I now give matured consideration to the fact that their overly strict Sabbatarian views would exclude from their Communion Table e.g., the anti-Sabbatarians, Martin Luther, John Calvin, and Thomas Cranmer, as well as Anglican Sabbatarians such as e.g., Anglican monarchs who were Supreme Governors of the Established Anglican Church from the 16th to 18th centuries, I have now come to the conclusion that the FPCS denial of visitors Communion who use Sunday public transport is also a schismatic heresy (I Cor, 11:18,19) which is contrary to the spirit of NT Sabbath teaching (Mark 2:27; Col. 2:16).

Lord's Prayer, or Ten Commandments to define such matters. Thus the type of Protestant teaching commonly found in the major Reformation Confessions, Catechisms, and common practices of the Reformation Churches⁷⁵, is the type of thing we should be isolating for the purposes of denouncing "a heretic"⁷⁶.

Hence only where such proceedings involve doctrinal matters such as those found in e.g., the three creeds (*Apostles'*, *Athanasian*, and *Nicene*), or Reformation Motto (*grace alone, faith alone, Scripture alone*), would I be prepared to say that the person in question was either being accused of, or defending himself, with respect to "heresy." E.g., a Roman Catholic priest who came to realize that invocation of saints is wrong, and was put on trial for his beliefs, would be clearly in a heresy trial *defending himself against Roman Catholic heresy*, since the *Lord's Prayer* teaches that we pray only to God; and the Reformation Motto requires belief in *Christ alone* as our mediator and redeemer. Or an apostate Protestant Minister who denied e.g., the virgin birth of Christ, bodily resurrection of Christ, or literal Second Coming of Christ, could be fairly described as a "heretic," since he would thereby violate the doctrine of the three creeds e.g., Articles 3, 4, 5, & 8 of the *Apostles' Creed*⁷⁷.

⁷⁵ By "common practices" I mean e.g., the fact that notwithstanding diverse views on church governments, all agreed on the clear Biblical principle that the clergy should be patriarchal, and so only adult males should be the Minister e.g., the pastor (Lutheran, cf. Eph. 4:11), priest (Anglican, cf. Rom. 15:16), or presbyter (Presbyterians, cf. Titus 1:5). Thus I would consider the ordination of women to such positions contrary to the clear teaching of Scripture (e.g., I Tim. 2:8-3:13), and an example of both "heresy" (Gal. 5:20) and "lust" / "covetousness" forbidden by the 10th commandment (Rom. 7:7; 13:9; I Cor. 6:10).

⁷⁶ While I support a broad Reformation Protestant spirit in defining "heresy," I simultaneously think individual Protestant churches must remain free, if they so wish, to impose narrower doctrinal standards with what they regard as either "error" or simply their own sectarian "house rules" on ministers and other office bearers inside their own church. E.g., Reformed Anglican Churches must remain free to ensure that their Ministers administer infant baptism, whereas Baptist churches must remain free to ensure that their Ministers do not. But while I think such churches may fairly defrock their respective Ministers for such "error" or non-compliance with their church's "house rules," I would not consider that such issues were in the realm of "heresy," and hence I would strongly oppose such a person being denounced as a "heretic" for holding to views inside of religiously conservative broad Protestantism, as found in the major Confessions and Catechisms of the Reformation.

⁷⁷ There would still be some matters that I would consider to be serious enough *errors*, for me not to take Communion at a particular church for. E.g., where a church did not forbid marriage of a man to his deceased brother's wife, and I was aware of, or worried that, such a union did or may exist at that church among the communicants. In such an instance, while I could accept that they held this view as an error, nevertheless, I would regard myself as under the direct command of God not to take Communion with them, "But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a

Now we cannot doubt that all the major Confessions of the Reformation rejected absolutely the claims of the Roman Pope to hold a universal jurisdiction, indeed, the Confessions of the Lutherans, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists, all denounce the Pope as the Antichrist⁷⁸. The issue of Papal jurisdiction which was foundational to the establishment of the Roman Papacy in 607 A.D., was extremely important to Protestants, as reflected in e.g., Article 37 of the *Church of England's* 39 Articles, which declares, "... The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England ... ;" or the Presbyterian's *Westminster Confession* 25:6, which says, "There is no other head of the Church, but the Lord Jesus Christ (Col. 1:18; Eph. 1:22); nor can the Pope of Rome, in any sense, be head thereof" Thus the Papal claims that Peter, not Christ was the rock on which the church was built, and concomitant follow up claim that the Popes are then the successors to Peter, clearly violates broad Protestant teaching.

Indeed, I consider the Romish view that Peter, not Christ, is the "rock," meets the criteria necessary for it to be denounced as *heresy*. That is because it attacks the teaching of the *Apostles' Creed* of "the holy Catholick Church" or the teaching of the *Nicene Creed* of "one Catholick ... Church" (Acts 9:31; Eph. 4:4; 5:23); for it strikes like a dagger at the issue of *Christ's authority* as head of the church universal and our knowledge of this through the infallible Bible. It ascribes Divine attributes to a mere mortal. In the first place, it transfers universal church authority from Christ to Peter; and in the second place it transfers universal church authority, *as is further claimed*, from Peter to "the Popes" (even though the Roman Papacy was not in fact formed till 607 A.D.). In transferring such a position as rock of the church from Christ to man, whether Peter (some apostate Protestants), or both Peter and the Popes (Roman Catholicism), it thus creates a category of thought in men's minds, whereby they look to a human rather than Divine source of authority (cf. Gen. 3:5). In the final analysis, it is thus in antithesis to the Reformation teaching of *sola Scriptura* (Scripture alone), for contrary to e.g., Matt. 4:4; II Tim. 3:16, its sets up either Peter, or Peter and the Popes and through them the Roman Church, as the "infallible" teaching guides, rather than the Bible. For even in NT times, while God spoke through St. Peter, he did not do so the exclusion of other NT prophets e.g., the Apostle Paul. Thus e.g., St. Paul says as a proof of his own apostleship, "But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed" (Gal. 2:11).

Let the good Christian reader be in no doubt about this fact. That if in the first instance, like the NEB, REB, NIV, or Moffatt Bible, one establishes in people's minds

brother be a fornicator, ... with such an one no not to eat" (I Cor. 5:11).

⁷⁸ Lutheran *Formulae of Concord* (Epitome 3, upholding Luther's *Smalcald Articles* which at 4:9-11 declare the Pope to be the Antichrist); Article 35, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* (which in Homilies 5 & 10, Book 1, and Homilies 16 & 21, Book 2, declare the Pope to be the Antichrist); Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 25:6; Congregational *Savoy Declaration* 26:4; Baptist *London / Baptist / Philadelphia Confession* 26:4.

the idea that *in the NT Church there was some kind of “universal bishop” in Peter on the basis of Matt. 16:18*, then in the longer run, *it becomes logical to look for such a continuing “universal bishop” after NT times*. After all, if the NT Church with apostles and prophets was in need of a “universal bishop,” how much more is the post NT Church which lacks such gifts in need of such a “universal bishop”? *And once people then start to think in these terms, the only historically credible claimant to be such a “universal bishop” is the Bishop of Rome*.

Thus we see the seeds of the heresy first sown that Peter is established as some kind of “universal bishop” by virtue of being “the rock” of Matt. 16:18, ultimately leads to Popery, *even if in the interim there are shallow minded apostate Protestants who think that can stay at the first stage, i.e., only “Pope Peter,” and not eventually go to the second stage i.e., “the Popes of Rome are the only credible successors.”* If any doubt the seriousness of this heresy, then they would do well to consider how even now, apostate Protestants are hankering for such a return to Popery. Consider the Anglican and Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) document, *The Gift of Authority* (1998)⁷⁹. Among other things, this ARCIC Report says, “a universal primate will exercise leadership in the world and also in both [Anglican and Roman Catholic] Communion, addressing them in a prophetic way” (s. 61). “An experience of universal primacy ... would confirm two particular conclusions we have reached: [1] that Anglicans be open to and desire a recovery and re-reception ... of the exercise of universal primacy by the Bishop of Rome; [2] that Roman Catholics be open to and desire a re-reception of the exercise of primacy by the Bishop of Rome and the offering of such a ministry to the whole Church of God” (s. 62).

In the final analysis this ARCIC Report failed for three reasons. Firstly, those apostate Anglicans wanting this primacy, wanted the Bishop of Rome to have the type of titular primacy that Justinian gave to the Bishop of Rome, (but only as an emperor’s “honour” in a letter with no legal force,) from 533 till his death in 565, but which was not thereafter renewed; whereas Roman Catholics wanted the Bishop of Rome to have the type of governing primacy that Phocas gave to the Bishop of Rome, with legal force, in 607 A.D. . Of course, had the Papists accepted the first type, they might have then used it to try and develop the second type. Secondly, the Anglican Communion of Churches (and not all Anglican Churches are even in the Anglican Communion,) is essentially a confederal body, and even with e.g., the Anglican Church of Australia, the different Dioceses are essentially confederal. This means such an agreement would require the consent of a multitude of essentially autonomous Dioceses, and this type of consent was not forthcoming. Thirdly, various Anglicans quite rightly rejected outright the ARCIC propositions that the Pope should have any primacy over them. E.g., it was roundly rejected by the Evangelical *Diocese of Sydney* in Australia.

⁷⁹ ARCIC, with Co-Chairmen, Cormac Murphy-O’Connor & Mark Santer, *The Gift of Authority* (Authority in the Church III), 1998, The Anglican Communion Documents, Published jointly by the Anglican Book Centre & [Roman] Catholic Truth Society (ISBN 1-551226-246-0), 1998.

Nevertheless, the very existence of such a group of Anglicans as those represented by the ARCIC recommendations, *supra*, shows that we should not take lightly the heresy of translations like the NEB, REB, and NIV, that Peter, not Christ, is the rock on which the church is built in Matt. 16:18. For any who have spiritual discernment, the spiritual dangers posed to the truth of God recovered at the time of the Protestant Reformation are clear enough to see. We must not allow this type of first stage idea of a “Pope Peter” to get into our churches, for once it does, the Devil can then use it to develop the second stage idea of, “Why did the NT Church need a Pope, but not the post NT Church?”

Let us therefore not be complacent about the false and spurious claims of these neo-Alexandrian versions such as e.g., the Moffatt Bible, or New English Bible, or Revised English Bible, or New International Version, all of which reintroduce the old Romish HERESY that in Matt. 16:18, Peter, not Christ, is the “rock.” Let us stand where the Scriptures stand. Let us proclaim, as Luther proclaimed, without apology and without a doubt, that Christ is the rock upon which the church is built! For “other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ” (I Cor. 3:11)!!!

Defence of Evangelical Protestant truth.

- a) *The danger of “ecumenical” tolerance to Roman Catholics.*
- b) *The NT teaching that apostles, prophets, and tongues end c. 100-110 A.D., but that devil-possession and exorcists continue till Christ’s return.*
- c) *A Case Study on Bob Larson Ministries, USA.*

a) *The danger of “ecumenical” tolerance to Roman Catholics.*

I refer the reader to my section in Textual Commentaries Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) in the Preface entitled, *“I’m an Evangelical – I hope you are too!”* One element of the Gospel of justification by faith is its defence against those who deny it. This is seen in e.g., the Apostle Paul’s *Epistle to the Galatians*. Here St. Paul says, “a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified” (Gal. 2:16); and, “But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall by faith” (Gal. 3:11). But more than this, in defence of the gospel St. Paul specifically refers to those inside the church who have been “removed from” this “gospel” of “grace,” and the work of salvation wrought by “Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins” (Gal. 1:3,4,6); saying, “though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.”

This makes the point that *one element of being a true Evangelical involves the*

defence of the gospel against heretics who put in its place a false gospel. In this context we see the dangers of those who call themselves “Evangelical” or “religiously conservative Protestant,” but who then dabble in the ecumenical compromise with those who deny this gospel. Evangelicals divide between those who remain inside largely apostate Protestant churches in the hope that they may yet be reclaimed and / or to give a gospel witness to those in them, in contrast to those who consider one must leave such churches. Both groups have historically existed, and both groups believe in some level of religious separation from the apostasy, and some level of autonomy from it for their local church, whether e.g., Low Church Evangelical Anglicans in the *Church of England* inside a now largely apostate *Church of England* who are seeking to proclaim the Gospel, or e.g., Low Church Evangelical Anglicans in the *Church of England (Continuing)* who have left the now generally apostate *Church of England*.

And I also note that churches that have so separated, e.g., the *Church of England (Continuing)* or *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* or *Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia*, can then in turn develop other theological problems that may be absent from, or very largely absent from, the apostate churches they left. There is a tendency that must be guarded against for such churches to OVER-REACT to the apostasy⁸⁰. E.g., I spoke some years ago to an independent Baptist Church Minister who was part of a particular type of independent Baptist Church which greatly stress organic separation,

⁸⁰ E.g., the *Church of England (Continuing)* left the *Church of England* over the issue of the ordination of women priests, although this was just one of a raft of concerns they had about the C. of E. departing from the Low Church Evangelical tradition from the 19th century on. But I know of a *Church of England (Continuing)* Minister who in reacting against the C of E’s apostasy has imbibed of anti-Anglican Puritan concepts, and is a semi-Puritan e.g., contrary to The Preface of the BCP he looks with favour on the Puritan revolutionaries of the Interregnum, so that he thus disregards, and is not disciplined for, setting aside the warnings of Scripture that those in “seditions” and “murders” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:20,21), and we are to “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17). Or the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* (FPCS) denies Communion to fellow Protestant visitors to their churches if they do not keep a Puritan Sabbath involving the non-usage of public transport on Sundays, even though historically Anglicans allowed a limited Sunday public transport system to operate in London from the 16th century on (Mark 2:27). The FPCS would deny Communion to e.g., Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, and William of Orange. Or in Australia, the *Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia* (PRC) left the *Presbyterian Church of Australia* (PCA) for a combination of reasons, including both a desire to separate from religious liberalism and apostasy, as well as a commitment to enact some further “reforms” to the Westminster Confession. But whereas historic Presbyterianism has recognized the validity of Anglican baptisms, under the PRC’s revised *Westminster Confession* 28:2, baptisms using *the sign of the cross* are said to be invalid, since it is claimed “whosoever presumes in baptism to use” “crossing,” “causes it to be no sacrament.” The PRC view would also mean that e.g., Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer who received Roman Catholic baptisms would have “died unbaptized,” something historic Presbyterianism has never claimed.

and then goes on to deny the first part of Article 10 of the *Apostles' Creed*, "I believe in ... the holy catholic church," by claiming the local church in which one enjoys the second part of Article 10 of the *Apostles' Creed*, "the communion (fellowship) of saints (believers)," is "the only church." In denying that there is a universal church that is "*kath'* (throughout) *oles* ('all,' from '*olos / holos*') i.e., inclusive of both Jews of "Judea and Galilee" and also Gentiles of "Samaria" spread out geographically in various local "churches" (Acts 9:31) i.e., catholic (Greek *katholikos* = *katholou* = *kath'* + '*olos*) or universal to Jews and Gentiles in different geographical locations; and that this catholic church forms "one" mystical "body" (Eph. 4:4), and Christ is the "head of the church" which is this "body" (Eph. 5:23); they put themselves in most serious heresy. For Christ is not polygamously married to *many catholic churches*, but monogamously married to *one catholic church*, so the "two shall be one." "This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church" (Eph. 5:31,32; cf. Heb. 2:12; 3:6). Wherefore the *Apostles' Creed* says, "I believe in ... the holy catholic church," and the *Nicene Creed* says, "I believe in ... one Catholick and Apostolick Church" (Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*). To deny this, or any other part of the *Apostles' Creed* or *Nicene Creed*, is to peddle "damnable heresies" (II Peter 2:1).

I also note that the option of a complete church structure separation is a much easier operation for those in a church tradition with independent *local* church government such as e.g., Congregationalists, than it is e.g., for Anglicans or Presbyterians⁸¹. Hence such an option of church structure separation may be more appealing and more readily obtainable with e.g., Baptists who have a pre-existing church tradition of independent *local* church government, than it is e.g., for Lutherans and Anglicans. The issue of whether one "stays and fights" inside e.g., an apostate *Church of England*, or organically separates, is a matter I "judge not" a man on (Matt. 7:1). But I do judge men in accordance with Biblical standards on the need for a suitable level of separation from the apostasy in the purity of their local church, and appropriate defence of "The just shall by faith" (Gal. 3:11) including proclamation of the Gospel message, "if any man preach any

⁸¹ Consider e.g., the Presbyterian's *Westminster Confession* (WC) chapter 31, "Of Synods and Councils," with respect to the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* (FPCS). On the one hand, the WC calls for a church government of "synods or councils" (31:1) which is national in character with regard to "the commonwealth" in which they are located (31:5). And reference is made in the FPCS "The Form of Presbyterial Church-Government" (1645) under "Of Syndocial Assemblies," to "national assemblies, for the government of the church." But in Australia there are only two FPCS churches (both in NSW, Grafton & Sydney), and over some decades only one of them has usually had a Minister. Thus to create such "national" "synods and councils" in "the commonwealth" would be impossible; a problem found more widely as the FPCS also has only small numbers of churches in other countries. Hence they have established international "synods and councils" in Scotland, to which e.g., elders from the Sydney FPCS travel to. But of course, these type of difficulties and problems simply do not exist for those with independent *local* church government, who find it much easier to call for a complete church structure separation.

other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.”

In this context I note that the BCP Calendar isolates a small number of the better figures of historical significance to the *Church of England* from the sixth to eighth centuries in Western Europe, and up till the thirteenth century in England, during times when in many ways “the lights were dim” inside the formally established church⁸². In this sense they resemble our Lord or the early Christian who were in the apostate Jewish Church in the earlier chapters of the Book of Acts, till in Acts 7 St. Stephen was killed for his Christian faith by those in the Jewish Church, after which from Acts 8 onwards the Christians separated to form their own independent Christian Church. Those who apply this type of thinking in a contemporary Anglican context may maintain a Low Church Evangelical Anglican Church in a wider apostate Anglican Diocese unless, or until, they are literally closed down. E.g., the Biblical Gospel as recovered at the time of the Reformation and found in the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* services and 39 Articles, is so hated by a number of Anglican Dioceses in Australia that they are completely closed to Low Church Evangelical Anglican clergymen whom they despise and hate for their proclamation of the gospel; (although any such persons who engage in the very unAnglican semi-Puritan type services increasingly found in the Diocese of Sydney over the last 30 or so years, may in my opinion be fairly excluded from a Diocese on the basis that they simply are *not Anglican*, indeed, I think they should be ejected from Diocese of Sydney Churches⁸³;) and so in these instances, Evangelical Anglicans who move into the area find it necessary to locate non-Anglican Evangelical Churches they can attend. Or inside the Diocese of Sydney, there are still a small number of Low Church Evangelical Churches that have certain of their services from the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* Services (although it is sadly an increasingly difficult thing to locate suchlike).

This Anglican hagiology of the 1662 BCP Calendar stops at points where those who proclaimed the gospel came to be in some way closed down in the Roman Church, for instance, “excommunicated” from the Roman Church, or subject to execution as heretics, i.e., the type of thing that occurred from the time of the “Holy” Roman Empire

⁸² The BCP Calendar has ten broad divisions; see divisions 6 & 7, and parts of 9 for these eras in: Textual Commentaries Vol. 1 (Mat. 1-14), Preface, “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section “*f) King Charles the First’s Day: with Dedication of Volume 1 in 2008.”

⁸³ See Textual Commentaries Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25), “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section, “2) The nexus between Charles I’s Day and Charles II’s Day,” subsection, “c) Traditional Diocese of Sydney Low Church Evangelicalism, NOT Puritan and semi-Puritan trends from 1970s.” Having said this, I also think that the Puseyites and semi-Puseyites should have been ejected from the outset when they originated in the 19th century, on the basis that these semi-Romanists clearly do not believe in the Protestant theology of Cranmer’s prayer book as set forth in 1662, nor the 39 Articles in their *plain, literal, and grammatical sense*. The failure to take such immediate and decisive action in the 19th century, has resulted in much spiritual and moral damage to the Anglican Church which in broad general terms is now “sick” and “faint” (Isa. 1:5).

on the European Continent, or in England with the establishment of the Roman Inquisition following John Wycliffe's time. Thus such enforcement of Rome's errors from the later 8th or earlier 9th centuries on the Continent meant there was a need for the independence of true Christians from the Roman Church, as found in the Waldenses who kept a purer gospel alive and date from at least this time⁸⁴.

On the one hand, the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* Calendar was largely drawn up in 1561 (with most days drawn from the old Sarum Calendar)⁸⁵. But on the other hand, it should be placed in the wider historical context that Anglican hagiology is taken up at, and from these points, by the Anglican clergyman, John Foxe (1516-1587), who records in his 1563 *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (1st English edition; Latin edition, 1554) the rise of e.g., the Waldensians and Lollards. In the context of 16th and 17th century Anglicanism, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* exerted an important Protestant influence among Anglicans, although with the demise of Anglican Protestant hagiology from the mid 19th century on, this wonderful work has now sadly fallen into much disuse, not only among Anglicans, but also among other Protestants⁸⁶. But to read the 1561 Calendar outside the wider context of the 1563 *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (and later updated editions), is to radically decontextualize and so misunderstand the bigger picture of Anglican hagiology which is set forth in the 1561 Calendar as preserved in the 1662 prayer book. Thus Foxe's 1563 *Book of Martyrs* (as preserved and expanded in later editions,) is contextually set against the backdrop of, and so contextually complements, the 1561

⁸⁴ Bramley-Moore, W., *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, 1563, revised folio edition, 1684, 3rd edition, Cassell, Patter, and Galpin, London, 1867, pp. 56-67 (Waldensians), pp. 67-83 (Waldensian Albigenses).

⁸⁵ Six days (as well as *Accession Day* which varies depending on when a monarch accedes to the throne, e.g., for Elizabeth I under whose reign this Calendar was first produced, 17 November; or under the present monarch, Elizabeth II, 6 February,) were added to the 1561 Calendar: King Charles I (30 Jan) (red letter day with office till 1859, it has a secondary focus on the Restoration under Charles II; revived as a black letter day in Australia in 1978, and as a black letter day that is optionally a red letter day in England since 1980 on the 1980 & 2000 optional Calendars); Bede (27 May) (black letter day); Charles II (29 May) (revised 1664, Royal Oak Day was a red letter day with office till 1859; it is remembered as a secondary focus of *King Charles I's Day*); Alban (17 June) (black letter day); Evertius / Enurchus (7 Sept.) (black letter day); and Papists' Conspiracy (5 Nov.) (a red letter day with office till 1859, modified in 1689 to remember 5 Nov. 1688 as well; it is still remembered in e.g., public celebrations on Bonfire Night throughout England).

⁸⁶ Puritan Protestants did not in general endorse the hagiological principles of the Anglican Protestant 1561 Calendar as modified in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, although to some extent Presbyterians in Scotland did as seen in e.g., St. Giles' *Church of Scotland* Cathedral, Edinburgh, a Presbyterian Cathedral, named after a seventh century figure. But historically Puritan Protestants generally did endorse the great Protestant hagiological work of *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*.

Anglican Calendar (as basically preserved in the 1662 Anglican Calendar). They are the complimentary two halves of wider Reformation Anglican hagiology. Hence to do as the 19th century secularists, Puseyites, semi-Puseyites, and religious liberals did, and detach the 1662 Calendar from its complementary half of *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, is to de-Protestantize the 1662 Calendar by de-contextualizing it; and then to this injury was added the insult of further removing from it the Protestant figures in most of its Offices (James I & William III in *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, Charles I in *King Charles the Martyr's Day*, the legally Protestant throne as restored under Charles II in *The King's Restoration Day* or *Royal Oak Day*; and in the case of Ireland, the red-letter day of *Irish Massacre Day*), although we thank God that the one remaining Office of *Accession Day* contains some relevant elements of Anglican Protestant theology (see Article 37 of the Anglican 39 Articles).

Thus it is important to note that Foxe records that the Waldensians' preachers included e.g., Berengarius around 1000 A.D., Henry of Toulouse (from 1147 they were sometimes named with reference to him as "Henricians"), or Peter Waldo in the 1100s (who either gave his name to, or took his name from, this pre-existing group), and their martyrs included e.g., the Waldensian, Enraudus (burnt in Paris, 1201)⁸⁷. I.e., the fact that they existed in c. 1,000 A.D. means that they predate this time, and with other evidence, indicates that they were in existence from at least the later part of the 8th century⁸⁸. Thus on the Continent, Anglican hagiology moves over to a focus on this

⁸⁷ Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (1563, 1684, 1867), *op. cit.*, pp. 56-9.

⁸⁸ The mediaeval Roman Church claimed in a story that was hostile to the Waldensians, that they had separated from the Church of Rome in the fourth century as a protest against Emperor Constantine's land grants to the Bishops of Rome in the *Donation of Constantine* (Bihlmeyer, K., *Church History*, Revised by H. Tuckle, translated from the thirteenth German edition by V.E. Mills and F.J. Muller, Vol. 2, *The Middle Ages*, Newman Press, Maryland, USA, 1963, pp. 146,211). While this claim has elements of falsehood since the *Donation of Constantine* was a later eighth century document, the fundamental claim seems difficult to ignore i.e., the Waldensians were already in existence in the eighth century when the *Donation of Constantine* began to circulate, and protesting against its claims, the Papists then falsely said that this was the reason why the Waldensians were an independent group from Rome from the earlier time of the fourth century. This, together with the evidence of the Waldensians in existence in c. 1,000 A.D., therefore means that this group can be reasonably said to have separated or came into existence *as a group* by the later part of the 8th century when the *Donation of Constantine* began to circulate; however, as to exactly where between the fourth and eighth centuries the Waldensians came into existence is unclear. Though St. John the Divine refers to the church in "the wilderness" from 607 A.D. (Rev. 12:14) in parts of Europe, this separated group who date from the 7th century and who co-existed with some better figures in the wider church in some parts of the Continent till the 8th century, were not necessarily the Waldensians, i.e., possibly they were the Waldensians and possibly they were others "of whom the world was not worthy" (Heb. 11:38). Alas, we

Waldensian group, following the time of any final better figures in the church on the Continent in the earlier 8th century, such as Lambert of Maastricht (d. 709) (1662 Calendar, 17 Sept.) and Giles of Nimes (d. 725) (1662 Calendar, 1 Sept.).

But the Inquisition set up in 1233 on the Continent, or earlier more rigid enforcement by the “Holy” Roman Empire established in 800 A.D., and slightly earlier circulation of the fraudulent *Donation of Constantine* which necessitated the Waldensians organic separation from Rome at this time, if not earlier in some parts of Europe, did not come to England till the late 14th and early 15th centuries (other than for the exception of those in the Knights’ Templars). Thus in England, Anglican hagiology moves over to Wycliffe and the Lollards from the 14th century, following the time of any final better figures in the English church in the 10th century with Dunstan (d. 988) (1662 Calendar, 19 May); 11th century with Alphege (d. 1012) (1662 Calendar, 19 April); and 13th century with Hugh (d. 1200) (1662 Calendar, 17 Nov.) and Richard (d. 1253) (1662 Calendar, 3 April).

Hence as recorded in *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, there was the gospel preaching by the *Morning Star of the Reformation*, John Wycliffe (c. 1329-1384)⁸⁹, who himself remained inside the Church of Rome, because the English government refused to punish him the way Rome wanted them to (although he was deprived of his university position). But Wycliffe’s teachings were then propagated by the Lollards, who following the appointment of the Inquisitor Nicholas de Hereford in 1391, and 1401 legislation enacted by the Parliament against the Lollards (II Henry IV, chapter 15; expanded under Henry V; repealed under Henry VIII; revived under Mary; repealed under Elizabeth I)⁹⁰, the Lollards became in England what the Waldensians were on the Continent, i.e., an independent church bearing witness to the pure faith.

Thus since the later 8th or earlier 9th century on the European Continent, and since the later 14th or earlier 15th century in the British Isles, no such better figures have existed in the Roman Church. The formal denial of proto-Protestant truth at the *Council of Constance* (1414-18), and connected increased enforcement mechanisms, and systematic denial of Protestant Christian truth by the *Council of Trent* (1545-63); ended for all time, the possibility of those who are part of “the temple of God” in the Roman Church (II Thess. 2:4), staying for long in the Roman Church. This therefore remains so, whether or not a Romish Inquisition is operating. This fact, coupled with the general accessibility of the gospel of the pure church with the Protestant Reformation from the

lack requisitely detailed historical records to be certain about the finer details.

⁸⁹ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* (1563, 1684, 1867), *op. cit.*, pp. 215-227, “Some particulars of the English Reformation, and the circumstances which preceded it, from the time of Wickliffe”

⁹⁰ Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 173-175 (Wycliffe’s teachings and the Council of Constance); 179-82 (II Henry IV, c 15, *De Haeretico Comburendo*).

16th century, has meant that the call to those in Rome, “Come out of her, my people” (Rev. 18:4); is since that time, given in such a way that those in the Church of Rome who are part of “the temple of God” (II Thess. 2:4), become more rapid transitory figures who are exiting the Roman Church.

Thus in our own day we find that Evangelicals divide between those on the one hand, who like the better figures on the 1662 Calendar on the Continent till the eighth century, or in the British Isles till the 14th century, remain inside largely apostate churches in the hope that they may yet be reclaimed for religiously conservative Evangelicalism and / or in order to preach the gospel in them; and those on the other hand who like the Waldensians from at least the time of the later 8th or earlier 9th centuries on the Continent, and the Lollards from the time of the later part of the 14th century or early 15th century, consider one must now leave such churches. Nevertheless, since both groups believe in some level of religious separation from the apostasy, and some level of autonomy from it in their local church, I “judge not” a man on this matter (Matt. 7:1). I leave the individual to pray and seek God’s guidance on this difficult matter, and I note that different persons take different options, and there are good and bad things about both options. But however one resolves this vexed and difficult matter, the salient point is that there is a need for a suitable level of separation from the apostasy in the purity of one’s local church, and appropriate defence of “The just shall by faith” (Gal. 3:11) including proclamation of the Gospel message, “if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.”

My general church views are closest to those religiously separated Reformed Anglicans who have left the apostate Anglican Communion, as well as a small number who may remain in Evangelical Low Churches inside the Anglican Communion. Hence in England I have sometimes attended 1662 Book of Common Prayer Services with the *Church of England (Continuing)* in London and Reading i.e., a church which is outside the largely apostate Anglican Communion; whereas in Australia I sometimes attend 1662 Book of Common Prayer Services in better Anglican Churches in the historically Low Church Evangelical Diocese of Sydney i.e., churches in a Diocese which is inside the largely apostate Anglican Communion. I consider that Scriptures such as e.g., Rom. 16:17 and Gal. 1:8,9, require that there is religious separation from all but religiously conservative Protestant Churches. Thus e.g., I would not give my spiritual recognition to semi-Puseyite or Puseyite Anglican parish churches by taking Communion with them.

b) *The NT teaching that apostles, prophets, and tongues end c. 100-110 A.D., but that devil-possession and exorcists continue till Christ’s return.*

Before discussing the issues at “c) A Case Study on Bob Larson Ministries, USA,” *infra*, it is necessary to first consider the issue of exorcists, which is relevant to that section. That is because certain Dispensationalists (but not all Dispensationalists) deny the reality of devil-possession after New Testament times, and hence correspondingly deny the need for exorcists.

The NT teaches that “apostles and prophets” were for the church’s “foundation” period (Eph. 2:20) i.e., New Testament times, and that “prophets and apostles” would cease to exist with the “generation” Jesus addresses in the NT (Luke 11:49) i.e., c. 30 A.D. + 70-100 years for a baby then alive = 100-130 A.D. . In Dan. 9:25 we read that the Messiah would “seal up vision and prophet” (Dan. 9:24, ASV footnote), that is, the gift of “prophecy” (Dan. 9:24, AV), and so Christ fulfilled this by declaring in Luke 11:49-51 that the prophetic gift would cease within 70 to 100 years of about 30 A.D. .

Furthermore, St. Paul’s says, “though that prophesyings be abolished” (Geneva Bible, 1560), or “if there are gifts of prophecy, they will be done away” (I Cor. 13:8, NASB). He dated this termination time by saying “apostles and prophets” were for the church’s “foundation” period (Eph. 2:20). This nexus between “apostles and prophets” shows both are limited in time to the church’s “foundation” period in New Testament times, and so neither can exist much time, if any time, after New Testament times. When Jesus appointed his apostles in c. 30 A.D. (a bit earlier than 30 A.D. but for my generalist calculation purposes c. 30 A.D.), they were all adult men, so the minimal possible age for any would be c. 20 years old. If a person who was 20 in 30 A.D., lived to be 70 years of age he would die in c. 80 A.D. and if he lived to be 100 years of age, he would die in 110 A.D. . This means *the prophetic gift which existed among more than just the apostles, but which existed only during apostolic times*, had to cease between 80 and 110 A.D. . The overlap between these c. 80-110 A.D. dates (I Cor. 13:8; Eph. 2:20; Mark 3:13-19), and the c. 100-130 dates (Dan. 9:25; Luke 11:49-51), requires the conclusion that the prophetic gift had to cease c. 100-110 A.D. .

The final book of the NT, Revelation, was written c. 96 A.D., but on these figures the prophetic gift would have continued for a short while afterwards in order for these prophets to confirm to the body of believers that the Book of Revelation was inspired. But all such prophets would have ceased to possess the gift of prophesy within a maximum period of c. 15 years of St. John penning the final “Amen” to the Book of Revelation i.e., these prophets would have ceased to exist c. 100-110 A.D. .

Moreover, in I Cor. 13:8 we find a parallelism between the time of the ending of the prophetic gift and the gift of tongues in the words, “though that prophesyings be abolished, or ... tongues cease” (Geneva Bible, 1560), or “if there are gifts of prophecy, they will be done away; if there are tongues, they will cease” (I Cor. 13:8, NASB). Since “tongues ... shall cease” at the same time “prophecies ... shall fail” (AV) i.e., “fail” (AV) here means “prophesyings be abolished” (Geneva Bible, 1560) or “end⁹¹,” this requires that apostles, prophets, and tongues, all had to cease by c. 100-110 A.D. . This also fits a general pattern of the NT which shows tongues decreasing even within NT times, being mentioned less as the Book of Acts progresses (Acts 2:3,4,8,11; 10:46; 19:6); and whereas the list of spiritual gifts mentioned in I Corinthians 12:8-10; 28-30 includes tongues, the lists in Romans 12:6-8 and Ephesians 4:11 make no reference to

⁹¹ Greek, “*katarge θ esontai* (‘they shall end,’ indicative passive future, 3rd person plural verb, from *katargeo*),” in which *katargeo* here means *brought to an end* (Mounce’s *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT*, pp. 21 & 270).

tongues, although they both make reference to prophets. This indicates that while the gift of tongues did not absolutely and finally cease till c. 100-110 A.D., it was used increasingly less during this time, and in this sense also parallels the ever diminishing gift of apostles as NT apostles progressively died out. The same pattern is also more generally evident in the Book of Acts for the diminution of “signs and wonders, and ... divers[e] miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost;” by which the “great salvation; which at the first was spoken by the Lord, ... was confirmed” in the early church (Hebrews 2:3,4).

But we find no such termination point for devil-possession before the Second Coming (Rev. 20:1-3). Indeed, we are told that from the time of the Office of the Papacy or Office of Antichrist in 607 A.D., the Pope has been devil-possessed by Lucifer himself. For the Antichrist is “the son of perdition” (II Thess. 2:3); and thus like “the son of perdition” (John 17:12), Judas Iscariot, for “the devil” “put” it “into the heart of Judas Iscariot” “to betray him” (John 13:2), and “after the sop Satan entered into him” (John 13:27); thus “Satan” “entered” “into Judas surnamed Iscariot” (Luke 22:3). This teaching is also found in Rev. 12:3; 13:1,2; and manifested in Rev. 16:13,14, where we learn that Lucifer may temporarily leave other devils to control the Pope if he has to leave Rome (Rev. 17:1,9) on some business (Rev. 18:2). Thus no exorcism will ever work for the Pope since he is “the son of perdition” (II Thess. 2:3) who since 607 has been devil-possessed by Lucifer himself. That is because the Pope is guilty of the unpardonable sin of “blasphemy against the Holy Ghost” (Matt. 12:31) in his claim to be “the Vicar of Christ” with “a universal” jurisdiction; for that position belongs ONLY to the Holy Ghost (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:7-13). Nevertheless, the presence of devils in the Papal “beast,” and “the mouth of the false prophet” i.e., Romish “ecumenical councils” with the Pope in charge of them (Rev. 13:11), clearly shows devil-possession continues after New Testament times, and all the way up to the Second Advent of Christ.

Thus it has been the experience of the church throughout the ages, that devil possession does continue after NT times into our own times, and that God calls men to exorcise devils. E.g., I remember when I was Confirmed in 1980, the Anglican Diocese of Sydney Minister told the Confirmation Class that having talked to a number of senior Ministers, he found that most of them performed one exorcism during their Ministry of 30 to 40 years, and some had performed two exorcisms. These men were Anglican clergymen who were not primarily involved in the ministry of exorcism, and they did not generally advertize their activities. Thus while people know they are an ordained Minister, they do not generally know that they are capable of performing exorcisms as required, and so there is no generally public element to their exorcist ministry, which they only exercise occasionally. However, some limited public reference may sometimes be made as to who is such an exorcist, or who to contact if one wishes to contact such an exorcist, in order for them to be accessed by relevant persons. Of course, there may also be some variation in the number of exorcisms performed over time or in different areas, depending on how many persons in a given area have engaged in conduct allowing for devil-possession. Thus levels of devil-possession in a given area may vary from time to time, depending on the spiritual quality of those living in the area. Hence a Minister might in fact have to perform more than one or two exorcisms during his Ministry years, if he is in an area that for some reason has a higher frequency of devil-possession. It

should also be stressed that proper safeguards must apply to any exorcism, and only after reasonably exhausting all other possibilities of illness or psychiatric disorder, does a properly called exorcist conclude that a person is devil-possessed.

On the one hand, we should not, as do certain Dispensationalists (but not all Dispensationalists), deny the reality of ongoing devil-possession after NT times, and the natural corollary to this that God still calls men to be exorcists; in the words of Christ, “In my name shall they cast out devils” (Mark 16:17). But on the other hand, we should also remember that the gift of exorcism does not necessarily mean that any given exorcist is a genuine saved Christian, for Jesus says, “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? And in thy name cast out devils? And in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity” (Matt. 7:21-23). Therefore we must apply the test of theological orthodoxy i.e., “he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven” to any exorcist, not simply look to the fact that there is evidence that he has exorcised devils.

It should also be borne in mind that the giving of the Great Commission in Matt. 28:18-20 refers to the need to “Go” “and teaching all nations, baptizing them;” whereas the Great Commission in Mark 16:15-18 also says, “And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.” Contextually, the emphasis is the same in Matt. 28:18-20 as Mark 16:15-18 i.e., the Great Commission. This highlights the fact that the difference in the Matthean and Marcan references to the Great Commission mean that the “signs” of Mark 16:17,18 are connected with the evangelistic work to “go” “into the world, and preach the gospel” (Mark 16:15).

Therefore, *as part of their evangelistic outreach* to “preach the gospel” (Mark 16:15) they might find it necessary to “cast out devils” *from an unbeliever*. This points us to the *raison d’être* of exorcism as linked with the proclamation, “repent ye, and believe the gospel” (Mark 1:15) that Jesus Christ died in our place and for our sins at Calvary (Mark 10:45; 14:24), before rising again the third day and ascending into heaven at God’s right hand (Mark 16), from whence he shall return to judge the living and the dead (Mark 13). Thus to detach exorcism from this Evangelical message that “Jesus Christ” is “the Son of God” (Mark 1:1; 15:39), is to join the ungodly exorcists which do not “the will of” the “Father” (Matt. 7:21-23). So too, Biblical “tongues” (Mark 16:17) which ceased *c.* 100-110 A.D. (I Cor. 13:8; Eph. 2:20), were used in an evangelistic context to preach the gospel (Acts 2) i.e., these were known languages given for the purpose of proclaiming the gospel (not to be confused with the abuse of tongues in I Cor. 14). So too, “if they” “take up serpents” or “drink any deadly thing” “it shall not hurt them” (Mark 16:18), is God’s provision to protect his Ministers till their job on earth to “preach the gospel” (Mark 16:15) is done, and so still applicable today to gospel ministers who are under God’s directive will (Acts 28:3-6), though not applicable to ministers who under his permissive do foolish things and then presume upon God to

protect them (Matt. 4:5-7). And “they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover,” was in emulation of Christ’s object lessons of healing (e.g., Matt. 9:1-8), also initially part of NT evangelism (Acts 3:1-10; 9:17); but even within later New Testament times, this was then changed to conditional healing of believers if it be the Lord’s will (Matt. 6:10; II Cor. 12:7-10).

Devil-possession is a serious and sombre matter. It should not be treated in a light or flippant manner. I thank God I was privileged to visit Israel in February 2002. There on the Sea of Galilee, in the “country of the Gergesenes” (Matt. 8:28), I saw what is the traditional site for the story of Jesus’ exorcism of “two possessed with devils” in Matt. 8:28-34. The site contains the remains of a number of Byzantine church buildings which were only rediscovered in historically modern times when excavated in 1970 under the Department of Antiquities and Museums in Israel. The remains of these buildings include the remains of a Byzantine Chapel built over a cave which seems to have been regarded as one of “the tombs” that the “two possessed with devils” were seen “coming out of” (Matt. 8:28). Looking from this “tomb” site towards the Sea of Galilee, one can see up on one’s left a steep hill that ends in a precipice going down into the Sea of Galilee; and so this hill was evidently identified by the Byzantine Chapel builders as the “steep place into the sea” that the “herd of swine ran violently down” after Jesus cast “the devils” (Matt. 8:31,32) into them. I thank God for having seen this site in Israel. But far more than that, I thank God for the wonderful Bible story of Matt. 8:28-34, and Christ’s glorious power to set men free from the bondage of Satan and his legions of devils.

Leaving the country of the Gergesenes, in Feb. 2002 I then went to Capernaum via Bethsaida. All these places are around the Sea of Galilee. One here finds the remains of “the white synagogue,” so named because it is built from lighter whitish stones, and it dates from the fourth century A.D. . But *the white synagogue* is built on foundation stones that are black. This has led to the theory that that *the white synagogue* was built on the foundation stones of an earlier *black synagogue* which might go back to the time of Christ, and if so, it would be the Capernaum synagogue referred to in the New Testament. While we cannot be sure about this, on the available data it is a plausible possibility. Either way, the later *white synagogue* of Capernaum reminds us that there was an earlier synagogue at Capernaum in Christ’s time. In Mark 1:21-28, we read of how Christ undertook an exorcism at the Capernaum synagogue which I further refer to in subsection, “c),” *infra*. But when we consider that “the country of the Gergesenes” (Matt. 8:28) and “the synagogue” of “Capernaum” (Mark 1:21) are in such close geographical proximity to each other, and that Jesus also performed further exorcisms at Capernaum at the end of that “sabbath day,” “at even, when the sun did set” (Mark 1:32-34; cf. Lev. 23:32; Luke 23:54-56); and beyond this “he preached in their synagogues throughout all Galilee, and cast out devils” (Mark 1:39); we are also reminded that certain geographical areas, such as the Galilee at this time, sometimes seem to have a higher intensity of people in them who have become involved with devils and devil-possession. But for those seeking release from devil-possession, in conjunction with an exorcism, the ultimate answer for them is the same as that for any non devil-possessed sinner, “Repent ye, and believe the gospel” (Mark 1:15) i.e., to “believe” requires saving

faith in “the Son of God” (Mark 15:39).

c) A Case Study on Bob Larson Ministries, USA.

In this section I consider my views on Bob Larson Ministries as I have known them over a period of about 35 years from c. 1976/7 to 2012. When I was a teenager of the 1970s I admired Bob Larson. Then in listening to, watching, and reading his cassettes, videos, and books of the 1980s and 1990s, I came to the view that they were a mix of good and bad, but that the good outweighed the bad, and I could generally select enough good out of them while eschewing the bad, to still benefit from them (Isa. 7:16; Heb. 5:14). The last such cassette I had of this type was from 1995. Though I later wrote to Bob Larson Ministries USA for a catalogue of their materials I got no reply, and I thought he may have retired.

Then in 2011 I learned of his change in setting up the “Spiritual Freedom Church” and new website format and via the internet ordered some DVDs of his which date from 1999 to 2007. I was not happy with much of what is in them. I found that the bad in them outweighed the good, and that the bad was so bad, that without even viewing them, I had to throw out Parts 3 to 6 of “Witchcraft, Cults & Satanic Ritual Abuse” (2005), after unspeakable horrors were itemized by Bob Larson in Part 2 in egregious violation of the Biblical guidelines laid down in Eph. 5:12,13. I also found terrible heresy in a number of them, which manifest a trichonomist heresy that Larson has picked up in which he is now claiming Christians can be devil-possessed, and he is correspondingly urging professed Christians to come to him for an exorcism. His expansion of reasons as to how people may allegedly become devil-possessed, to the point where he is now claiming any number of Christians are so devil-possessed, with his associated concepts of “the devil” is “inside” “every single one of us,” *infra*, has moved his claims of exorcisms beyond the boundaries of Biblical credulity. Thus e.g., in Larson’s “The danger of Denying Deliverance” (2006), *Larson’s tone, demeanor, persona, and theological message on exorcism has so radically altered, that I can no longer recognize him relative to his former self.* Hence in this section I now document certain relevant matters. But in doing so, I wish the reader to know from the outset that THE BIG MORAL OF THIS STORY IS, “*Don’t get involved in the ‘ ecumenical’ compromise with Roman Catholics and other non-Evangelicals,*” some of the dangers of which may be seen in the sticky predicament that Bob Larson has now gotten himself in, and presently seems unable to extricate himself from.

I met and spoke with Bob Larson (b. 1944) of Denver, Colorado, USA, and his first wife, Kathy, (whom he separated from c. 1990; his second wife is Laura by whom he has had three daughters⁹².) when he came to Australia in the late 1970s at e.g., Scott’s

⁹² I do not know the details of Larson’s divorce from his first wife, Kathy (Kathryn), who was from Canada, and so I do not know if it accords with Biblical requirements that it be for a weighty cause such as adultery, desertion, or cruelty (see “2c,” “The Secular State: Types 1 & 2,” *infra*). I am thus unable to comment in specific

Presbyterian Church, City of Sydney (near the Harbour Bridge). As a High School teenager at the time, *I thought very highly of Bob Larson*, and I recorded his messages and some of the songs he sang in Sydney, and I undertook a cassette recorded interview with him outside Scott's Presbyterian Church holding up what would now be regarded as the old-fashioned style cassette-recorder external microphone⁹³. E.g., I told him about the Koala Park at West Pennant Hills (western Sydney) where he could get a photo with a kangaroo or koala, which he was very interested in doing. As I rode through the streets of Sydney on my motor-cycle to exit the inner City of Sydney via the Harbour Bridge, I happened to see Bob Larson and his first wife in a white taxi after they had left Scott's Church, so I maneuvered my bike to overtake them, beeping the horn and waving at them "Goodbye," and they waived back.

The cassette cover for one of his cassettes from 1987 ("Death & the Devil in Rock Music") has an overriding caption, "Bob Larson Speaks Out," with a picture of him as clean shaven; whereas Larson's *Book of Rock* (1987) shows a picture of him clean shaven on the back jacket, and bearded on the inside cover⁹⁴; and the cassette cover for a 1991 cassette ("Outline of an Exorcism") came with an overriding cover sheet caption, "Demons Uncensored by Bob Larson," with a picture of him as bearded. This indicates that he grew a beard in or around 1987, and has largely kept it since then, although at times he has gone to just a moustache⁹⁵.

As touching upon religious belief, he formally attended a non-denominational Community Bible Church in Denver Colorado⁹⁶. In "Exorcism" (1992) he specifically calls himself "a Protestant." He identifies himself with some form of Evangelical Protestantism, and associated desire to lead people to Christ e.g., in "Demon Possession" (1989), Bob Larson contextually identifies with the teachings of "Evangelical scholars," and also leads a 13 year old caller, Paul, to ask "Jesus Christ ... into your life⁹⁷."

terms on whether or not his remarriage is, or is not, valid in God's law (Matt. 19:9). Moreover, Larson's later decline in standards from some point in the 1990s acts to raise the question, Is this related to his divorce? E.g., did Kathy exercise a restraining influence on some of his ministry excesses, that his second wife Laura does not; or are the later developments of the 1990s totally unrelated to the divorce of his first wife?

⁹³ I either no longer have, or cannot now find, these recordings.

⁹⁴ This is on a front page (with "489" filled out in pen,) stating I bought "Limited Edition No 489 of 1,000" copies produced.

⁹⁵ E.g., a picture I have of him dated August 2011 shows him in the Ukraine of the Russian Federation with a moustache ("Ukraine / Russia Mission Report -- August 2011," "Welcome to Spiritual Freedom Church," <http://www.boblarson.org/russiareports.html> on internet as at Oct. 2011).

⁹⁶ "Answers to Atheists" (1988).

⁹⁷ "Demon Possession" (1989) & "The Raelian Revolution" (1990). Cf. his

Larson's contemporary website statement entitled, "What We Believe," contains a number of orthodox Evangelical statements such as, "The Bible is the inspired and infallible Word of God." "Our God is one, but manifested in three person –The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, being coequal" "Phil. 2:6." "The Son is the Word made flesh, the One Begotten," "The Holy Spirit proceeds ... from both the Father and the Son and is eternal" "John 15:26." "Jesus is the Christ, conceived by the Holy Spirit and virgin born, the Son of God, the one and only Savior, the Lord of all." "Christ sacrificially died on the Cross and shed his blood as the atonement for sin." "God raised him from the dead body. He ascended into heaven, and he will visibly return in glory according to his promise." "Salvation is God's gift of eternal life, presented to all who, by faith, accept Jesus Christ as Savior and receive spiritual new birth by the Holy Spirit"⁹⁸.

But Larson also embraces the ecumenical compromise with non-Evangelicals such as Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox⁹⁹. Moreover, in his website entitled, "What We Believe," his statement, "God the Father is greater than all ... John 14:28;" requires the Biblically correct clarification of the *Athanasian Creed* that Christ is "Equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead" (John 5:18; Philp. 2:6), "and inferior to the Father, as touching his manhood" (John 14:28; Philp. 2:7,8). And there are also other inadequacies in his statement of belief, such as his failure to mention the need to repent from sin as set forth most chiefly in the Ten Commandments. Yet to this it must also be said that he has shown some commendable elements to his ministry, such as seeking to have people repent and turn to Christ¹⁰⁰, and generally upholding the moral values of "the Ten Commandments"¹⁰¹, such as his opposition to fornication and drugs¹⁰², the abortion

contextual identification with what he calls the "evangelical Christian" in Bob Larson's *Tough Talk about Tough Issues* (1989), p. 111, or references to "the church" and "evangelicals" at pp. 254,255; or his contextual identification with what he calls "Protestants" in endorsing the anti-Mormon and anti-Freemasonry ministry of Denis Higley in Vernal, Utah, USA "Mormonism & Masonry" (1985).

⁹⁸ Bob Larson's "Spiritual Freedom Church" (<http://www.boblaron.org>) "What We Believe" (<http://www.boblaron.org/believe.html>).

⁹⁹ E.g., Bob Larson's "Spiritual Freedom Church" (<http://www.boblaron.org>) "Ukraine / Russia Mission Reports -- August 2011," says at the Report from Sevastopol, in Crimea, Ukraine, that someone called, "Dmitry, who organized our meeting, asked that Bob [Larson] bless and anoint everyone there" with "holy oil and the sign of the cross on the forehead. Many Christians in Ukraine come from an Eastern Orthodox tradition where such rituals have important spiritual significance. Bob was handed a large bowl of oil and stood patiently" as the people "filed past him, one by one, to be blessed" (emphasis mine). It is clear from this Report that Bob Larson is happy to leave people he ministers to in the errors of Eastern Orthodoxy, since he considers they are "Christians in ... an Eastern Orthodox tradition" (<http://www.boblaron.org/russiareports.html> on internet as at Oct. 2011).

¹⁰⁰ "Demon Possession" (1989).

slaughter¹⁰³, euthanasia¹⁰⁴, suicide, group sex¹⁰⁵, pornography¹⁰⁶, and homosexuality¹⁰⁷.

I have a long list of products from Bob Larson Ministries of Denver Colorado, USA, although he now also operates under *Spiritual Freedom Church* in Scottsdale, Arizona, USA, but retains a postal address at P.O. Box 36A, Denver, Colorado, 80236, USA¹⁰⁸. When in March 2009 I took a United Airlines flight from New York to San Francisco, USA, with a flight path over Colorado, in which a general flight map I was shown depicted the expected flight path would go over the Colorado capital of Denver, I gave a passing thought to Bob Larson who still retains a postal address at Denver.

My earliest recordings of him are two undated cassette tapes which were over two nights in which he says his Ministry started “a couple of years ago.” The first one is entitled, “Rock,” and the second one is entitled, “Satanism.” He refers on both the “Rock” and “Satanism” cassette tapes to the rock group Black Sabbath’s “latest album” with “666” on the top if it. This album (“Sabbath Bloody Sabbath”) was produced in Nov. 1973 and their next album (“Sold our Soul for Rock & Roll”) came out in Dec. 1975. But Larson also refers on “Rock” to the Rolling Stones “latest album” as “Goats Head Soup.” This album was released in Aug. 1973 and their next album, (“It’s Only Rock’n’Roll,”) was released in July 1974. Therefore the overlap between these dates means that Larson’s “Rock” and “Satanism” can be dated to sometimes between Nov. 1973 and July 1974. Larson further refers in “Rock” to “our most recent book, *Hell on Earth*,” which the US Library of Congress catalogue says was published in 1974. Hence

¹⁰¹ “Heavy Metal” (1992). I say “generally” because we find inconsistencies in e.g., Larson’s tolerance to the idolatry (second commandment) and blasphemy (third commandment) of the Roman Mass, *infra*; or failure to honour racial parents as it extends to the great white patriarch of Japheth (Gen. 9:27; 10:1-5) with a segregationist America under white Caucasian control (one element of the fifth commandment, cf. Gen. 10:1; 12:3; Acts 3:25), as seen in his anti-racist comments in “Evolution” (1986), or his endorsement of desegregation practices in e.g., “Larson’s Top Ten Exorcisms” (1999); or various lusts (10th commandment) e.g., anti-sexist pro-feminism comments contrary to such passages as Titus 2:3-5 in Larson’s *Tough Talk about Tough Issues* (1989), pp. 253-5.

¹⁰² Larson’s *Book of Rock* (1987), pp. 13-18.

¹⁰³ “White House Holocaust” (1993).

¹⁰⁴ Larson’s *Tough Talk about Tough Issues* (1989), pp. 116-120.

¹⁰⁵ “The Raelian Revolution” (1990).

¹⁰⁶ Larson’s *Tough Talk about Tough Issues* (1989), pp. 142,166,175,236.

¹⁰⁷ “The Raelian Revolution” (1990) & “How to reach Homosexuals” (1995).

¹⁰⁸ His website is at: <http://www.boblaron.org/believe.html>.

these two tapes can be dated to about the first half of 1974. I got both of them in 1976 or 1977. Thereafter, to some extent reflecting the changes in technology over the era, I have gotten various cassette tapes¹⁰⁹, books¹¹⁰, pamphlets¹¹¹, videos¹¹², and Digital Video Disks (DVDs)¹¹³.

My views on Bob Larson for the era of the 1970s to parts of the 1990s are somewhat ambivalent. As a teenager I was very grateful for learning about the dangers of rock music from Bob Larson's tapes and materials such as his 1974 cassette tapes on "Rock" and "Satanism¹¹⁴;" and at the time I thought very highly of him. Even after I became more critical of him in my 20s, I still liked, listened to, and benefited from, a lot of what he said in those works of his that I got. Thus for the period from the 1970s to

¹⁰⁹ Bob Larson Ministries cassette tapes: "Mormonism & Masonry" (1985), "Evolution" (1986), "Creationism" (1987), "Death & the Devil in Rock Music" (1987), "Answers to Atheists" (1988), "Demon Possession" (1989), "The Raelian Revolution" (1990), "Outline of an Exorcism" (1991), "Exorcism" (1992), "Exorcism" (1993 – same as 1992 one), "Spiritual Warfare / Pastor Seminar" (1992), "Death Metal" (1992), "Heavy Metal" (1992), "White House Holocaust" (1993), "The Clinton Catastrophe" (1993), & "How to reach Homosexuals" (1995).

¹¹⁰ Larson's *Book of Rock*, Tyndale House Publishers, Wheaton, Illinois, USA, 1987; Bob Larson's *Your Kids and Rock*, Pocket Guides, Tyndale House Publishers, Wheaton, Illinois, USA, 1988; & Bob Larson's *Tough Talk about Tough Issues*, Tyndale House Publishers, Wheaton, Illinois, USA, 1989.

¹¹¹ "Bob Larson Speaks Out!" on "Demons" (1993) (I recall I had some other pamphlets, but I cannot locate them).

¹¹² Bob Larson's "In the name of Satan" (1990), "Metal Connection" (1992), & "Gay Deception" (1993).

¹¹³ On Digital Video (or Versatile) Disk (DVD), Bob Larson's "Larson's Top Ten Exorcisms" (1999), "Witchcraft, Cults & Satanic Ritual Abuse" Parts 1 & 2 (I purchased Parts 1-6, but after watching Parts 1 & 2, I made a decision to not watch Parts 3-6 but to throw them out unseen, *infra*) (2005), "The Devil Inside – Down Under: The Vatican Exorcism Edition" also known as, and referred to in Larson's products order page as, "An Interview With The Pope's Exorcist" (2006), "The Danger of Denying Deliverance" (2006), & "Answers for Objections to Exorcism" (2007). I only acquired these DVDs recently in 2011. Though I had written years earlier to Denver Colorado for "a current copy of books, cassettes, etc., available from Bob Larson Ministries," I received no reply, and thought he might have closed down; but I then located his current works and method of acquiring them (which is quite different to his old form,) on the Internet in 2011.

¹¹⁴ Some other material of his I formerly had, I either no longer have, or cannot find.

parts of the 1990s, I find much that is useful and good in his works, and I thank God for some of the valuable and helpful information I have obtained from these works.

But there are some concerns I have with these works. *My first concern has to do with Larson's ecumenical compromise with Papists and other non-Evangelicals.*

My two earliest tapes of Larson, which are "Rock" (1974) and "Satanism" (1974), were contextually two addresses made over two days to a Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) Church in the United States of America, in which Larson gives spiritual recognition to the SDA Cult¹¹⁵. E.g., he refers to "born again Christians" in that SDA Church, refers to an SDA "Sabbath morning," and more broadly gives spiritual recognition (II John 8) to them, even though SDAs "abideth not in the doctrine of Christ" (II John 9). E.g., concerning professedly Christian Gentiles who keep the Jewish weekly sabbath "days, and" new moon "months, and" annual "times, and" sabbatical "years" (cf. Lev. 23; Num. 28 & 29), St. Paul says, "I am afraid ..., lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain" (Gal. 4:10,11); and this concern with regard to Jewish weekly sabbath "days" in Gal. 4:10,11 is clearly applicable to the Judaizing teachings of the SDA Church. For in the double-entendre of the Greek (e.g., Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1), Christ rose on "the first of the week (*sabbaton*)" also meaning "the first of the sabbaths (*sabbaton*)." Thus Sunday became a weekly Sabbath by virtue of Christ's resurrection (Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10), and hence it is kept as part of the morality of the fourth commandment (Exod. 20:8-11). Moreover, SDAs look to an extra-Biblical source of purportedly "Divine revelation" in the writings of Ellen G. White (d. 1915), and with respect to the SDA prophetess, Ellen G. White's book, *The Great Controversy* (1888 & 1911), Larson says of the battle between God and the Devil, "That, if I may use your phrase, is what 'The Great Controversy' is all about. Who's side are you on?" Hence though broadly identifying with some form of Evangelical Protestantism, Bob Larson also clearly embraces the ecumenical compromise with non-Evangelicals such as Seventh-day Adventists.

Larson's embrace of non-Evangelicals also includes his ecumenical compromise with e.g., Roman Catholics¹¹⁶. This type of thing is seen very clearly in his cassette, "Exorcism" (1992). Larson here very specifically identifies as a Protestant, saying e.g., "from a Protestant standpoint, which is where I'm approaching this." He makes an extensive usage of the Roman Catholic *Ritual Romanum* on exorcism, and in general terms speaks favourably of it. Though he does not agree with all its provisions, e.g., he says with its section saying an exorcist should "sprinkle with holy water. As a Protestant I wouldn't¹¹⁷." With regard to the invocation of saints in the *Ritual Romanum* Larson

¹¹⁵ With regard to Seventh-day Adventism, see Anthony Hoekema's *The Four Major Cults*, Eerdmans, Michigan, 1963, pp. 89-169,388-403; & Geoffrey Paxton's *The Shaking of Adventism*, Zenith Publishers, Delaware, USA, 1977.

¹¹⁶ "Demon Possession" (1989).

¹¹⁷ In his later DVD, "The Devil Inside – Down Under: The Vatican Exorcism Edition" also known as "An Interview With The Pope's Exorcist" (2006), "the Pope's

says, “Whether [Roman] Catholic or Protestant . . . , I will go so far as to say differences in some minor aspects of theology are not as important as concentrating on the major focus of faith in Jesus Christ. Now while I as a Protestant may not believe ‘the pious intercession of the saints’ will have any effect here, everything else that has been said hitherto with regards to the authority of Christ I agree with” Or with regard to the *Ritual Romanum* referring to taking the Romish sacraments of auricular Confession and the Roman Mass, Larson says, this is “a very good idea” i.e., even though as a Protestant he does not use the Roman Catholic “sacrament” of auricular confession, he thinks a confession of sins to God in private is a good idea for a Protestant, and he is quite happy for Papists to use auricular confession to a Romish priest; and “whether you believe in transubstantiation or . . . as I personally do in the symbolic significance as a memorial, the important thing is, it is an act of submission to the will of Christ”

Thus Larson here regards invocation of saints as “differences in some minor aspects of theology” between Protestants and Roman Catholics. In fact, invocation of saints involves a syncretism with Devilish teachings of “witchcraft” (Gal. 5:20) with regard to invoking dead persons (I Sam. 28:7,11,15), and denies the role of Christ as the mediator of the new covenant (I Tim. 2:5,6; Heb. 12:24). It is not “some minor” “difference;” for “The Romish doctrine concerning . . . invocation of Saints is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God” (Article 22, Anglican 39 Articles).

Furthermore, Larson here considers that taking the Roman Mass and transubstantiation manifest a Papist’s “act of submission to the will of Christ.” Larson’s claims with regard to the Roman Mass are extraordinary given that Papists taking the Roman Mass think that they are thereby meriting some kind of favour with God contrary to the teaching of justification by faith (Gal. 16-9; 2:16; 3:11-13); given that the Roman Mass is a Trinitarian heresy that denies “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John 4:2; II John 7), for “the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one” (Final Rubric, The Communion Service, Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*); given that the Roman Mass is both “blasphemous” and “dangerous” in that it denies the completed atonement of Christ on the cross (Article 31, Anglican 39 Articles); and given that it gives rise to “gross idolatries” (Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 29:6, Congregational *Savoy Declaration* 30:6, & and *Baptist Confession* 30:6), for “adoration . . . unto the sacramental bread” is “idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians” (Final Rubric, The Communion Service, Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*).

St. John warns that such a denial “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” is the deceptive teaching of “an antichrist;” and correspondingly warns that, “he that biddeth” such a person “Godspeed is partaker of his evil deeds” (II John 7,11). In this context, I find Larson’s DVD, “The Devil Inside – Down Under: The Vatican Exorcism Edition”

exorcist,” “Father” Gabriele Amorth, shows the aspergillum with which he sprinkles the so called “holy water” during exorcisms.

also known as “An Interview With The Pope’s Exorcist” (2006), deeply disturbing. The interview with Vatican’s chief exorcist, “Father” Gabriel Amorth, shows this Romish priest sitting in front of a Roman Catholic “altar” with a “tabernacle” in the middle, and a crucifix on top of the tabernacle. In the Roman Church, the “tabernacle” contains the so called, “reserved sacrament” i.e., pieces of Communion Bread in which the human creature of a Popish priest, considers he has created the Creator through transubstantiation. Hence this “reserved sacrament” is placed in a “tabernacle,” and Romanists idolatrously bow down and adore it by genuflecting when they pass by it. The crucifix on top of it also reminds us that this Romish theology includes the so called “sacrifice of the mass;” referred to in Article 31 of the Anglican 39 Articles as “blasphemous,” in the words, “The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.”

We thus find that Larson’s “The Devil Inside – Down Under: The Vatican Exorcism Edition” or “An Interview With The Pope’s Exorcist” (2006), strongly promotes, and fosters toleration towards, the very imagery that the holy Apostle, St. John, uses to identify the Antichrist. For St. John teaches that a denial “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John 4:3) is the deceptive teaching of various “antichrists” of his day that typed the then coming Roman “Antichrist” (I John 2:18). Thus Larson here further sets aside the warnings of the beloved apostle, “Little children, keep yourselves from idols” (I John 5:21); and “he that biddeth” “an antichrist” “Godspeed is partaker of his evil deeds” (II John 7,11).

Larson’s “ecumenical” compromise also extends in his “Exorcism” (1992) cassette to those who embrace Montanist heresies in the form of “Charismatics,” describing differences with such Montanists as “non-essential issues of doctrine.” It further extends to Eastern Orthodox, *supra*.

In Larson’s “Witchcraft, Cults & Satanic Ritual Abuse” (2005), Part 1, he gives spiritual recognition to the Roman Catholic Church, Seventh-day Adventist Church, and United Pentecostal Church. (There is a further discussion of this DVD, *infra*.)

Larson lays down what he calls the “Foundations of the Faith” in five criteria which he says isolates devilish “cults” from the “orthodox.” He says cults: *Criterion 1*) devalue the Godhead, and cites I Tim. 2:5; *Criterion 2*) devalue Christ’s Deity, and cites John 1:1 & Col. 2:9,10; *Criterion 3*) deny man’s sinful state, and cites Jer. 17:9 & Rom. 5:12; *Criterion 4*) either add to, or subtract from, the Divine revelation of the Bible, and cites Heb. 4:12 & Isa. 40:8; and *Criterion 5*) deny redemption by saying Christ is never enough, and cites Acts 4:12 and Eph. 2:8,9. Though these five criteria are an inadequate definition of orthodoxy, what Larson says on these five areas is *prima facie* sound.

But he then claims in “Witchcraft, Cults & Satanic Ritual Abuse” (2005), Part 1,

that both the Roman Catholic Church and Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) Church meet these five criteria and so are orthodox. However with regard to Larson's five criteria, the Roman Church, for instance, with *Criterion 1*) devalues the God of I Tim. 2:5, "there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus," by its various saint mediators that are prayed to, or mediator Popish priests in confessionals. Concerning *Criterion 4*) they add to the Divine revelation with "visions" of its saints, the Romish "ecumenical" councils, or the Pope. And concerning *Criterion 5*) they deny redemption by saying Christ is not enough with Mary being a purported joint sin-bearer as "co-redeemer," or claiming one must add various purportedly goods works to faith in order to be saved. The Bible says to deny that "Christ hath redeemed us" when he hung on Calvary's "tree," for "The just shall live by faith" (Gal. 3:11,13), is to present "another gospel" than the gospel "of grace," and such persons who "pervert the gospel of Christ" are "accursed" (Gal. 1:6,7). And those in such "heresies" "shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:20,21). But Larson says of such persons in the form of the Roman Church which fails to meet elements of his own five criteria, that they are "orthodox."

Likewise, with regard to Larson's five criteria, the SDA Church, for instance, with *Criterion 2*) devalues Christ's Deity by regarding the Arian heresy which claims Christ was a created being contrary to Micah 5:2; or Ps. 90:2 with John 1:3 & Col. 1:16; is a matter of secondary importance. Thus the emphasis of Col. 2:2,16 is turned on its head, as contrary to the words, "Let no man ... judge you ... in respect of ... the sabbath days" (Col. 2:16), getting Gentiles to keep the Jewish sabbath (John 19:42) contrary to Gal. 4:10,11, becomes the big issue for SDAs; and then the words, "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. 2:9) becomes a secondary issue. Hence the SDAs give spiritual recognition to, and uphold the work of SDA semi-Arians e.g., the SDA publication, *Adventist Review* (6 Jan. 1994), says, "Adventist ... pioneers, including James White, J.N. Andrews, [and] Uriah Smith ..., held to an Arian or semi-Arian view - that is, the Son at some point in time ... was generated by the Father." The "Trinitarian understanding of God, ... was not generally held by the early Adventists. Even today a few do not subscribe to it."¹¹⁸ Notably, Uriah Smith (1832-1903) is the author of the classic SDA cult pseudo-historicist work, *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation* (Battle Creek, Michigan, USA, 1865), which in various editions, is still printed by the SDA Church.

Concerning *Criterion 4*) SDAs further add to the Divine revelation with the "visions" of their prophetess, Ellen G. White. Concerning *Criterion 5*) they further deny elements of redemption by saying Christ is not enough, since contrary to Heb. 8-10 in which "the blood of goats" types Christ's "own blood" as he entered "once into the holy place," in fulfilling the Day of Atonement typology "having obtained eternal redemptions for us" (Heb. 9:12); SDAs claim the Leviticus 16 typology pointing to "atonement" (Lev. 16:33,34) is not complete till the purported joint sin-bearer of Satan as "the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities" (Lev. 16:22) after the Second Advent, even though in

¹¹⁸ *Adventist Review*, 6 Jan. 1994, pp. 10,11; quoted in http://www.Smyrna.org/Books/Who_Is_Telling/What_Does_the_Present_Church_Say.htm.

SDA theology this joint sin-bearer of Satan is interpreted to mean Satan *bears final responsibility* for man's sin. This SDA teaching is also an outgrowth of their heretical denial that man is a dichotomy in which "the reasonable soul and flesh is one man" (*Athanasian Creed*, 1662 *Anglican Book of Common Prayer*), so that when Christ said, "It is finished" (John 19:30) i.e., the completed atonement of Christ on the cross, and "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit" (Luke 23:46), on earth "the veil of the temple was rent in the midst" (Luke 23:45), symbolizing the fact that Christ's spirit had entered the heavenly Most Holy Place in fulfillment of the Day of Atonement typology.

The answer is speculative to the question, "Why does Larson first come up with five criteria that condemn the Roman Catholic and Seventh-day Adventists Churches, and then claim that his criteria does not condemn them, but instead shows that these two churches are orthodox?" Is it because he has found substantial numbers of people from these two Churches to financially support his Ministry? If so, then he is in violation of the first and tenth commandments with regard to "covetousness which is idolatry" (Col. 3:5), for Christ saith, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon" (Matt. 6:24). If not, he is still in violation of one element of the pure worship of God called for in the first and second commandments, since the teachings of the Roman Catholic and Seventh-day Adventist Churches on Larson's own test of these five criteria, show that they are "false teachers ... who ... bring in damnable heresies" (II Peter 2:1).

But in "Witchcraft, Cults & Satanic Ritual Abuse" (2005), Part 1, Larson then goes a step further by saying, "There are arguments about whether United Pentecostal people should be considered cultic. I don't think they should, even though they are so called 'Jesus only' people, and do not have a Trinitarian view of the Godhead." The United Pentecostal Church adopt a form of the Sabellian or Modalist heresy in which the three Divine Persons are said to be "one Person" who simply manifests himself in three different modes with three different names. This denies the reality of the three distinct Divine Persons (Matt. 3:16,17; John 3:1-21) e.g., God the Son says, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter," "even the Spirit of truth" (John 14:16,17). It fails to recognize that whereas we commonly use a "one person one being" category of thought, that with the God we must use a "three persons one being" category of thought that maintains monotheism though "one being" (or "one substance") with a plurality of three Divine Persons. For "we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity; neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the substance" (*Athanasian Creed*, 1662 *Anglican Book of Common Prayer*); or in more modern language, "we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity, neither confusing the Persons, nor dividing the [one Supreme] Being." The Bible says persons in such "heresies" "shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:20,21), and hence the *Athanasian Creed* says, they "shall" "without doubt ... perish everlastingly" (1662 *Anglican Book of Common Prayer*). Other errors of the United Pentecostals include the claim that one must "speak in tongues" to evidence salvation i.e., one must imbibe of the Montanist heresy. They thus combine the heresies of Sabellianism and Montanism.

It might also be remarked that the same Trinitarian God whose image is found in the threefold creation of man, woman, and children (Gen. 1:2,26-28), is also found in the

post-diluvian creation of the races of man from the three fountain heads of Japheth, Shem, and Ham; and that he further divided the races of man he created by linguistic culture and geography (Gen. 9-11)¹¹⁹. But the group which would in time become the United Pentecostals, exhibited a perversion of this order from the outset, by placing white people under a negro, G.T. Haywood, in the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World (PAW), contrary to the natural order of Gen. 9:27; even though the more general Christian morality of the American Deep South at the time led whites to withdraw from PAW, much like the Mormons had withdrawn from polygamy under similar pressure for monogamy. Various constituent groups were finally reunited to form the United Pentecostal Church¹²⁰.

While Larson formerly embraced Montanist heretics in the form of Charismatics, the fact that he now embraces the United Pentecostals even though they are both Sabellian and Montanist heretics, shows a further movement away from Biblical requirements to guard against heresy (Rom. 16:17; Gal. 5:19-21). Larson's extension of the ecumenical compromise with Papists and other non-Evangelicals to Modalists of the United Pentecostal Church, is thus a sad example of his further decline from Biblical standards.

In the first chapter of St. Mark's Gospel (Mark 1:21-28), Christ undertakes a public exorcism of one with "an unclean spirit" who "cried out" in a "synagogue" (Mark 1:23). Christ does not ask to take the devil-possessed person into a side-room (although by way of contrast, Christ undertook a private exorcism in Mark 5:1-13, and knowledge of it then later became public in Mark 5:14-20), but at least on this occasion, Christ publicly exorcises him in front of a congregation, for he "rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come of him" (Mark 1:25). "And when the unclean spirit had torn him, and cried with a loud voice, he came out of him. And they" in "the synagogue" "were all amazed" (Mark 1:21,25-27). "And immediately his fame spread abroad thought all the region round about Galilee" (Mark 1:28).

But let the reader also note that there was a very specific purpose for this public exorcism that went beyond simply helping the devil-possessed man to be free from his devil-possession. It was that men might hear and learn the message of Christ, "Repent

¹¹⁹ Beyond the primary race of the human / Adamic race; we also find a three-fold division of secondary race in the Shemitic group with Mediterranean Caucasoids (the Semites), Mongoloids, and Australoids; and a three-fold division of secondary race in the Hamitic group with Mediterranean Caucasoids (the North Africans), Negroids, and Capoids. There are also finer divisions of tertiary race (and sometimes quaternary race). The generality of God's expansion of "Japheth" in the Gen. 9:27 prophecy isolates the white Caucasian tertiary race, inside the Caucasoid secondary race, inside the human / Adamic primary race. This prophecy was dramatically fulfilled with the white settlement of e.g., Australia and North America.

¹²⁰ "United Pentecostal Church International," *Wikipedia* (Nov. 2011; http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Pentecostal_Church_International).

ye, and believe the gospel” (Mark 1:15). We cannot doubt that “believe” here means to have *saving faith*, and we also find it follows an emphasis on the Deity of Christ (Mark 1:3; citing Isa. 40:3 where “Lord” is “Jehovah), in the context of the Holy Trinity (Mark 1:10,11), with people “confessing their sins” (Mark 1:5), “repentance for the remission of sins” (Mark 1:4), and regeneration through the power of the Holy Ghost (Mark 1:8). To detach the larger function of the exorcism in Mark 1:21-28 from this gospel context is to fundamentally misunderstand it. So too, any exorcist in New Testament or post New Testament times who takes up Christ’s commission, “In my name shall the cast of devils” (Mark 16:17), is truly wasting his time if he is not intimately and integrally also connected with the connected commission, “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized” (through spiritual regeneration, Mark 1:8¹²¹) “shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned” (Mark 16:15,16). Our focus should be the gospel, and any exorcisms are only secondary to this. But if we find that such exorcisms involve devaluing or compromising that gospel, as occurs in the ecumenical compromise with Roman Catholics and other non-Evangelicals, then we have gone awry, and are in need of repentance and recommitment to Christ through proper Biblical Protestant Christian principles.

My second concern has to do with the fact that Larson sometimes exhibits loose lips or exaggerations. E.g., in “Demon Possession” (1989) on USA talk-back radio when a caller doubts the reality of devil possession, he uses vain and rash swearing by saying, “I’m gonna’ swear on this Bible that I’ve done that” i.e., exorcisms (Matt. 5:33-37)¹²²; and he also asks someone to pray with him in unison with “millions of people,” when he really had no clear basis (at least that I know of,) for claiming that “millions of people” were listening and praying with him. He tells another caller on talk back radio in “White House Holocaust” (1993) that, “I’ve had all of America praying for you.” While all of us make mistakes, it seems to me that if Larson genuinely repented of these errors he would have censored them out of these recordings, and described the remaining cassettes as “selections” from his talk-back radio programme.

Other such evident exaggerations seem apparent when in “Satanism” (1974) in discussing “haunted houses,” he says that “in England now there are mansions across the country they can’t give away because of the tails of dragon chains, and creaking doors, and footsteps down the hallway.” Or in “Demon Possession” (1989) reference is made

¹²¹ Spiritual regeneration (Titus 3:5) or being “born again” (John 3:1-8), is the correct meaning of the words in the *Nicene Creed*, “I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins” (Eph. 4:5) i.e., “one baptism” (Eph. 4:5) does not refer either to water baptism or its mode of administration.

¹²² Article 39 of the Anglican 39 Articles says, “As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James the Apostle, so we judge, that Christian Religion doth not prohibit, but than a man may swear when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the prophet’s teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.”

to “hundreds and hundreds” of exorcisms that he has done, but by the time of “The danger of Denying Deliverance” (2006) Larson says he has performed over “6,000” exorcisms, and in “Answers for Objections to Exorcism” (2007), reference is made to Larson performing some “10,000 exorcisms.” While one could say the “100s and 100s” between 1989 grew to the “10,000” of 2007 which is the same as the over “6,000” of 2006, it looks like some manipulation of figures is going on here given this gap of 4,000 between over “6,000” and “10,000” occurs in about one year, whereas the movement to “6,000” took about 30 years. It seems that *part of the answer to these figures* is the fact that Larson is now claiming a large number of people are devil-possessed that he formerly would not so claim this of, *infra*, and *part of the answer to these figures* seems to be some level of inflation due to exaggeration.

The issue of Larson’s loose lips, means that *at times*, though certainly not always, he fails to heed the teaching of Eph. 5:12,13. On the one hand, Eph. 5:12 says, “For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret;” but on the other hand, Eph. 5:13 says, “But all things that are reprov’d are made manifest by the light.” Therefore, these two verses create “a balancing act” between recognizing that “it is a shame even to speak” of certain things, but it is nevertheless simultaneously necessary to make some level of reference to these things in order that they may be brought to “light” and “reprov’d.” In fairness to Larson or anyone else in this situation, I concede that this “balancing act” between discussing a matter as is necessary, and not over discussing it, involves the usage of a discretion, with the consequence that wherever that line is drawn one may attract some unfair critics.

However, I think there are some clear instances where Larson has not recognized this element of it being “a shame even to speak” of certain things (Eph. 5:12), and correspondingly not modified his detail when seeking to bring it to “light” that it may be “reprov’d” (Eph. 5:13). Examples of this include his gratuitous playing of ungodly death metal and heavy metal music on his cassettes “Death Metal” (1992) and “Heavy Metal” (1992), *infra*.

But I think this element has in some form been present with Larson from the very outset of what in “Satanism” (1974) he called his “ministry dealing in the area of the demonic and the occult.” In fairness to Larson, in dealing with the area of devils and the occult one is necessarily in a most difficult area to balance out these twin issues of Eph. 5:12,13; and there is much in Larson’s material that I am grateful to have learnt of through him. Nevertheless, I think Larson has at times lost this requisite Biblical balance, which I accept is a difficult Biblical balance to hold in place given the area of his subject matter.

On the upside, I find most interesting and informative Larson’s condemnation of the musical “Jesus Christ Superstar” in “Rock” (1974) and “Satanism” (1974). This blasphemous production debuted on Broadway, New York, USA, in October 1971, as the first ever Broadway rock opera, and *it is sadly returning to New York’s Broadway in March 2012*. E.g., in “Rock” (1974) Larson reveals that this originally British production was “financed by the same person who financed The Beatles,” “Robert

Stigwood,” “an English homosexual rock promoter,” and was written by a couple of “atheists” in the UK, “Mr. Rice and Mr. Weber.” He then says he ministered to a 15 year old girl from “the backwoods of Missouri,” USA, who was devil-possessed. He says the devil spoke through her in a “British accent” saying, “I told you I was a British demon and I inspired Jesus Christ superstar.” He says the devil then bragged about various lyrics in this wicked production that he was proud of having inspired, and when asked his name, the devil said, “My name is blasphemy.” To some extent at least, any such devilish spirit would have to have to be a lying spirit since it linked its identity to the “blasphemy” of Rev. 13:1 i.e., so as to encourage Larson in his prophetic Futurist views. In fact, Rev. 13:1 refers to the Papal Antichrist, and his “blasphemy” includes e.g., the common claim that the Roman Catholic Church is “the Catholic Church.” To call the Roman Church “the Catholic Church,” is to utter a great blasphemy, for “the catholic church” of the *Apostles’ & Nicene Creeds* is *the universal church* of Christ (Acts 9:31; Eph. 4:4; 5:23,31,32), and NOT the Roman Church. Nevertheless, it is also true that “Jesus Christ Superstar” is a most blasphemous and evil production.

And in “Satanism” (1974) Larson’s detail includes the fact that the wicked actor playing “Mary Magdalene” in “Jesus Christ superstar,” is “giving him a body rubdown” as she is “singing, ‘I don’t know how to love him’,” and “saying, ‘Sleep and I shall soothe you,’ while” the actor playing “Jesus says, ‘Oh, it feels so good’.” While we Christians are repulsed to learn of these evil and unBiblical sexual gestures, lyrics, and images in “Jesus Christ Superstar,” I think Larson is within the Eph. 5:12,13 guidelines to give out this admittedly disturbing and scandalous information about the contextual sexual connotations to the words of Mary Magdalene’s song, “I don’t know how to love him.” He is within his rights to say of this vile and obnoxious song, “there’s some preachers stupid enough to play it in their Sunday School classes.”

But on the downside, I find some of Larson’s detail in other areas in “Rock” (1974) is not justified. E.g., on the one hand, I concur with his concern on the promotion of effeminate and homosexual images by a number of musicians he itemizes, including the bisexual, David Bowie, and transvestite Alice Cooper; but on the other hand, I think we need to be far more careful than Larson was in “Rock” (1974) in terms of giving out information on what these people do, especially so, given that he refers to the presence of numerous impressionable minded teenagers in his audience. This same type of thing appears to have persisted over time. Because I consider one might give more detail in a written work of this nature than one can safely give in an oral presentation, I shall give an example of this type of thing, which I hope the good reader understands I do with some reluctance. In e.g., Larson’s “Spiritual Warfare / Pastor Seminar” (1992), in discussing Satanic cults he refers to “the most perverted forms of sexual torment, bestiality, anal sex with animals, you name it, they do it.” I consider in the oral context Larson could have better said, “the most perverted forms of sexual torment, unnatural acts of bestial sodomy, you name it, they do it;” but in a written context he might with all due caution, give this type of added information that in some instances this is bestial sodomy *per anum*.

Larson himself admits that his message may shock certain people in his audience.

E.g., in “Rock” (1974) he says with regard to such shock, “Sorry about that Jerry, you might be back in the hospital tomorrow after I get done,” *infra*. Or on “Gay Deception” (1993) he says, “Ya’ may wantta’ get Grandma out of the room is she’s faint of heart, this may not be the day for her.” While I consider that e.g., both Larson’s “Rock” (1974) and “Gay Deception” (1993) convey far more useful information than the relatively small percentage of unnecessary information of this type in them; by contrast, I consider Larson’s “Death Metal” (1992) and “Heavy Metal” (1992), *infra*, go the other way, and contain a relatively high percentage of unnecessary information of this type in contrast to a relatively small amount of useful information.

E.g., amidst an overwhelming majority of good and useful information in “Gay Deception” (1993), at the start of this video Larson gratuitously gives out some unnecessarily detailed information on how certain transvestites dress, and unnecessarily plays secular music that has a worldly, and indeed, Satanic connotation. He says, “It’s Saturday night and a young man is dressed in drag. He displays fishnet stockings hoisted up to his garter belt; another male reveals a nude body except for a skimpy gold lamé bathing suit. Yet another man flaunts a wig. For all three it’s a night of cross-dressing deviance, but in the eyes of God it’s a classic example of gay deception” (emphasis mine). He then plays a song with the words, “I’m just a sweet transvestite, from Transsexual, Transylvania.” Before these words, the lyrics that Larson does not play include the immediately preceding words, “I’ll get you a Satanic mechanic¹²³.”

I consider Larson’s colourful references to a transvestite with “fishnet stockings hoisted up to his garter belt” or “a skimpy gold lamé bathing suit,” unintentionally panders to those seeking to “glamorize” such deviancy, i.e., I suspect this would bring “a smile of satisfaction” to transvestites and their sympathizers who were listening to Larson’s talk-back radio programme (which is shown on this video), whom I suspect would also probably “smile happily” when they heard the words being sung, “I’m just a sweet transvestite, from Transsexual, Transylvania.” For example, I have known of unsaved heterosexual persons in Sydney to make similar type comments in a positive way about the annual homosexual Sodomite’s Mardi Gra i.e., they think that it is “colourful” and “worth watching,” and even though they are not themselves homosexual, it acts to give them greater tolerance to those who are. By contrast, I think Larson might have better omitted these type of specific details and tried to associate their conduct with more clearly negative imagery and concepts. E.g., he could have said something like, “These perverted men, these silly looking flower boys, put on women’s clothing and wigs, and with their big broad shoulders ridiculously look like big female apes. It’s all contrary to the Biblical teaching of Deuteronomy 22:5, ‘The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman’s garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the Lord.’ And that Old Testament law continues to apply

¹²³ This is from “The Rocky Horror Picture Show” (1975 movie, 20th century Fox Films) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Rocky_Horror_Picture_Show). This includes this song which Larson played parts of entitled, “Sweet Transvestite” (lyrics at: <http://www.stlyrics.com/songs/h/horrorrocky10629/sweettransvestite341754.html>).

for Christians under the New Testament as seen by the issue of dress in I Timothy 2:9 & 10, and fundamental differences between men and women in I Timothy 2:11 to 3:12; or in I Corinthians 11:1-14, for example, verse 3 says, 'I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of every woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God;' verse 14 says, 'Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?;' and then I Corinthians 14:34 reminds us that 'women' are to 'keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak.' And so like the gender-bender feminists attacking patriarchal roles, these gender-bender transvestites are examples of people getting into what Titus 1:12 calls, 'worldly lusts' that Christians should be 'denying'. I think these transvestites look ridiculous and silly. Perhaps they should apply for a job at the local circus as clowns!"

But in the Bob Larson DVDs I purchased in 2011 that date from 1999 to 2007 a further marked deterioration of this kind was evident. Having earlier acquired some useful information from Larson's video, "In the name of Satan" (1990), I expected something similar in the DVDs on "Witchcraft, Cults & Satanic Ritual Abuse" (2005). This came in a package of three DVDs with each containing 2 parts. I found Part 1 of the first DVD could be watched, and it contains some very useful information on e.g., Aleister Crowley, a major figure who helped to promote Satanism, was himself promoted in a song by heavy metal Satan-rocker Ozzy Osbourne (also referred to in Larson's *Book of Rock*, pp. 173-5), engaged in acts of bestial sodomy, and died as a heroin addict with syphilis eating away at his brain which made him a blithering idiot. But this Part 1 of the first DVD also contains some serious heresy in terms of Larson giving spiritual recognition to the Roman Catholic Church, Seventh-day Adventist Church, and United Pentecostal Church (see "My first concern has to do with Larson's ecumenical compromise with Papists and other non-Evangelicals," *supra*).

But when I came to Part 2 of the first DVD I was horrified to learn that Larson has now sunk to new depths in failing to heed the Biblical guidelines of Eph. 5:12,13. On one occasion, Larson should simply have said something like something like, "Satanic ritual abuse involves unspeakable forms of ritualistically dishonouring and desecrating the Bible." Instead he gives unnecessary and shocking details about how this is done *that I wish I had never heard*. On another occasion, Larson should simply have said something like, "Satanic ritual abuse involves unspeakable forms of ritualistically attacking, desecrating, and perverting, the Christian teaching of what it means 'to be born again'." Instead he gives ugly detail about how this is done in Satanic rituals *that I wish I had never heard*. I consider that Larson's gratuitous detail on these two matters involves some of "the depths of Satan" (Rev. 2:24) *that he should not have uttered*. For "it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret" (Eph. 5:12). As I prayed and mediated on these matters, seeking God's guidance, I formed the opinion that I should not watch, but just throw out, Larson's second and third DVDs on "Witchcraft, Cults & Satanic Ritual Abuse" (2005) containing Parts 3 to 6, since Larson could not be trusted to show requisite Biblical discretion on these matters. Hence Parts 3 to 6 went into the garbage bin, sight unseen. Though I am disgusted by what he wrongly revealed in Part 2, since I have already heard it, and since it is part of the same DVD as Part 1 which I wish to retain, I have decided to keep this first DVD

only of Larson's "Witchcraft, Cults & Satanic Ritual Abuse" (2005).

My third concern has to do with the fact that Larson showed a movement away from his earlier 1970 position that the gyrating rhythmic qualities of heavy rock music were intrinsically dangerous, to a 1980s and later position that only the lyrics and presentation images were a problem. Larson moved from a view in "Rock" (1974) that heavy rock music is intrinsically dangerous, to a view that regards such music as e.g., Heavy Metal or Death Metal, as permissible providing it has "Christian" lyrics. In his 1974 cassette, "Rock," he makes the point that people "feel" heavy rock music, not listen to it to "tickle" their "earlobes." At this point in time, he seems to have been influenced to some degree by Frank Garlock's *The Big Beat: A Rock Blast* (1971).

Thus e.g., in "Rock" (1974), Larson said that he attended a "rolling Stones" concert with Mick Jagger, in which, "They danced, they gyrated sensually, it was a heathen orgy. I ... buried my head in my hands. I was 100 yards from the stage and the music just jammed into my skull until my audio-neuro sensory apparatus was dead I was ... completely visceral ... " Then there was "a slight tug in my sleeve," and it was "a baby not a year of age." The baby's mother came and took the child, "and sat down next to Dad Dad never saw her when she sat down ... He was tripped out, and it wasn't on dope. It was on the Devil. See [with regard to] the idea with people high on drugs, the idea with people high on demons, I can look [them] in the eye and spot the difference in a moment. See you can trip out Satanically through music. When you get off through the sounds, when you really surrender your will to that rhythm, you can Satanically trip out on it. It does the same thing as transcendental mediation does. It shuts down the mind so that you consciously lose perceptible control over you will. Then it becomes a demonized state, transcendentalism. He was tripped out through music" (emphasis mine).

Or in "Satanism" (1974), Larson refers to how musical gyrations are used to manipulate people and help put them under the influence of devils. In "Rock" (1974), he says to his audience he will "take a guitar" "to illustrate to you some of the sounds of today's music scene." In the context of 1974 he says, "Most adults think that music is something you listen to. Heavy rock isn't something you listen to. It's something you feel. See, most adults have the idea that rock is just another type of music. Well it isn't. They think that music ought to be something that tickles your earlobes. Heavy rock doesn't. It comes out at you, and jams you in the skull like a ten ton truck. ... Sorry about that Jerry, you might be back in the hospital tomorrow after I get done." And then he starts playing some heavy rock music on his guitar. After which he says, "If you were the Devil, and you wanted to gain control over an entire generation, ... how would you do it? You'd have to have something that'd have immediate contact with the thinking of nearly every young person in the entire world, and there's only one thing It's what Longfellow called, 'The universal language,' music. ... There's only one type of music you can travel anywhere in this world and hear, and that is American hard rock." Larson then plays some on his guitar as a demonstration. "What I seek to convey is this ..., heavy rock ... grabs you, it immerses and envelopes you in sound" This is "why"

“they” who listen to it, do not object to “their minds being invaded with such lyrical pornography That music captures them physically, and once they’re captured by the sound, their mind is not in a place to objectify what enters into it by means of auditory stimuli. In other words, once the music has overcome them, they are totally open, vulnerable, susceptible, to whatever the Devil wants to brainwash them with lyrically. Usually he will use a pulsator de-syncopated tempo that’s heavily electronically accentuated. Let me show ya’ what I mean” (emphasis mine). He then gives a demonstration on his electrical guitar.

Larson then explains certain differences, saying, “The pulsating style of rock is the driving sound most people think of. It can be fast or slow. It used to be very fast.” In the “[19]50s and early [19]60s . . . it used to be like this.” He then gives a demonstration on his electrical guitar. But he then says, “I want to make a point, . . . heavy rock doesn’t have to be fast; in fact, it’s slow. It isn’t because the tempo’s fast that a song is rock. It’s the way that heavy beat just keeps punching home electronically” (emphasis mine). He then gives a demonstration on his electrical guitar. He then says, “You get basically the same effect with a syncopated rhythm.” “Now musically, ‘syncopated’ means ‘place the accent on the off beat.’ But what you do in rock is over electronically accentuate it until you have a very sensualized effect from the music.” He then gives a demonstration on his electrical guitar.

Larson then says, “Hold your head into that long enough, the music completely captivates you, and you head is placed in a totally susceptible position to be indoctrinate by the message of the medium. Riding down the streets of Paris, France, one day, with a young French College student, I opened his glove compartment. It was full of tapes . . . [of] heavy rock artists. . . . I asked him, ‘What is this music doing?’ ‘Well,’ he said, ‘ten years ago you heard nothing but French music; today, it all American hard rock.’ I said, ‘What’s that doing?’ He said, ‘Well, . . . we’re getting in touch with your . . . philosophies.’ ‘Where’s that headed?’ I asked. ‘Oh,’ he said, ‘that’s easy. Once this music has got all the young people of the world together, then we’re gonna’ have a one world government, that’s . . . headed up by one man’.” The comment of Larson, a prophetic Futurist, on this is then, “Make no mistake about it What we are hearing today is something more than music. It is the propandizing tactics of Satan to captivate the mind of a generation and prepare it for the Antichrist.”

Though I am a prophetic Historicist, I see the Papal Antichrist attempting to unite diverse groups through racially mixed marriages and mongrelized races (Dan. 2:43, cf. Neh. 13 & the “mongrel race” which did “dwell in Asdod,” Zech. 9:6, NASB); and this being a serious problem in the events preceding Christ’s return (Dan. 2:43,44; Matt. 24:37-39). There will also be a world-wide exhibition of the Papal Antichrist’s power and forced conversions in the future during the giving out of the Papal “mark” “of the beast” (Rev. 12:17)¹²⁴. But though race-based nationalism with a cultural linguistic

¹²⁴ See my work *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006, 2nd edition 2010), With a Foreword by the Reverend Sam McKay, Secretary of the Protestant Truth Society (1996-2004), Appendix: “The Mark of the Beast - 666”

tongue in geographical separation is God's mechanism to prevent the type of thing Larson is here concerned with (Gen. 9-11; Deut. 32:8; Acts 17:26), Larson's "worldly lusts" (Titus 2:12) of anti-racist sentiments means he fails "to see the wood from the trees," and thus he does not condemn e.g., racial desegregation in the USA and coloured immigration into Western countries in the post World War Two era. Countries such as the USA and Australia should be Biblically defined with reference to the prophecy of Gen. 9:27, "God shall enlarge Japheth," and thus have a white race based Caucasian nationalism centred around persons of white Western European descent, combined with the commonality of the English tongue, and a broadly Protestant Christian culture as derived from the heritage of the British Empire. Alas, in the same way that anti-sexists misuse Scriptures on the universality of the gospel to "male" and "female" (Gal. 3:28 cf. Matt. 19:4; 28:19) to subvert patriarchy (Gen. 2 & 3; I Cor. 11:1-16; 14:34-37; I Tim. 2:8-3:13); so likewise, anti-racists misuse Scriptures on the universality of the gospel to "Jew" and "Greek" (Gal. 3:28; cf. Matt. 8:5-13; 15:21-28; 28:19) to subvert racist forms of patriotism or nationalism (Gen. 9 & 10; see Gen. 12:3 racial "families" = Acts 3:25 "kindreds" = Gal. 3:8 "nations").

Thus it is clear that Larson's concern in "Rock" (1972) and "Satanism" (1974) goes beyond his concern with their bad lyrics and bad images, and while it is concerned with such bad lyrics and bad images in rock music in general, it is also concerned with the genre of *heavy* rock music itself. One finds similar concerns if Frank Garlock's *The Big Beat: A Rock Blast* (1971)¹²⁵, although unlike Larson in "Rock" (1974) and "Satanism" (1974) who limits his concerns about the intrinsic danger of the music itself to *heavy* rock, Garlock expresses similar concerns about not just the genre of *heavy* rock, but the genre of rock music *per se*.

Thus e.g., Frank Garlock refers to a whoremonger, infamous for his many acts of fornication, who "found the best way 'to get the chicks turned on is to make love to the rhythm of rock'n'roll. Any girl will go all the way under the right circumstances.' And any girl who values her purity is foolish to allow herself to be subjected to those circumstances." "It is almost impossible for a ... person to be part of the rock culture ... without being for free sex, drugs, ... hippie standards of dress and conduct, and rebellion If you allow yourself to listen to their music and make them your idols, *you will eventually think the way they do*, because what the musician believes affects the listener, even if the musician never says a word. ... All one needs to do is to take a trip to the places where rock'n'roll has its roots" in "Africa, South America, and India," "and observe the ceremonies which often go along with this kind of music – voodoo rituals, sex orgies, human sacrifice, and devil worship – to know the direction in which we ... are headed." "By using the ... tunes and rhythms that the Africans have used for years to worship the Devil, and which the African Christians shun like a plague, we ... are reverting to savagery." "Music definitely does affect the mind, and any mind filled with

(<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>).

¹²⁵ Garlock, F., *The Big Beat: A Rock Blast*, Bob Jones University Press, Greenville, South Carolina, USA, 1971.

rock music will find it difficult, if not impossible, to think about things that are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, of good report, virtuous, and praiseworthy (Philippians 4:8)¹²⁶.”

Garlock also undertakes an analysis of the musical elements of rock music. He isolates in its “repetition” of “chord pattern” or “a few notes,” its “rhythmic” “beat” with “repetition” of “the dominance of the beat,” a capacity for it to exercise “mass hypnosis.” He also cites a rock idol who says, “Rock ... comes right out and grabs you Rock is visceral, it does disturbing things to your body ..., you find your body tingling, moving with the music. If you try to repress the feeling, it jangles your insides To get into rock, you have to give in to it, let it inside, flow with it, to the point where it consumes you, and all you can feel or hear or think about is the music. ... Such open sensuality’.” Rock is “sensual¹²⁷.” Notably, at this point in time, 1971, Frank Garlock speaks favourably of “other men in the field, such as Bob Larson¹²⁸.”

Unlike Garlock, Larson never considered the genre of rock music *per se* to be intrinsically evil, only *heavy rock* music¹²⁹. However, Larson then changed his position for the worse. Under his new position, he treated the music genre of heavy rock exactly the same as he previously treated the genre of rock music in general, and deemed it to be amoral. Thus his concern came to be exclusively a concern for the lyrics and images conveyed by the music, whether rock or heavy rock. Thus Larson ceased to care about the damaging way that the heavy rock music genre seeks to *work up the flesh with its big beat pulsating rhythm*. Hence sometime between 1974 and 1987, Larson did a back-flip on this issue of heavy rock. In Larson’s *Book of Rock* (1987) he says, “As the beat of contemporary Christian music grew louder and stronger, dissenting voices were raised, mine among them. I saw something disturbing in the defiant rejection of Biblical guidelines for musical expression. A poor imitation of the world’s music and life-styles was not the way to reach ... kids Musically endorsing their frustrations could not lift them to Christ’s level I saw no hope that spiritually viable music expression could evolve from confusion. ... But I was wrong” (emphasis mine). Larson takes the view that “these Christian rock artists” did in fact then “mellow and mature,” so that they became “worthy of acceptance by the church.” But in reaching this decision, he says, “I seriously underestimated the prejudiced inertia of the Evangelical Church. I was shocked that my cautious views were taken further than intended. What I had written and said was used by certain church leaders to turn thumbs on ... guitars and drums in God’s house The contemporary sounds of the seventies were declared a battleground upon which faith itself was disputed. ... Instead of pointing out the shallow and commending the good, many church leaders dug in their heels Today

¹²⁶ Frank Garlock’s *The Big Beat: A Rock Blast* (1971), pp. 19,22,24.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 32-37.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

¹²⁹ Garlock’s type of view is also continued in Richard Peck’s *Rock*, Bob Jones University, South Carolina, USA, 1985.

[in the year 1987], the Evangelical Church has entered a new era. Records and tapes are the fastest growing aspect of the Christian bookseller industry. Many stores report that 50 percent of their sales volume is contemporary Christian music. The airwaves are filled with it. ... Top-forty Christian music charts now list the current popularity of the latest releases People like Amy Grant, ... [and] Petra, ... produce albums The vacuum is being filled. Christian young people who forsake the degenerate sounds of secular rock have an option” in “stacks of albums by contemporary artists whose musical expression reflects youthful thinking Of course, not all trends in the contemporary Christian music scene are positive and praiseworthy. But even the worst modern attempts at expressing Christian faith are better than the secular sex-drenched paens to hedonism ...¹³⁰.”

On the one hand, it must be said that we all change over time, and such change is *hopefully* a good thing as by sanctification in the “Spirit of the Lord,” we “are changed” by degrees “from glory to glory” (II Cor. 3:18). E.g., I regret to say that I once believed in theistic macroevolution, but by the grace of God, in time I came to embrace old earth creationism. This was clearly a change in thinking *for the better*. But on the other hand, by the grace of God, we must guard against going the other way and start “backsliding” (Jer. 3:6,8,11,12,14,22).

With regard to music there has historically been *some level of diversity* among Protestants Christians. For instance, the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 sings “psalms and hymns and spiritual songs” (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16) so that at e.g., Morning Prayer (Matin / Mattins), there is the singing of *Psalms* 95, after which the rubric says, “Then shall follow the *Psalms* in order as they be appointed” from Coverdale’s Psalter; and this is followed by either “the *Hymn* called *Te Deum Laudamus*” or the *spiritual song* of the “*Canticle, Benedicite, Omnia Opera.*” When 1662 BCP using Anglicans sing there is generally musical accompaniment e.g., a church organ. By contrast, the Free Presbyterians understand “psalms and hymns and spiritual songs” in Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16 to be synonyms meaning “psalms and psalms and psalms,” and so they only sing psalms from the Psalter. The Free Presbyterians also say that there should be no musical accompaniment (which I find rather curious given that the Psalms themselves endorse musical accompaniment in e.g., Ps. 92:3; 150:3-5).

While I endorse the Anglican 1662 Book of Common Prayer type of view that in church one can sing not just psalms, but also hymns or spiritual songs, and do so with musical accompaniment, I consider that the church service should be an outgrowth of Biblical teaching. Hence I regard as most appropriate the usage of the *Venite* (Ps. 95) near the start of Morning Prayer which says, “O Come, let us sing unto the Lord: let us heartily rejoice in the strength of our salvation. ... O come, let us worship, and fall down: and kneel before the Lord our Maker” Thus on the one hand, I consider only music which aesthetically fits with this type of service should be used *in church service* i.e., traditional types of Christian music and hymns.

¹³⁰ Larson’s *Book of Rock* (1987), pp. 111-113.

But on the other hand, I think that *outside of a church service* there is a greater latitude. In this context my views approximate those of Larson's older views in "Rock" (1974) and "Satanism" (1974). Hence I am not opposed to someone listening *in the privacy of their own home*, or at a concert such as I heard Keith Green singing at in Sydney with a number of other musicians, to some of the more melodically talented and theologically correct musicians in whose songs *the lyrics are actually listened to*, bearing in mind that they must exercise caution even with these better ones. For instance, in the late 1970s at an auditorium venue in Sydney (i.e., not when he was at Scot's Church), in conjunction with an address he gave, I heard Bob Larson singing, and as I recall it, I am quite happy with his song, "Sittin' in the pew," *infra*. Or I think most, though not all, of Keith Green's songs (1977-1982)¹³¹, or Bob Dylan's album "Saved" (1980)¹³², would fit into this permissible category *in the home, but I would have none of them in the church*. Of course, even here one must "refuse the evil and choose the good" (Isa. 7:16; cf. Heb. 5:14) e.g., I was never happy with Bob Larson's song, "If he made the mountains, and formed the seven seas, it would be a small thing, to set the sinner free," etc. . While I do not doubt that God created, I do not think that this makes redemption "a small thing," but rather, it too is *a very big thing*. Likewise, a small number of the songs of Keith Green (d. 1982) are not theologically sound; after first accepting Christianity, Bob Dylan (b. 1941) proved to be a "stony ground" believer (Mark 4:5) who later left the faith (I John 2:19); and both of these musicians are pictured on the CD albums I have itemized with long hair, though Scripture teaches, "if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him," whereas, "if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her" (I Cor. 11:14,15).

However, in Larson's turn-around position between 1974 and 1987, in which he came to conclude that the music genre of heavy rock is not in itself intrinsically evil, it is clear to me that Bob Larson threw caution to the wind. E.g., his claim in Larson's *Book of Rock* (1987) that there are "stacks of albums by contemporary artists" that can be used is simply not correct. When I have gone through such bookshops where there is a CD player to listen with headsets to various CDs, I have found well below 10% of them would potentially be acceptable for the type of personal home use I endorse. I also think Larson's celebration of "Top-forty Christian music charts" is badly misplaced, and acts to debase the good and elevate the bad. This type of mechanism for selecting "better" songs is a slippery-slide to worldly lusts, with selection of the wrong artists for the wrong reasons. *We need by God's grace to pull people up, not let them fall down into the mud. We need to exercise loving Christian paternalism because most "persons" "cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand"* (Jonah 4:11).

Thus e.g., in Larson's cassettes "Death Metal" (1992) and "Heavy Metal" (1992), contrary to Eph. 5:12, "it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret," he gratuitously plays a lot of this heavy secular music, rather than simply

¹³¹ Keith Green's "The Ministry Years" 1977-1979 (Vol. 1) and 1980-1982 (Vol 2) now available on CD (Last Days Ministries, Oceanside, California, USA, <http://www.KeithGreen.com>).

¹³² Bob Dylan's "Saved" (Columbia, CBS Records, 1980; now available on CD).

reciting some of the objectionable lyrics he is concerned with, and I find this music so painful, hurtful, and repulsive, that I have to fast forward through most of the cassette, stopping at different points where he is just talking and not playing any death metal music. Yet in “Heavy Metal” (1992), Larson distinguishes between secular Heavy Metal such as the group *Knights in Satan’s Service (KISS)*, and what he calls a “Christian group,” like “Petra” or “Deliverance.” The cassette includes an interview with Jimmy Brown of “Deliverance,” and when a listener rings in on talk-back radio to say he likes to listen to both secular and “Christian” Heavy Metal, an attempt is made to distinguish them on the basis of their lyrics. *But this fails to recognize that the reason why their listener cannot make this distinction, is that he engages in fleshly lusts in pulsating and gyrating to this abominable music, in which his brain is largely turned off and he’s not consciously listening to the lyrics all that much. In short, his same worldly lusts are being fed by secular and “Christian” heavy metal, even though the secular heavy metal has abominable Devilish lyrics that the “Christian” heavy metal does not, THE LYRICS ARE TO SOME EXTENT AN OPTIONAL EXTRA!* In the 1990s, Larson thus misses a most important point about “death metal” and “heavy metal” that he seems to have much better understood about 20 years earlier in “Rock” (1974) and “Satanism” (1974).

In this context I have never been able to watch most of Larson’s video, “Metal Connection” (1992). It starts with him referring to his presence with some “long haired musicians,” whom he calls “Christian metal musicians,” in such groups as “Vengeance Rising.” The worldly values of these “long haired musicians” is easy enough to see, and “Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him” (I Cor. 11:14). This is *a shameful video* which I have found too horrible and painful to listen to much of. It is clear to me from the little I have seen of these ghastly so called “Christian metal musicians,” that they are full of worldly lusts, who are pandering to many of the same type of lusts that the secular metal musicians do. Their music debases people’s minds irrespective of the lyrics. Rather than compromising and perverting the gospel of Christ to ungodly and worldly forms, as an Evangelical I believe we must faithfully and clearly proclaim the gospel in its Biblical purity. Hence in this type of endorsement by Larson of “Christian metal musicians,” I see worldly lusts replacing Biblical values of sanctification in the Spirit.

My fourth concern has to do with the fact that Larson has massively deteriorated in the quality of his Christian teaching since some point in the 1990s. Given the above concerns, this is a case of *going from bad to worse*; although whereas I formerly found some value in his works from the 1970s to parts of the 1990s, from which I selected the good and rejected the bad, I regret to say he badly deteriorated at some point in the 1990s. This was forcefully brought home to me when in 2011 I acquired some of Bob Larson’s DVDs which date from 1999 to 2007, and I was truly surprised by some of the things I saw in them. In them, a notable deterioration is clearly evident with Larson that seems datable to some point in the 1990s.

For example, in “Satanism” (1974), Larson who is addressing an audience in a Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) Church in the USA warns against the dangers of seeing the film, “The Exorcist.” He says, “Nothing has done more to intensify the current interest

in the demonic than has the movie, ‘The Exorcist’.” He then recounts a story of how a man from the SDA Cult came to him, and asked him to speak to his SDA wife. He says the man’s job meant he worked at night, and after this woman had seen the film, “The Exorcist,” a devil started to frighteningly stalk her when she was at home by herself. When she got into bed at night-time, this devil appeared to her in her bed seeking to entice her to engage in incubus (sex with a devil), for which reason she started sleeping in her car to get away from it. The same thing happened to the other woman she went to see the film with, and after she started running the car engine to keep warm at night, due to carbon-monoxide poisoning she and five others were killed as they slept. The distraught woman from the SDA Church is reported as saying to Bob Larson, “God forgive me, because I went to see ‘The Exorcist’ six people were Satanically murdered.” By contrast, in his “Answers for Objections to Exorcism” (2007), Larson shows a segment of an interview with him on CNN Television News in the USA, which includes footage from the film, “The Exorcist.” When I saw it I was initially caught by surprise, but then quickly put my hands up over my eyes so I would see no more of it. Why did Larson not censor this evil out? Why is seeing “The Exorcist” movie so dangerous that it might be taken by a devil as an invitation to him in 1974, but about 25 years later in 2007 something that can have excerpts shown from in a Larson DVD? Larson has clearly lost much of the horror he once had for these shocking things, and is happy to use them as part of a “sales gimmick” in one of his DVDs. And with an overly high frequency he now likes to repeatedly call himself, “The Exorcist,” seemingly with some background allusion to some of the cultural concepts of “The Exorcist” generated by this movie. *So what has happened to Bob Larson?*

“Son of man, seest what they do?” “But turn thee yet again, and thou shalt see greater abominations” (Ezek. 8:6). In his cassette, “Exorcism” (1992), Larson correctly and wisely urges hesitancy and reluctance in concluding that a person is devil-possessed; urging “checks and balances” and “objective confirmation” before reaching such a conclusion after exhausting all other possibilities. Likewise in “Demon Possession” (1989), he rejects the claims of a trichotomist caller (Rick from Vancouver, Canada,) who claimed that man has a “spirit” and a “soul” and that Jesus’ exorcisms were instances of healing “sick” people in which “he just cleaned up that particular part of their soul.” Though this caller had numerous other errors that Larson correctly rejected, *it is also to be noted that this basic category of thought in which man is a trichotomy and devil-possession has to do with the “soul” not the “spirit,” with some important modifications is essentially the idea now adopted by Larson (see Larson’s trichotomist views in “Answers for Objections to Exorcism,” infra).*

Then “Michael” from “Ohio,” USA rings regarding the fact that some people told him his sinful behaviour exhibited the work of devil-possession. He asks Larson, “Don’t you think that sometimes the activity ... of people who are supposedly demon-possessed is just what they happened to be bent towards ...?” Bob Larson replies, “... I can tell you there are far too many people who run around loose-lipped and prophesying and getting all sorts of so called ‘words of wisdom’ about people who have demons and 99.9% of the time it’s absolute baloney. If you have a demon, nobody has to tell anybody, you don’t have to get any secret ‘word of knowledge’ about it, ... those things’ll show up and

they'll make themselves readily plain There ought to objective verification. Not some subjective personal knowledge that somebody has a demon ... ; and you may just have had a problem of developing habituated responses to evil, and you had not yet grown in grace and learned to stand on the Word ... , and somebody came along and threw this trip on you, and there was some type of psycho-somatic response and for a while it did help; but because it was not dealt with by claiming the 'exceeding precious promises' to be an escaper of 'corruption,' accepting the 'divine nature' as the Scripture says in Peter [II Peter 1:4], you dealt with it on the wrong kind of basis, and if that's what happened, I feel sorry for you, but the answer's to get on the Word and stand on the Word, and not listen to what other people tell you about demons" (emphasis mine).

Staggeringly, it seems to me that in addition to adopting some of the categories of thought from the trichotomist caller (Rick from Vancouver, Canada), Larson has done a back-flip and is now doing the very type of thing that he here condemned in "Demon Possession" (1989) in his comments to the caller who was allegedly said to have been formerly devil-possessed (Michael from Ohio, USA).

Thus in contrast to "Demon Possession" (1989) and "Exorcism" (1992), in "The danger of Denying Deliverance" (2006) we find that Larson now foolishly throws all such caution to the wind. E.g., he tries to urge "Christians" to think that they "have demons" as manifested in such things as their unwarranted "anger" or "addiction." This is confusing man's sinful nature and lusts (e.g., Ps. 51:5; Rom. 7:7-25), with devil-possession. The vigour with which Larson seeks to so convince Christians that their sinful desires in fact exhibit devil possession requiring exorcism which he calls "deliverance," puts a very different tone on Bob Larson compared to the old Bob Larson of the 1970s to parts of the 1990s. I DO NOT RECOGNIZE IN THE BOB LARSON I SEE IN "The danger of Denying Deliverance" (2006), THE BOB LARSON I STUDIED AND WITH VARYING DEGREES OF QUALIFICATION BENEFITED FROM, OF THE 1970S TO PARTS OF THE 1990s. *So what has happened to Bob Larson?*

In "Answers for Objections to Exorcism" (2007), Larson is shown in a short TV debate televised on CNN Television News, USA, with a Baptist Minister, John MacArthur (b. 1939) of California, USA¹³³. MacArthur says he thinks "the whole thing" of exorcism "is bogus." The reason is that MacArthur believes that devil possession and exorcism exist only in specific times, and stopped within, or about the time of, the end of the New Testament. Showing his neo-Alexandrian errors, in *The MacArthur Study Bible on the New American Standard Bible* (Nelson Publishers, USA, 1997 & 2006), John MacArthur further says of Mark 16:9-20, "The external evidence strongly suggests that these verses were not originally part of Mark's gospel. While the

¹³³ Re: MacArthur, see Textual Commentaries Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, section "9) Usage of ASV, RSV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NKJV, NIV & Moffatt Bible in this commentary." In "Outline of an Exorcism" (1991), in a reportive manner, Larson speaks more favourably of MacArthur in the context of a lawsuit MacArthur went through in connection with some USA legal issues concerning Ministers of Religion being told by people in pastoral counselling about crimes they knew of.

majority of Gr.[eek] manuscripts contain these verses, the earliest and most reliable do not.” He then comments on these verses, but with qualification as to their authenticity e.g., at Mark 16:16 he says, “Even if v. 16 is a genuine part of Mark’s gospel” etc.; and says at Mark 16:17,18, “The signs were promised to the apostolic community (Mt. 10:1; 2 Cor. 12:12), not all believers in all ages.” Thus in the first place MacArthur wrongly thinks the words of Mark 19:9-20 are *probably not original*; and in the second place he incorrectly considers that even if they are, then Christ’s words, “in my name shall they cast out devils” (Mark 16:17) does not apply beyond the apostles’ time.

Larson then addresses this and other matters of this earlier short debate in this DVD, saying that MacArthur is a “Calvinist Dispensationalist.” On the one hand, I would certainly disagree with John MacArthur’s Dispensationalism (and any other form of so called “Dispensationalism”¹³⁴); although like him, I am a Calvinist. As discussed at “b) The NT teaching that apostles, prophets, and tongues end c. 100-110 A.D., but that devil-possession and exorcists continue till Christ’s return,” *supra*, the reality of devil-possession continuing after NT times up till the Second Advent is the Biblical teaching (e.g., Mark 16:17; Rev. 16:13,14). But on the other hand, I consider the wrong issue was ultimately here isolated in this debate between Larson and MacArthur, since it did not go beyond this preliminary issue of whether or not devil possession and exorcism continues after NT times. Thus by matching MacArthur and Larson in debate, the matter was locked into this preliminary issue in which I would agree with Larson and not MacArthur. But beyond this important preliminary issue, the question for consideration is whether Larson is correctly isolating the Biblical doctrine of exorcism in harmony with the words of Christ, “In my name shall they cast out devils” (Mark 16:17); or whether in fact Larson is among those that Christ refers to when he says, “Many will say to me ..., Lord, Lord, have we not ... in thy name cast out devils? ... And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity” (Matt. 7:21-23).

As already noted, in Larson’s “The danger of Denying Deliverance” (2006), *Larson’s tone, demeanor, persona, and theological message on exorcism has so radically altered, that I can no longer recognize him relative to his former self.* For Larson here most vigorously seeks to persuade his audience that their sinful desires such as unwarranted “anger,” or “addiction,” in fact constitute devil-possession warranting and calling for exorcisms (he also now calls exorcism “deliverance”). He also claims that he repeatedly tried to get Steve Erwin of a Brisbane crocodile zoo in Australia to allow him to perform an exorcism. Erwin declined the invitation and Larson thinks this *may* be

¹³⁴ I do not object to referring to the “pre-Jewish Dispensation,” “Jewish Dispensation,” and “Christian Dispensation” e.g., Sir William Blackstone refers to how, “long before the Jewish Dispensation, by the destruction of two cities by fire from heaven,” “God” showed his “law” against sodomy “is an universal, not merely a provincial, precept” (4 Bl. Com. 216; emphasis mine). But this type of usage of the term “Dispensation,” has *none of the theological loading of the term “Dispensation” as used by Dispensationalists* e.g., Cyrus Scofield (d. 1921) in *Scofield’s Bible*.

responsible for his subsequent death when he was stung by a stingray; but the only reason Larson ever advances for his claims that Erwin was in need of such an exorcism seem to be that he had some heathen Buddhist nuns pray over him. While I would agree it was very wrong to allow such heathens to pray over him, it is quite another thing to suggest that this means there are valid grounds for thinking that Erwin was devil-possessed. Then he claims in “Answers for Objections to Exorcism” (2007), that he exorcized a devil from someone who picked up a “curse” from a “blood-transfusion” he had in Japan. He claims that a non-Christian can get a “curse” passed on from such “a blood-transfusion,” but says he is not against blood transfusions because if a Christian first prays over the blood then such a curse cannot be passed on to him. Though the “qualification” means he is not preaching against blood-transfusions, *per se*, this *really is still quite ludicrous and reminds me of elements of Jehovah’s Witnesses’ rhetoric about blood transfusions.*

Yet more examples of this type of thing are found in “Larson’s Top Ten Exorcisms” (1999). E.g., a Mongoloid called “Blaine” says that he is a Christian, but that he has been getting power from plants and animals via Red Indian heathen religion. Certainly I would agree that dabbling in heathen Red Indian religion puts one into contact with devils. However, when he is exorcised by Larson, the basis or so called “legal authority” for Blaine’s devil possession is not his own personal dabbling in heathenism, but rather, it is said to be a witch’s curse on his “great-grandfather” whom he says was “the first Eskimo missionary in Alaska.” Thus Larson has Blaine say, “I Blaine renounce the curse put on my great-grandfather, I claim my heritage in Jesus Christ ... because Christ was cursed on the tree, no curse of Satan has any right to prevail on me” Had Larson argued devil-possession as a result of Blaine’s involvement in Red Indian heathen religion, then depending on exactly what Blaine had done, this *might* be potentially credible. However, the fundamental idea that a Christian can be devil-possessed because a witch put a curse on his great-grandfather is simply not sustainable. Larson also exorcises e.g., a devil “of anger,” a devil “of death” because a person tried to commit suicide. Thus the basic message is that persons who exhibit such fleshly lusts as “anger,” or suicidal tendencies; or think that their great-grandfather or some other distant relative might have been cursed by some obscure and unidentified long dead figure, should come to him for an exorcism.

Or in “The Devil Inside – Down Under: The Vatican Exorcism Edition” or “An Interview With The Pope’s Exorcist” (2006), one of those interviewed is “Lisa.” She says that at 16 she was sexually abused at a Roman Catholic convent, and as a consequence of this rape she got pregnant. To the question of “how” the devil “got into” her, the answer given is that more than 10 years before she was raped, as a little girl she fell off a swing and cut her lip. A devil is then said to have “entered” her, and Lisa says, “he was saying he replaced my mother’s love.” How many children fall off swings or in other ways accidentally hurt themselves in childhood? Can every mother say she is always there to immediately help? Are we to seriously believe that such common elements of growing up might actually be points of devil-possession? Once again, this is quite absurd, but once again it shows that Larson is creating a whole series of scenarios where he can say to just about anybody and everybody something like, “You need an

exorcism ... and I'm The Exorcist!"

The intensity with which Larson is now trying to essentially recruit people into believing that that are somehow in need of an exorcism by him is further evident in the words of a song, thrice repeated near the start of his, "The danger of Denying Deliverance" (2006). Showing a variety of images of Larson performing an exorcism and then ending with a picture of the Devil behind bars with the words on top, "The Devil Inside," the words of the song are, "The devil inside, the devil inside, every single one of us, the devil inside" (emphasis mine). This indicates that "the devil" is "inside" "every single one of us," and so contextually seems to indicate that "every single one of us" requires an exorcism, since this is sung as Larson performs an exorcism, and this DVD is all about "The danger of Denying Deliverance" meaning, "The danger of Denying" the need for an exorcism. And that Larson is clearly now acting with foolhardiness in this matter, is further seen by the quote at the start of "The Devil Inside – Down Under: The Vatican Exorcism Edition" or "An Interview With The Pope's Exorcist" (2006). This quotes the Pope's Exorcist, saying, "An unnecessary exorcism never hurt anyone ..." Father Gabriele Amorth, Founder Association of Exorcists, Society of St. Paul, Rome" (emphasis and punctuation mine).

Larson is therefore clearly giving a fairly strong sales-pitch to first try and convince people that they need an exorcism, because "the devil" is "inside" "every single one of us;" as seen by such things as: unwarranted "anger;" "addiction;" "blood-transfusions" not first prayed over to remove any "curse" from them; the possibility of some long dead and unidentifiable obscure figure in the shadows placing a curse on some ancestor who died long before one was born, possibly as far back as a "great-grandfather;" or a childhood injury that made the person frightened or angry because nobody was nearby to give him comfort, but in fact some devil was watching and used this event to start devil-possession of that person. In this context, when Larson gets someone who co-operates with him, he does not want to lose them, at least immediately. Hence he has developed a teaching of "relapses" for which he gets some support from "Father" Amorth in "The Devil Inside – Down Under: The Vatican Exorcism Edition" or "An Interview With The Pope's Exorcist" (2006).

By contrast, in "Satanism" (1974), Larson says with respect to a Satanic Ouija board, "If you're a born again Christian and your heart is right with the Lord, you can't get the counter on a Ouija board to move." I.e., in 1974 Larson rejected the possibility of devils being able to act out their desires through a Christian. Moreover, Larson's new view is very different to his earlier teaching about sealing the exit of a devil with Christ's blood to prevent its return. Thus in "Exorcism" (1992), (with Scripture citations for these four steps provided by myself, and showing the four steps in a different order to the order they were discussed in by Larson,) he says an exorcism involves: 1) ordering the devil to leave in the name of Christ, an action which may also involve a prayer to God (cf. Matt. 8:32; 17:21; Mark 1:25; Acts 19:13,15); 2) knowing the devil's name so it can be referred to, and because the name usually represents a designation (cf. Mark 5:9,15; Luke 8:30); 3) "ensuring that the sin once confessed" by which the devil got access, "can be placed under the blood of Christ and removed as an access for that spirit" (cf. Luke

11:24-26; I John 1:9-2:1; 2:20; 3:23,24; 4:4; & 4) following the exorcism with a blessing inviting the Holy Ghost to enter this person (cf. Matt. 12:44; I John 3:23,24; 4:4).

The Bible contrasts different types of exorcisms e.g., sometimes a “devil” “goeth not out but by prayer and fasting” (Matt. 17:18,21) i.e., this is a much longer type of exorcism than normal, requiring more prayer and preparation by the exorcist than normal. Some devils are garrulous and seek to use the opportunity of the exorcism to convey information to human beings present there which the Lord does not want them to hear, and so must be “suffered not” “to speak” such things (Mark 1:34, cf. Mark 1:23-25). Some devils are violent, and such a devil “teareth” the person he possesses, and his victim “foameth” at the mouth “and gnasheth with his teeth, and pineth away” (Mark 9:17,18); and such violence can result in “bruising” (Luke 9:39). There is also a contrast made between a successful and unsuccessful exorcism in terms of long-term effect.

Moreover, whenever Christ performed an exorcism, it was connected with his preaching “repent ye, and believe the gospel” (Mark 1:15) and thus e.g., sometimes done in a synagogue (Mark 1:21-31,39). So too, it is notable that his words, “In my name shall they cast out devils” are contextually part of the Great Commission to “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel” (Mark 16:16,17) i.e., exorcisms are relevant at the point of preaching the gospel because some people will need to be exorcised before they can accept the Gospel, as devils who possess them will try to inhibit them in various ways. Thus the salient point to note is that a genuine exorcism is connected to the person in question exercising saving faith in Christ, as they “repent ... and believe the gospel” (Mark 1:15). Hence these two elements need to be kept in focus (even if some later fall away from the faith as “stony ground” believers, Mark 4:5,16; Heb. 6:4-6).

On the one hand, when exorcisms are done properly, such as the ones Jesus did, no devil will return (Matt. 8:28-34), either because they are sent “out of the country” (Mark 5:10), or “into” certain animals such as “swine” (Mark 5:11), or “into the deep (*abusson / abysson*, from *abussos / abyssos*¹³⁵, rendered ‘the bottomless pit’ in Rev. 9:11; 11:7; 17:8; 20:1,3)” (Luke 8:31). E.g., we read in Luke 8:2, of “certain women, which had been healed” by Jesus “of evil spirits and infirmities,” for instance, “Mary called Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils;” or in Mark 16:9, “Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.”

But on the other hand, we read of how “when” an “unclean spirit is gone out of a man,” he might “return,” and bring “with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself,” so “the last state of that man is worse than the first” (Matt. 12:43-45); and one, though not the only possible scenario for when a devil is so “gone out of a man,” is after an unsuccessful exorcism (Acts 19:16¹³⁶). Notably, this return of a devil with some

¹³⁵ A feminine singular accusative noun, from which we get our English word, “abyss.” Rendered “the deep” in Rom. 10:7 with reference to hell (cf. Acts 2:27,31; Eph. 4:9; I Peter 3:18-20); and as “bottomless” in Rev. 9:1,2.

¹³⁶ The words, “gone out (*exelthe*, subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular

other devils is possible in Matt. 12:43-45 because the devils find the “house” of that person to be “empty” i.e., unoccupied by the Holy Spirit of God because the person is not converted to Christ. Thus the person cannot claim the promises, “greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world” (I John 4:4), and “If God be for us, who can be against us?” (Rom. 8:31), for only if we are saved is “God with us” (Matt. 1:23) in the sense of Christ dwelling with us.

Therefore, with both the Romish “Father” Amorth and Larson talking about “relapses” in which devils return to people after an exorcism, they both thereby bear testimony against themselves that their exorcisms are fake. That is because, if those whom they were exorcising were genuinely calling upon Christ in saving faith, the devils would not find the “house” to be “empty” (Matt. 12:44), but rather, would find the house to be inhabited by the Holy Ghost and thus impregnable to them (I John 3:24; 4:4).

In this context, it is notable that in the I John 3:24 to 4:4 passage, the holy Apostle St. John, says in I John 3:23,24, “he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him” i.e., in “Jesus Christ” (I John 3:23), “and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us” (I John 3:24) (emphasis mine). Thus St. John looks to obedience of God’s commands as a fruit of genuine salvation. Indeed, he earlier says in I John 2:4, “He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.” One of the commandments that he specifically isolates is that of I John 5:21, “keep yourselves from idols;” and another command St. John refers to in II John 7,9-11, is that if “deceivers” “who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” should “come” “unto you,” then because any suchlike are “an antichrist,” who “transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ,” then one is to “receive him not,” “neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.”

However, as already noted, in “The Devil Inside – Down Under: The Vatican Exorcism Edition” or “An Interview With The Pope’s Exorcist” (2006), we see the Vatican’s chief exorcist, “Father” Gabriel Amorth, sitting in front of a Roman Catholic

verb, from *exerchomai*)” (Matt. 12:43), might not be in the context of an exorcism in which a devil is specifically cast out, but may simply refer to the type of thing we read of in Rev. 16:13 where “three unclean spirits” are said of their own volition to “come out (*ek*) of the mouth” i.e., with an intent to return. But bearing in mind the generality of the words, “When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man,” and the story of the “seven sons of ... Sceva” “exorcists” in Acts 19:13-20, in which fake exorcists attempt to cast out a devil, and “the man in whom the evil spirit” came out of the man as he “leaped on” these “vagabond Jews,” “and overcame them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded;” it seems to me that *one* such instance of Matt. 12:43-45 could be after an unsuccessful exorcism such as that attempted by the seven sons of Sceva, i.e., if it suited a devil’s purposes to pretend that he had been exorcised e.g., because he was directed by Satan to fain support for a particular person’s apostate ministry. Thus the generality of Matt. 12:43-45 seems to cover multiple scenarios as to how such a devil might have “gone out of a man.”

“altar” with a “tabernacle” in the middle which contains the so called, “reserved sacrament” i.e., pieces of Communion Bread, which Papists idolatrously bow down and adore by genuflecting when they pass it. However, “no adoration ... ought to be done ... unto the sacramental bread or wine ..., for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians ... ” (Final Rubric, The Communion Service, Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*). Thus “the Pope’s exorcist” clearly sets aside the commandment, “keep yourselves from idols” (I John 5:21). Moreover, the transubstantiation heresy upon which this usage of the “tabernacle” is premised, denies the humanity of Christ, “For ... the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one” (Final Rubric, The Communion Service, Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*). Thus this “Father” Amorth is among them “who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John 4:3; II John 7) via the transubstantiation heresy, and yet it is clear that Bob Larson is giving spiritual recognition to both him and Romanism in this DVD contrary to the command of II John 10,11 “receive him not,” “neither bid him God speed,” with the consequence that Larson is made a “partaker of his evil deeds.” *Thus neither Amorth nor Larson can be said to be exorcists who “keep his commandments” (I John 2:3).*

Furthermore, as Larson himself documents in “Exorcism” (1992), those involved in the Roman Catholic rite of exorcism seek to get those who are exorcised to take the Roman Mass. This means that such persons are in violation of the Second Commandment which prohibits idolatry (Exod. 20:4-6) by “adoration... unto the sacramental bread,” which is “idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians ... ” (Final Rubric, The Communion Service, Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*), and also a violation of the Third Commandment which prohibits blasphemy (Exod. 20:7), because the Roman Mass is “blasphemous” by its denial of the completed atonement of Christ on the cross (Article 31, Anglican 39 Articles). Moreover, in “The Devil Inside – Down Under: The Vatican Exorcism Edition” or “An Interview With The Pope’s Exorcist” (2006), Larson refers to a Fiji Indian woman, Judith, far gone in the sin of rebellion against patriarchal values which in no way worries Larson (Isa. 3:9,12; Titus 2:5), and who after one of Larson’s exorcisms exclaims, “I’m free I’ve been bound since I was five years old Jesus is real” But she is then pictured with her “present partner” Lazar, i.e., she is living in sin in a *de facto* relationship, although the DVD says, “Judith and Lazar have recently been engaged.” What saith the Word of God? “Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, ... shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God” (I Cor. 6:9-11).

Therefore, *the fruits in the lives of the idolaters and fornicators show that these people are not true Christians. They show that their profession of faith in Christ at the time of their exorcisms was bogus, and thus even if a devil had “gone out of” them, he, and any others he might bring with him can “enter in” these people because their “house” is “empty” of God’s Spirit (Matt. 12:43-45; I John 3:23,24; 4:4).* Hence if we are to accept the testimony of both Amorth and Larson that those whom they exorcise have been experiencing “relapses” of devil-possession in which devils return to people after an

exorcism in the person being exorcised has professed faith in Christ as Saviour and Lord, then we must accept the natural corollary to this, namely, that the exorcisms of Amorth and Larson are fake exorcisms; not because we necessarily dispute that devils are present at these exorcisms, but that both men by their testimony admit that they are among those who “have cast out devils,” while simultaneously being among those who “doeth” not “the will of” the “Father which is in heaven” (Matt. 7:21,22)

It is clear from Larson’s “The Devil Inside – Down Under: The Vatican Exorcism Edition” or “An Interview With The Pope’s Exorcist” (2006), *that a number of those who claim to have been exorcised by Larson do not exhibit the fruits of Christian conversion, even though Larson is claiming that it is through turning to Christ’s power that they are exorcised*¹³⁷. This is all very different to the sort of thing Bob Larson says in “Satanism” (1974), such as, “We need not fear the Devil,” and citing “I John 4:4,” says, “‘he that is in’ us ‘is’ ‘greater’ ‘than he that is in the world’.” “The child of God has no fear of Satan as long as he walks and lives in fellowship with the Lord, and does not allow Satan access to his life though gross and serious sin.” *If idolatry and fornication are not “gross and serious sin,” which if wilful and unrepentant exhibit the fact that a person is not a true Christian, then what conduct is such sin?* In the words of the Litany, “From fornication, and all other deadly sin; and from all the deceits of the world, the flesh, and the devil, *Good Lord, deliver us*” (Anglican Book of Common Prayer of 1662). *So what has happened to Bob Larson?*

In Larson’s “Answers for Objections to Exorcism” (2007), the big issue becomes, *Can a Christian be devil-possessed?* Sadly the debate becomes fixated on the difference between MacArthur’s erroneous Dispensationalist view that they cannot *because devil-possession does not occur after NT times* and so all and any modern day exorcists are necessary fake exorcists like the seven sons of Sceva (Acts 19:13-19), and Larson’s correct claim that devil-possession and exorcism continue after NT times down to our own day. Thus the debate never moves onto the issue of distinguishing in post NT times between Biblically sound and good exorcists (e.g., Matt. 8:28-34; Mark 16:9,17), as opposed to unsound and bad exorcists (Matt. 7:21-23; 12:43-45; Acts 19:13-19).

Through reference to Matt. 12:44; I John 3:23,24; 4:4, the question has already been answered in the negative, *Can a Christian be devil-possessed?* But in view of the importance of this issue to the *MacArthur verses Larson debate*, and connected theological issues, let us now further consider the question, *Can a Christian be devil-possessed according to those who believe in devil-possession after NT times?*

Certainly I agree with John MacArthur’s conclusion that a true and genuine born-again Christian cannot be devil-possessed, but for different reasons to MacArthur’s erroneous Dispensationalist view. Firstly, it is to be noted that the commission of Mark 16:17 is in the wider evangelistic context. Thus Christ says in Mark 16:15-17, “Go ye

¹³⁷ See also Jason who is living with his “partner” i.e., a fornicator; or Lisa who has “relapses” of devil-possession i.e., she is “empty” (Matt. 12:44) of the indwelling of God’s Spirit (I John 3:24; 4:4).

into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues” etc. . I.e., as part of their evangelistic outreach to “preach the gospel” (Mark 16:15) they might find it necessary to “cast out devils” *from an unbeliever, supra*.

Secondly, it is important to distinguish between *devil’s seeking to influence people* and *devil-possession*. *With regard to devil’s seeking to influence people, including Christian believers*, Christians are warned, “Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour: whom resist stedfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world” (I Peter 5:8,9).

The Devil and other devils have a capacity to possess and control animals. While the original reason for this capacity is speculative, it is clear that in general they cannot do so at whim, and thus the devils had to gain Christ’s permission to so possess “the herd of swine” (Matt. 8:31,32). Satan clearly misused this capacity when he devil-possessed the serpent in Eden and spoke through it (Gen. 3-5; Rev. 12:9). More generally, like his minion devils, and usually acting through them, he can cross-apply this capacity to “whisper in the ear” of a person. This should not be confused with, and is NOT the same as devil-possession. Though called, “whispering in the ear,” in fact the devils make no audible sound, but rather exercise a capacity in a person’s mind to suggest an idea which that person is then free to accept or reject (Matt. 16:23). Even those who by years of submission to God’s directive are more skilled in fighting these things, must still always by God’s grace guard against them. But because “unbelieving” (Rev. 21:8) atheists (Ps. 14:1) believe in neither temptation by their sinful natures (Jas. 1:14,15) nor suggestive thoughts by devils (Matt. 16:23), they are easily manipulated by Lucifer through his hosts of devils by “ideas” implanted in their heads which they take to be “their idea” and accept, e.g., “Smart people don’t believe in God,” “Let’s get drunk,” etc. . If by God’s grace we “resist the Devil, ... he will flee from you” (Jas. 4:7), but the atheistic “fool” (Ps. 53:1) is “an easy target.”

But this is not the same as devil-possession. Hence Christ warns the Apostle Peter of this when “the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not” (Luke 22:31,32). Hence after St. Peter’s repentance, Christ asks him, “Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these?” (John 21:15); i.e., *he does NOT perform an exorcism on Peter.*

Importantly, a Christian believer cannot be devil-possessed. That is because we are specifically told in I John 4:1-4, “Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world.” Who is “he that is in you” (I John 4:4)? God, for “hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us” (I John 3:24). *Therefore to suggest*

that a Christian believer can be devil-possessed, is to deny that “greater is he,” God, “that is in you, than he,” the Devil, “that is in the world”! But “If God be for us, who can be against us?” (Rom. 8:31), for if we have “Jesus” we have “God with us” (Matt. 1:21,23). Thus because we are indwelt by the Spirit of God (I John 2:20; 3:24), the “house” is not “empty” (Matt. 12:44), and so no devil can enter it. Of course, I do not deny that there are various persons who make a “lip-service” profession of faith, and so who are not true Christians, and these persons may under certain circumstances be devil-possessed, but that is another matter.

Therefore, on the one hand, *devils may seek to influence Christians by “whispering in their ear” an idea* (Luke 22:31,32; I Peter 5:8,9), which the Christian can then accept or resist in the same way he accepts or resists a thought he gets from his own sinful nature, or from some external stimulus e.g., a movie or a friend. But on the other hand, *a true Christian cannot be devil-possessed* (Matt. 1:23; Rom. 8:31; I John 4:4).

However, in Larson’s “The danger of Denying Deliverance” (2006) and “Answers for Objections to Exorcism” (2007), he repeatedly and vigorously claims Christians can be, and indeed frequently are, devil-possessed, and that this “manifests” in things like their unwarranted “anger,” or “addiction,” which he incorrectly claims is the result of devil-possession, whereas at least in the overwhelming number of most instances, it is in fact simply the result of their sinful nature and desires.

In “Answers for Objections to Exorcism” (2007), Larson claims four Scriptures teach that Christians can be so devil-possessed. Firstly, in I Sam. 16:14, “but the Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him.” Larson here fails to recognize the sad reality that Saul was not a saved man. Of course, he was the king and hence his right to rule had to be accepted and respected; and the Spirit of God was sometimes present in this context. Yet Saul’s dying wish was for euthanasia followed by his self-murder (I Sam. 31:3-6). Since “no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him,” it follows that because the last thought of a person who commits suicide is to commit self-murder, that those guilty of such “murders” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:21; cf. Rev. 21:8; 22:15). Hence the Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* rubric at the start of The Burial Service says, “Here it is to be noted, that the Office ensuing is not to be used for any that ... have laid violent hands upon themselves” (emphasis mine) i.e., as unrepentant murderers they are quite properly denied a Christian burial. *Clearly then, far from showing that Christians can be devil-possessed, I Sam. 16:14 actually shows how devils may affect an UNSAVED person.*

The second Scripture Larson claims supports his teaching that Christians can be so devil-possessed is Luke 13:10-17. This says that when Christ “was teaching in one of the synagogues on the sabbath,” “a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, ... eighteen years” was “healed on the sabbath day.” Larson considers that only “godly people” would be in “one of the synagogues” and so this is the same as a Christian woman. I find this a rather startling claim and very different to “the old Bob Larson.” When I saw Bob Larson at a couple of venues in Sydney in the late 1970s, I recall one of the songs he sang (which I used to have a recording of, but I now seem to no longer have

it), was “Sittin’ in the pew.” I remember hearing Bob Larson singing, “Every Sunday morning you’re just sittin’ in the pew. Give your heart to Jesus, and when it is through, church will mean a whole lot more, than sittin’ in the pew¹³⁸.”

There are clearly UNSAVED persons in churches. Larson’s claim that the words of Jesus that she was “a daughter of Abraham” (Luke 13:16) means she was saved, fails to recognize that this was also used as a racial term of Jews. Hence in the *Parable of Lazarus and Dives* (Luke 16:19-31), Dives is said to be “in hell,” “being in torments” (Luke 16:23). Yet in racial terms Abraham is still his father, for “he cried out and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me ...”; and in reply “Abraham said, Son,” etc. (Luke 16:24,25; emphasis mine). Hence “a daughter of Abraham” in Luke 13:16 might likewise be a racial term. Furthermore, even if it is a spiritual term, it is used after Jesus “loosed” her “from her infirmity” (Luke 13:12), and so may indicate that this healing was part of a subsequent conversion. We read of many instances in the Book of Acts, where the Apostle Paul went to a synagogue to be God’s instrument to convert unconverted Jews and God-fearer Gentiles who worshipped at synagogues (e.g., Acts 17:1-4; 18:4); so it is clearly incorrect to argue that because someone like this woman was attending “one of the synagogues” (Luke 13:10) that she was therefore saved. (So too, Nicodemus no doubt attended synagogues, yet was unsaved in John 3:9,10.) I think a better construction would be that Jesus was here releasing a person from Satan’s bondage (Luke 13:16) as part of his evangelistic technique. *Thus far from showing that Christians can be devil-possessed, Luke 13:10-17 actually shows that unsaved persons may attend a church (or in the context of Luke 13 a synagogue), and be IN NEED OF SALVATION as witnessed by the fact that THEY ARE IN BONDAGE TO SATAN.*

The third Scripture Larson claims supports his teaching that Christians can be so devil-possessed is Hebrews 4:12. Before considering Larson’s views on this verse, let us first understand the difference between those arguing for a trichotomy i.e., soul + spirit + body = man, and the orthodox position which is that man is a dichotomy i.e., soul / spirit + body = man.

Understanding man as a dichotomy of body + soul / spirit, is the orthodox teaching found generally throughout Scripture. Thus the constitutional nature of man is referred to in Scripture as either “body” and “soul” (Matt. 10:28), or a body made of “dust” and a “spirit” (Eccl. 12:7; cf. Gen. 2:7). “Soul” and “spirit” are used in poetical parallelism in the *Magnificat*, in which St. Mary, the mother of Jesus says, “My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour” (Luke 1:46,47).

¹³⁸ In explanation of the more widely used terminology, “Give your heart to Jesus,” I note that God works with, not against our will. Hence we read in Exodus 9:12, “the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh;” and in Exodus 8:32, “Pharaoh hardened his heart.” So likewise, while regeneration of a man is a God given gift, and so we read in Ezekiel 36:26, “A new heart ... will I give you;” because God works with, and not against our wills as he enables us, we also read in Proverbs 23:26, “My son, give me thine heart.”

Hence death is sometimes referred to as giving up the “soul” (Gen. 35:18; I Kgs 17:21), and the dead as a “soul” / “souls” (Rom. 2:9; Rev. 6:9); or as giving up the “spirit” (Eccl. 12:7; Luke 23:46; Acts 7:59), and the dead as “spirits” (Heb. 12:23; I Peter 3:19). Thus man is a simple dichotomy of “flesh” / “body” and “spirit” (I Cor. 5:5; 7:34; II Cor. 7:1). Hence whereas Ps. 139:14-16 refers to “soul” creation, Heb. 12:9 refers to “the Father of spirits” (cf. Num. 16:22; Isa. 57:16; Zech. 12:1).

Understanding man as a trichotomy of body + soul + spirit is an unorthodox opinion. The two key texts used by trichotomists are Heb. 4:12 and I Thess. 5:23. Hebrews 4:12 says, “For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” More widely, “soul” and “spirit” are clearly used in a dichotomist way in the Book of Hebrews. E.g., those “in the body” (Heb. 13:3) are said to have “souls” (Heb. 13:17) not “souls and spirits;” reference is made to those whose “bodies” are “pure” (Heb. 10:22), also having “an anchor of the soul” (Heb. 6:19), not “an anchor of the soul and spirit;” reference is made to “the saving of the soul” (Heb. 10:39), not “the saving of the soul and spirit;” and after glorification we read of “the spirits of just men made perfect” (Heb. 12:23), not “the spirits and souls of just men made perfect.”

Thus against this immediate dichotomist teaching in both the Book of Hebrews and also more widely in Scripture, I therefore understand Heb. 4:12, “dividing asunder of soul and spirit” to be a linguistic device of amplification, meaning, “dividing” the “soul” apart, or “dividing” the “spirit” apart, i.e., reaching into the very deep recesses of the soul or spirit. Hence the “dividing asunder” is not between a “soul” and “spirit” (trichotomist view), but rather inside a “soul” or “spirit” (dichotomist view). That this division is *within* and not *between* two things is further seen in “the dividing asunder” “of the joints and marrow” which requires the view of *internal division* since “joints” are where two bones join, whereas “marrow” is inside a bone, i.e., this is a division *within* “joints and marrow.” But whereas “joints and marrow” are still two distinctive entities both of which are here internally divided asunder, by contrast, it is clear from the more general dichotomy of man in the Book of Hebrews and elsewhere, that “soul” and “spirit” are referring to the same thing in Heb. 4:12. Notably, one further finds this same type of linguistic device of amplification when Heb. 4:12 says, “the word of God” “is a discerner of the thoughts and the intents of the heart.” The “thoughts” is (the root) Greek word, *enthumesis*, meaning “thoughts” or “ideas” etc., and “intents” is (the root) Greek word, *ennoia*, meaning “thoughts” or “ideas” etc., so that this *is amplification of the same idea by repetition* in, “a discerner of the thoughts and the intents of the heart.”

I Thess. 5:23 says in the AV, “And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and (Greek *kai*) soul and (Greek *kai*) body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.” In conformity with the rest of Scripture, more widely we find a dichotomy is taught as the constitutional nature of man in the Pauline Epistles (e.g., I Cor. 5:5; 7:34; II Cor. 7:1). The Greek word *kai* is a very elastic conjunction, and depending on context it can mean many things including e.g., “and,” “even,” “that is,” or “or.” The King James translators were orthodox

dichotomists, and so we cannot doubt that in their rendering of the first *kai* as “and” in “spirit and (*kai*) soul,” that they understood this in the same way as Heb. 4:12 i.e., *amplification of the same idea by repetition*. This is one way to understand I Thess. 5:23 inside orthodox theological parameters. Another way to understand I Thess. 5:23 inside orthodox theological parameters is to take the *kai* between “spirit” and “soul” in the sense of “even” or “that is” or “or.” Thus the rendering of I Thess. 5:23 would be, “I pray God your whole spirit or soul, and body, be preserved” etc. . Given that both translations and punctuations of I Thess. 5:23 are reasonable renderings of the Greek into English, and given that both connected interpretations of what I Thess. 5:23 mean are inside orthodox theological parameters of man as a dichotomy, both views are linguistically and theologically possible. Jerome’s Vulgate renders I Thess. 5:23 as Latin, “*spiritus* (spirit) *vester* (your) *et* (and) *anima* (soul) *et* (and) *corpus* (body);” not as “*spiritus* (spirit) *vester* (your) *aut* (or) *anima* (soul), *et* (and) *corpus* (body).” In favour of Jerome’s and the KJV translators’ view it might be said that we have a clear precedent for such usage of “spirit and soul” in I Thess. 5:23 with the “soul and spirit” of Heb. 4:12; and in favour of the alternative view it might be said that we have a clear precedent for such usage of “spirit or soul” in I Thess. 5:23 with the poetical parallelism of “my soul” and “my spirit” in Luke 2:46,47. Therefore, which of these two dichotomist views of I Thess. 5:23 is the better one? Why?

It is an established principle of Biblical interpretation among Protestants that we use the perfectly clear verses of Scripture to explain the more difficult ones, for as taught in Matt. 4:5-7, “it is not lawful ... to ... so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another” (Article 20, Anglican 39 Articles). In this context, we cannot doubt that a dichotomist understanding of Heb. 4:12 and I Thess. 5:23 is the only understanding that is harmonious with the more general and clear Biblical view that man is a dichotomy of body + soul / spirit.

This teaching of man as being a dichotomy of body + soul / spirit, also connects with important Christological teaching. E.g., the Apollinarians denied Christ’s full humanity. These trichotomists divided man into spirit + body + soul, and claimed that whereas a human being has a soul i.e., spirit + body + soul = man, instead of a soul, Christ had the Divine Logos i.e., spirit + body + Logos = Christ¹³⁹. This denial of Christ’s full humanity was condemned by the *Council of Constantinople* in 381 A.D. . So too the *Council of Chalcedon* in 451 declared, “our Lord Jesus Christ, at once complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man, consisting also of a reasonable soul and body.” That as touching upon his humanity Christ was a dichotomy of body and soul is taught in the fact that “Jesus Christ ... descended into hell” (*Apostles’ & Athanasian Creeds*), since we find this dichotomy of body + soul = man in Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27,31; which shows Christ’s soul separated from his body in

¹³⁹ Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, pp. 191-5; Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 44-5; Pearson’s *Exposition of the Creed* (James Nichols edition of Bishop John Pearson’s *An Exposition of the Creed*, 1659,1683, Ward, Lock, & Co., London, UK, reprint 1854, “He descended into hell,” at section 5, pp. 343-6).

order to descend by a local motion into hell¹⁴⁰. Thus the orthodox position that man is a dichotomy, of relevance in, among other things, rejecting the Apollinarian heresy, is found in the *Athanasian Creed*, which rightly says, “the reasonable soul and flesh is one man;” and “we believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds: and man, of the substance of his mother, born in the world; perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting.” Thus a person arguing for a trichotomy is *necessarily and by virtue of that fact* in Trinitarian Christological heresy. The Christological importance of a human dichotomy to the Trinity, means that those who like Origen (d. 254) argue for a trichotomy are condemned by the orthodox as in “heresies,” evidencing the fact that “they ... shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:21). Hence the damnatory clauses of the *Athanasian Creed* say, “it is necessary to everlasting salvation: that” a person “believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ,” as a “man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting,” and “This is the Catholick Faith: which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved¹⁴¹.”

Therefore, let us now consider Larson’s claims with respect to Heb. 4:12. In the first place, Larson claims Heb. 4:12 teaches a trichotomy of spirit + body + soul = a man. In the second place, he then claims that a person’s “spirit” can be saved, but devils can simultaneously possess his “soul.” Thus this trichotomy is basic to his wider claim that Christians can be devil-possessed. Larson’s trichotomy immediately puts him in heresy, and under the damnatory clauses of the *Athanasian Creed*. His further development of

¹⁴⁰ I understand Christ’s descent into hell (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27,31; Rom. 10:7; Eph. 4:9,10; cf. Jonah 2:2,6 & Matt. 12:40), to be a triumphal march (Col. 2:15), in which he “preached unto the spirits in prison” in the sense that he *preached at* them, telling them that their wicked intent to destroy the racial purity of Seth’s race in their racially mixed marriages between Cain’s race and Seth’s race had failed (Gen. 6:1-4; I Peter 3:19,20), and that in the fullness of time he had come in a racially pure line from “Seth” via “Noe” and “Sem” (Luke 3:36,38). So great is our Lord’s holy hatred of a generalized miscegenation that seeks to destroy the races of man that he created, that the Lord of heaven and earth, who is also Lord of hell, triumphantly marched as hell’s jail-keeper and preached this message to these antediluvian miscegenationists, though they had been already burning in hell since the time of Noah’s flood, which I estimate to be about 35,000 years.

¹⁴¹ The difference between heresy and error as historically defined in Anglican ecclesiastical law, is whether or not an error is so great that it is repugnant to a point of doctrine that is essential to the Christian faith. Thus heresy involves a violation of the type of thing found in the three creeds, *Apostles’, Athanasian, & Nicene*; or the Trinitarian and anti-Pelagian teaching of the first four general councils, or Trinitarian teaching of the 5th & 6th general councils (though in other areas the 5th & 6th general councils erred per Article 21 of the Anglican 39 Articles); or a denial of justification by faith. Excommunication should occur for moral offences with wilful and unrepentant sinners, especially for those who set aside the moral precepts of the Decalogue e.g., wilful and unrepentant “fornicators,” “idolaters,” and “drunkards” (I Cor. 6:9,10).

this trichotomy heresy to claim that a Christian can be saved in his “spirit” while devil-possessed in his “soul,” therefore must be correspondingly rejected as premised upon an invalid assumption that man is a trichotomy, when in fact he is in harmony with orthodoxy a dichotomy of body + soul / spirit.

Furthermore, Larson’s notions of a saved Christian having a devil-possessed soul, is contrary to the general teaching of Scripture found in the contrast between Heb. 10:38,39, “Now the just shall live by faith: ... we are ... of them that believe to the saving of the soul;” as compared to Matt. 16:26, “For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?;” or Luke 12:20, “But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee.”

The fourth and final Scripture Larson claims supports his teaching that Christians can be so devil-possessed is Acts 5:3, “but Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost ...?” The lack of clarity as to the definitive meaning of “hath Satan filled thine heart to lie” here in Acts 5:3, requires that we use other clearer Scriptures to interpret two possibilities. Does “hath Satan filled thine heart to lie” here mean Satan whispered in their ear this idea? If so, they were not devil-possessed, but rather Devil-influenced. Or does “hath Satan filled thine heart to lie” here mean devil-possession? If so, then these were clearly stony-ground believers (Matt. 13:5), who “went out from us, but they were not of us” (I John 2:19). Either way, on the basis of clearer passages of Scripture, *supra*, it is clear that this is not an instance of Christian believers being devil-possessed.

Larson’s usage of Acts 5:3 also raises another issue that he did not mention. In Acts 5:4 we read that Ananias and Saphira “lied ... unto God,” and in Acts 5:3 that they did “lie to the Holy Ghost.” This means that Acts 5:3,4 teaches the Deity of the Holy Ghost as the third Divine Person of the Holy Trinity. This takes on an added significance in the context of exorcism because of Christ’s teaching in Matt. 12:22-37. Here “the Pharisees” blasphemously said of Christ, “This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils” (Matt. 12:24). Since Christ in fact “cast out devils by the Spirit of God” (Matt. 12:28), he warns them, “All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven men” (Matt. 12:31). While “blasphemy against the Holy Ghost” may occur in multiple ways, it is clear that *one* way is by attributing the work of the Holy Ghost to the Devil. Of course, it is for God to determine when this has happened, not some mere man such as myself. Nevertheless, in this context, the teaching of Matt. 12:31 is significant because Bob Larson is now saying to people who are Christians, that the spirit in them is a devilish spirit, yet on the basis of I John 3:24-4:4, it is clear that the only spirit in a Christian is “the Spirit” “of God” (I John 3:24; 4:4).

Therefore Larson is skating on thin ice to try and entice Christian believers to allow him to perform exorcisms on them. I do not say that Larson has committed the unpardonable sin, but I do say that he MIGHT have, or he MIGHT do so in the future. HE SHOULD DESIST COMPLETELY, TOTALLY, AND ABSOLUTELY FROM

ENTICING SAVED CHRISTIANS TO COME TO HIM FOR EXORCISMS ON THE BASIS THAT MAN IS A TRICHOTOMY (soul + spirit + body = man) AND SO WHILE THEIR "SPIRIT" IS SAVED, THEIR "SOUL" IS DEVIL-POSSESSED. Larson's idea of a purported *biological transmission of devils is not a sustainable theological concept* i.e., from an ancestor such as a great-grandfather who is said to have been cursed by an obscure and unidentifiable figure which resulted in the ancestor's devil-possession, and the devil is then said to be transferred biologically to one's grandfather, father, and oneself; or a purported biological transfer of a devil via a blood transfusion from someone who is cursed or devil-possessed, in which the blood not being first prayed over then acts as the vehicle to transmit a devil from the blood donor to the blood transfusion recipient. A Christian who has "the Spirit" "of God" (I John 3:24; 4:4) need not fear devil-possession. *LARSON NEEDS TO REPUDIATE HIS TRICHOTOMIST CLAIMS OF A SAVED "SPIRIT" WITH A DEVIL-POSSESSED "SOUL" AS ALLEGEDLY FOUND IN E.G., THE BIOLOGICAL TRANSFER OF A DEVIL, OR A PERSON'S FLESHLY SINS SUCH AS UNWARRANTED "ANGER," OR IN SOME GENERAL IDEA THAT THERE IS "THE DEVIL INSIDE, THE DEVIL INSIDE, EVERY SINGLE ONE OF US, THE DEVIL INSIDE."*

Larson's Scriptural usage of I Sam. 16:14; Luke 13:10-17; Acts 5:3; Heb. 4:12 are thus clearly unsustainable and must be rejected.

In his exorcisms, Larson says in "Answers for Objections to Exorcism" (2007), that as part of the exorcism, "We take the Bible and whack 'em" i.e., he considers that physically hitting them with a Bible helps drive the devil out. Though such literal "Bible bashing" of people strikes me as somewhat bizarre, I shall not now further comment on the desirability of this technique; other than to say it is a long way removed from his earlier more sedate techniques as described in "Outline of an Exorcism" (1991) and "Exorcism" (1992). And even in "Larson's Top Ten Exorcisms" (1999), while he sometimes pushes a Bible onto the heads of those he is exorcising, he does not actually "whack 'em," and so this raises the question of whether or not this is one of Larson's exaggeration, i.e., when he says "We take the Bible and whack 'em," does he really mean the lesser thing that he does in "Larson's Top Ten Exorcisms" (1999)?

Of some further clear concern is his statement in "Answers for Objections to Exorcism" (2007), that in one of his exorcisms, "I called my 12 year old daughter up on stage," and she sent a devil "to the pit." It is surely a perversion of the natural order to have any female, let alone a 12 year old girl, doing this type of thing (Isa. 3:4,5,12), and it is against the principles of a sensible Biblical Ministry which among other things should be patriarchal with an adult male (I Tim. 2:8-3:13). Once again, this nonsense about gratuitously using his 12 year old daughter as a exorcist, is contrary to the type of thing that Larson talks about some years earlier in "Exorcism" (1992), when he says of a section in the *Ritual Romanum* requiring a Roman Catholic priest gets his Bishop's approval for an exorcism, "while Protestants and in specific Evangelicals may not believe that it's necessary for an individual" exorcist "to get permission from a higher church authority" in a Roman Catholic "Bishop," "it is wise" for "Protestants" to "have the proper kind of spiritual covering" in terms of a church structure. Clearly bringing a 12

year old girl up on a stage lacks any such “proper kind of spiritual covering,” and *clearly once again Larson has fundamentally changed.*

On the basis of the evidence, *supra*, Larson is guilty of a trichotomy heresy in his views of Heb. 4:12, that a Christian can have a saved “spirit” and simultaneously a devil-possessed “soul;” and he may already be, or may in the future be, guilty of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost in his claim that Christians should regard their sinful desires such as unwarranted “anger,” or “addiction,” as constituting devil-possession warranting and calling for exorcisms by him. Contrary to his earlier views of the 1970s to parts of the 1990s, he is now claiming devil-possession for people far too freely. E.g., his claim that non-Christians, or *by implication* Christians who do not first pray over blood in blood-transfusions, may pick up a “curse” and a devil from such a blood-transfusion; or a little girl who falls off a swing and gets a cut lip might have a devil start to possess her by coming to comfort her because her mother is not present; or if a great-grandfather that died before one was born was cursed by an obscure figure, one might be devil-possessed. In the words of the song played near the start of Larson’s “The danger of Denying Deliverance” (2006), “The devil inside, the devil inside, every single one of us, the devil inside” (emphasis mine). *Sadly, Larson has now “spun out of control,” and is “loose and wild” in what he is saying and teaching.* In “The danger of Denying Deliverance” (2006) and “Answers for Objections to Exorcism” (2007), *Larson’s tone, demeanor, persona, and theological message on exorcism has so radically altered, that I can no longer recognize him relative to his former self.* His expanded orbit of reasons as to how people may allegedly become devil-possessed, to the point where he is now claiming any number of Christians are so devil-possessed, with his associated concepts of “the devil” is “inside” “every single one of us,” *supra*, has moved his claims of exorcisms beyond the boundaries of Biblical credulity. *SO WHAT’S HAPPENED TO BOB LARSON?*

It seems to me there are two possibilities. Either Larson is a con-man, or Larson is now operating under the power of devils and so in need of an exorcism himself. Let us therefore now consider these two possibilities.

Possibility 1: Is “The Exorcist” Bob Larson a con-man? In the *John MacArthur verses Bob Larson debate* on USA CNN News shown on Larson’s “Answers for Objections to Exorcism” (2007), MacArthur takes the view that Larson’s exorcisms are “bogus,” and in this context he likens Larson to the “sons of ... Sceva” in Acts 19:13-20. These “exorcists” were “vagabond Jews” who “took” it “upon” themselves “to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth.” But these were fake exorcists, and an “evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?” (Acts 19:13,14,15)

Therefore, in likening Larson to the sons of Sceva, MacArthur was contextually saying that Larson is a charlatan. Due to time constraints in the debate, MacArthur was not able to expand on this claim, but he presumably would consider that things like the voices of devils coming from people being exorcised was either Larson or a member of his exorcist team exercising the talents of a ventriloquist; or possibly in this technological age small audio speakers are placed near those being “exorcised” to produce “devil

voices,” e.g., in a coat pocket of “the exorcist,” and when he or an assistant watching him pushes a button in their trouser pocket, a “devil voice” snippet recording is played out loud; (having watched the 1999 DVD, “Larson’s Top Ten Exorcisms,” I could not accept that these first two possibilities are credible;) or those being exorcised exhibit some kind of psychiatric disorder; or those being exorcised being under the influence of some kind of drug(s); or Larson deviously brings in and pays off suitable actors to pretend they are devil-possessed before his audience; or some combination thereof in different instances. Notably, in “Satanism” (1974) Larson says a “South American” “witchdoctor” said to him, “I believe many people in mental institutions are there not because of emotional disorders but because of spirits;” to which Larson comments, “I agreed whole-heartedly with him, though perhaps for different reasons.” So too in “Demon Possession” (1989), Larson says, “A high percentage of people in mental institutions are people who do have, or once had, demons, and that’s the end result.” In terms of *Possibility 1: Is “The Exorcist” Bob Larson a con-man?*; the creation of such fictional devils by e.g., psychiatrically disturbed persons, or co-operative actors, might be one element of what Larson means when in “Answers for Objections to Exorcism” (2007), he talks about the “fun” of exorcisms, *infra*.

Larson’s source of “authority” for suggesting that a devil who is cast out after possessing someone is zapped by Lucifer as punishment is not theologically sound. In rejecting the idea that a devil would not be so punished by Satan, Larson says in “Outline of an Exorcism” (1991), “Anyone who’s read C.S. Lewis’s *Screwtape Letters* knows that’s fantasy.” “He’s gonna’ get punished.” In the first place, C.S. Lewis (1898-1963) had a number of theological problems, not the least of which was his deep involvement in the ecumenical compromise with Papists. In the second place, C.S. Lewis’s works are themselves fiction, and certainly not the basis for making this type of theological claim.

However, to MacArthur’s claim that Larson is “bogus,” must be made the important qualification that when he says, “I think the whole thing is bogus,” MacArthur contextually thinks all exorcisms are “bogus” because he holds a certain type of Dispensationalist view which considers devil-possession and exorcism cannot occur after NT times (although not all Dispensationalists think this). While I do not accept MacArthur’s Dispensationalist views that devil-possession and exorcism ceased to exist after New Testament times; the basic issue he raises remains i.e., given that the Bible teaches there are both genuine and fake exorcists, *Is Larson a fake exorcist? Is he in MacArthur’s words, “bogus”? Is he a charlatan?*

Possibility 2: Is “The Exorcist” Bob Larson in need of an exorcism? The holy Apostle, St. John, says, “Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist” (I John 4:2,3); and further warns, “Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist” (II John 7). These “antichrists” (plural) of NT times typed what was then the coming “antichrist” (singular) (I John 2:18); which we know from comparison of e.g., the II Thess. 2:3 singular “man of sin,” with e.g., the Matt. 24:24 “false Christs” or Matt. 24:4 “many”

who “come” “saying, “I am Christ,” is in fact an Office of Antichrist. And concerning any person who “transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ,” St. John further says, “receive him not,” “neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds” (II John 9-11).

We cannot doubt that this Office of Antichrist was established with the Office of Roman Pope in 607 A.D., when Boniface III obtained a decree from Phocas making him “universal bishop.” His and the subsequent Papal claim to be “vicar of Christ” with a “universal” jurisdiction, usurps the place of the Holy Spirit of God and constitutes an unforgivable blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (Matt. 12:31), wherein the Pope is “the son of perdition,” and personally devil-possessed by Lucifer himself (II Thess. 2:3; cf. John 13:26,27; 17:12; II Thess. 2:9). The Roman Pope and system of Romanism denies the humanity of Christ (I John 4:3; II John 7) in the transubstantiation heresy. For though as touching upon his Divinity, Christ is omnipresent and so is with us believers (Matt. 18:20; 28:20); as touching upon his humanity, Christ’s body is in heaven (Matt. 26:11; John 16:28; Acts 3:21; I Cor. 11:26). The transubstantiation heresy thus denies the humanity of Christ, “For ... the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one” (Final Rubric, The Communion Service, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662).

This means that in the first instance, Larson’s ecumenical compromise with the Roman Catholic Church has put him in a position in which he “biddeth” “an antichrist,” indeed *the* “Antichrist,” “God speed,” and so is made a “partaker of his evil deeds” (I John 2:18; II John 7,11). For as a vice-Christ or a vice-God, as “vicar of Christ” or “vicar of God” claiming a “universal” jurisdiction in the church or temple of God, the Pope “as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4). This takes on an added significance through reference to Larson’s “The Devil Inside – Down Under: The Vatican Exorcism Edition” also known as “An Interview With The Pope’s Exorcist” (2006). This interview with “Father” Gabriel Amorth, the Vatican’s chief exorcist, took Larson not simply to the geographical place of the City of Seven Hills, Rome (Rev. 17:9), but put him in spiritual contact and spiritual recognition with (II John 7-11), a top figure at the seat of the Papal Antichrist from which Lucifer organizes everything worldwide, for Rome is “the hold of every foul spirit” (Rev. 18:2). Given that Larson was in such close physical and spiritual contact with a leading Popish figure in Rome where the Antichrist Pope is administratively centred, the place said by St. John the Divine to be “the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird” (Rev. 18:2); we must therefore ask, *Has Larson picked up some devils from his close encounters with, and spiritual recognition of bidding “God speed” to (II John 11), the Church of Antichrist i.e., the Church of Rome?*

Following the *Vatican II Council* (1962-5) and as an outgrowth of that Council, the Church of Rome came to embrace the Montanist heresy which is found in modern times in the Charismatic and Pentecostal Churches. Tertullian (d. after 220) became a religious apostate when he embraced Montanism in the early third century A.D. . Like modern day Charismatics and Pentecostals, the ancient Montanists had an emphasis on

ecstatic utterances and prophesy. Thus the Montanist, Tertullian said, “We have among us now a sister who has been granted gifts of revelations, which she experiences in church during the Sunday Services through ecstatic visions in the Spirit.” And Eusebius (d. 339) says of Montanists, in “Mysia over against Phrygia, Montanus” “first exposed himself to the assaults of the adversary,” that is, the Devil, when he “became possessed of a spirit, and suddenly began to rave in a kind of ecstatic trance, and to babble in a jargon, prophesying in a manner contrary to the custom of the Church.” This involved the phenomena of “ecstatic trance,” “babble in a jargon,” and “prophesying.” “Some of those that heard his bastard utterances rebuked him as one possessed of a devil ... remembering the Lord’s warning to guard vigilantly against the coming of ‘false prophets’” (Matt. 24:24). Eusebius says the Montanists “were carried away and not a little elated, thinking themselves possessed of the Holy Spirit and of the gift of prophecy.” E.g., he refers to “two women ... filled with the bastard spirit;” and in rejecting this lying wonder further records that the Montanists “were expelled from the Church and debarred from Communion¹⁴².”

The two key Montanist elements of “tongues” and “prophesy” were also rejected by the Protestant Reformers. In dealing with the error of the Roman Church having services in Latin with people for whom this was an unknown tongue, the Reformers articulated the Biblical teaching from, e.g., I Cor. 14, that services should be in the language of the people; thus repudiating the claims of those who like the Montanists, seek to have public worship in “an unknown tongue” (see Article 24, Anglican *39 Articles*). And in dealing with the error of the Roman Church in claiming extra Biblical revelations in their “ecumenical councils” and “saints,” the Reformers articulated the Biblical teaching from, e.g., Luke 11:49-51; Eph. 2:20, that Scripture is complete, and this is one element of the *sola Scriptura* (Latin, “Scripture alone”) Protestant teaching.

Significantly, Larson’s ecumenical compromise has also included his embrace of Montanists. Hence in “Exorcism” (1992) he describes differences with such Montanist “Charismatics” as being in the area of “non-essential issues of doctrine.” And in “Answers for Objections to Exorcism” (2007), Larson claims that while he was doing one of his exorcisms, “the Lord gave me ... some supernatural revelation,” and he also speaks favorably of “Charismatics.” The fact that Larson is now claiming “supernatural revelation” means he may well have what Eusebius calls a “bastard spirit” as first documented in the Church with “Montanus,” and thereafter known as Montanism. Such a view is consistent both with Larson’s ecumenical involvement with Papists and Montanist Charismatics.

Thus in terms of *Possibility 2: Is “The Exorcist” Bob Larson in need of an exorcism?*; if this is the case, Larson is now working with devils, who among other things, might sometimes give him what he calls, a “supernatural revelation.” In the context of the *John MacArthur verses Bob Larson debate*, Larson says of MacArthur on “Answers for Objections to Exorcism” (2007), that “he’s missing so much fun.”

¹⁴² Tertullian, *De amina*, 9, c. 210; Eusebius, HEV 16:7; both in Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 77-8.

Larson's description of exorcisms as "fun" is deeply disturbing, since these are sombre and serious matters (e.g., Matt. 8:28-34; 17:14-21). While I can accept that after the harrowing ordeal of dealing with devils, in which under God the exorcist has shown bravery in battling against a dangerous and frightening foe, a good exorcist may ultimately experience Christian *joy* in having been the instrument of God to set a person free from their bondage to Satan, I cannot accept that exorcisms are in any sense a "fun" activity.

On the one hand, it is possible that Larson's usage of the term "fun" here was simply a very poor choice of words on his part, that more widely reflects his tendency towards having loose lips and using exaggeration in order to get crowd attention. But if so, why did he not make a second DVD that omitted these words, since when I purchased this 2007 DVD it was some four years later on in 2011? Thus, on the other hand, Larson's claim that MacArthur is "missing so much fun," may give us a valuable insight as to what might be really going on. Specifically, if a group of devils have attached themselves to Larson and his ministry, they seem to be desirous of creating a carnival-like show of exorcism in order to distract people from the real message of Christianity found in the "gospel" of "grace," "The just shall live by faith," for "Christ hath redeemed us," "being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (Gal. 1:6; 3:11,13). Their intent would include promoting the ecumenical compromise with Papists and others, in order to draw Evangelical Protestants away from safeguarding the gospel of grace against apostates (Rom. 16:17; Gal. 1:6-9).

Has such "a circus-like band" of "carnival show" devils attached themselves to Larson and his ministry? Is their intent to distract people away from the real message of the Christian gospel, so as to stop people from "holding the head" "of" "the church," which is "Christ," and to instead "beguile" them into some kind of "vainly puffed up" "fleshy mind" by "intruding into those things which" they have "not seen," but they think they have (Col. 1:18; 2:8,18,19)? If so, this band of devils are in fact what Eusebius would call, "bastard spirits." And if so, this band of "bastard spirits" are "playing Larson for a sucker." I.e., in a twofold process, firstly, they are "whispering into Larson's ear" to get as many people as possible to allow him to "do an exorcism" on them. Thus Larson is throwing caution away into the wind by telling professed Christians that they can be devil-possessed, and that such possession "manifests" itself in things like their unwarranted "anger," or "addiction," when in fact these things simply manifest their sinful natures and sinful lusts. Hence with "Larson under pressure" from these devils who "want to put on a carnival exorcism," he is now telling people things like they can pick up a devil from a "curse" if they get a "blood-transfusion" without the blood being first prayed over by a Christian; or in Australia he kept trying to get a crocodile zoo keeper who had heathen Buddhist nuns pray over him to allow Larson to do an exorcism on him, when this is clearly very insufficient grounds for claiming the zoo keeper was devil-possessed. Then secondly, when under these inducement techniques Larson can get a group of professed Christians to allow him to do an exorcism on them, or a bigger name celebrity such as the Brisbane crocodile zoo keeper in Australia, *the same group of devils* then repeatedly "do the rounds" in pretending under a variety of different names and characters to be in people that Larson and his team come

to. If so, since the person has foolishly consented to Larson's exorcism when he has no real reason to believe he is devil-possessed in the first place, and has evidently in some way opened himself up to allow devils to so act out this carnival show through him. If so, Larson evidently does not get any true Christians to come to him, since the devils would not be able to so operate through a true Christian.

I do not consider an exorcism should be attempted unless all other reasonable possibilities have been exhausted e.g., impulses of one's sinful nature, psychiatric disorder, or hallucination due to drugs. But if this *Possibility 2* is correct, then Larson himself is now in need of an exorcism from a reputable, religiously conservative Protestant Christian exorcist.

In the final analysis, for me to make a satisfactory determination on these two possibilities which was totally fair to both Larson and his claims, would require more data than I presently have. The veracity of Jesus' exorcisms could be seen in the testimony of those formerly possessed to those who had known them when they were possessed, for instance, seeing a well-known devil-possessed man "in his right mind" (Mark 5:15-20), or seeing a woman cured about whom it was public knowledge that "Satan hath bound" her with "a spirit of infirmity eighteen years" (Luke 13:11).

Looking at "Larson's Top Ten Exorcisms" (1999), there is no such verification recorded. Larson largely leads these people to say things, whether what he calls the devil in them, or the person themselves (which he distinguishes by naming them). This type of "parroting of lines" could be from e.g., either some fairly inarticulate and psychiatrically disturbed persons, or possibly some devil-possessed persons. The only way to distinguish would be to apply the Biblical test of passages such as Mark 5 and Luke 13, *supra*, and ensure these people were properly interviewed both before and after their exorcism. Certainly on the basis of what is shown in "Larson's Top Ten Exorcisms" (1999), one could not be confident that these were people who had been restored to a "right mind" (Mark 5:15) following an exorcism. Thus if Larson is a con-man, he probably developed his teaching of possible "relapses" in "The Devil Inside – Down Under: The Vatican Exorcism Edition" or "An Interview With The Pope's Exorcist" (2006), so that if a psychiatrically disturbed person he was using for the exorcism were later interviewed, he could say, "Oh, he must have had a relapse."

In "The Devil Inside – Down Under: The Vatican Exorcism Edition" or "An Interview With The Pope's Exorcist" (2006), Larson does seek to meet something of this verification test, but once again we are not getting independent verification but his own selective verification, which may be genuine or may be doctored. E.g., he shows a girl being exorcised who later says, "It's like I'm finally able to participate in the human race." So too, he shows some others after being exorcised, such as Jason, or an Indian woman, Judith, who are later interviewed. If Larson is a con-man, this would require the conclusion that these people were in some sense either under hallucinating drugs at the time of their exorcism, or actors, so that one would then have to conclude that he might have used a combination of psychiatrically disturbed persons, or primarily, psychiatrically disturbed persons, or persons under some drugs, and actors in "Larson's

Top Ten Exorcisms” (1999), and then only persons who were either under some drugs or actors in “The Devil Inside – Down Under: The Vatican Exorcism Edition” or “An Interview With The Pope’s Exorcist” (2006).

Therefore, in the absence of the required type of clear verification by persons who knew these people before and after their exorcisms, which would require interviews of a number of such persons over time, before and after their exorcism, and investigation of so called “relapses,” the issue of whether or not Larson’s exorcisms are fake or genuine may be argued both ways on the available data. However, if they are genuine in the sense that they do exhibit the genuine supernatural activity of devils, then we must conclude that Larson is himself operating under the power of devils in unsaved persons in order for certain braggadocio devils to “put on a carnival show,” in which their purpose appears to be a desire to promote the ecumenical compromise between, on the one hand, Evangelical Protestants such as Larson professes to be; and on the other hand, Papists, Eastern Orthodox, Montanists, and others. If Larson’s exorcisms do exhibit the genuine supernatural activity of devils, such a conclusion is necessary due to e.g., those elements of his exorcisms which are linked to a trichotomist heresy that claims a Christian can be saved in his “spirit” while devil-possessed in his “soul;” and his connected linking of this alleged “soul” devil-possession to such fleshly lusts as unwarranted “anger” or “addiction,” or such alleged causal factors as “blood-transfusions” not first prayed over biologically transmitting a “curse,” or the biological transmission of a “curse” from a long dead and unidentifiable obscure figure who is said to have “cursed” a distant relative such as a “great-grandfather,” or the alleged entry of a devil in their childhood due to a childhood injury that made the person frightened or angry because nobody was nearby to give him comfort. Thus if his exorcisms do exhibit the genuine supernatural activity of devils, it would be necessary to put the question to him, “O foolish” Bob Larson, “who hath bewitched” thee, “that” thou shouldst “not obey the truth?” (Gal. 3:1).

But what is clear, is that when I recently acquired Larson’s 1999-2007 DVDs in 2011, upon watching e.g., “The danger of Denying Deliverance” (2006) and “Answers for Objections to Exorcism” (2007), I found that *Larson’s tone, demeanor, persona, and theological message on exorcism has so radically altered, that I could no longer recognize him relative to his former self.* To the obvious question, *SO WHAT’S HAPPENED TO BOB LARSON?*, There are thus two possibilities. Specifically, *Is “The Exorcist” Bob Larson a con-man? (Possibility 1); or Is “The Exorcist” Bob Larson in need of an exorcism? (Possibility 2).* I leave the issue of these two possibilities about Larson to the good Christian reader to further study and consider for himself. Certainly my purposes, the issue of which of these two possibilities is correct, is a secondary issue.

The primary issue, and the main reason I have raised this matter connects to the danger of “ecumenical” tolerance to Roman Catholics and also other unorthodox non-Protestant groups like Eastern Orthodox or the Montanist Charismatics and Pentecostals. I remind the reader that this subsection “c) A Case Study on Bob Larson Ministries, USA,” is under the wider heading of a section entitled, “Defence of Evangelical Protestant truth,” in which section “a)” is entitled, “The danger of ‘ecumenical’ tolerance to Roman Catholics;” and flows on from the former section entitled, “Christ the Rock

(Matt. 16:18; I Cor. 3:11),” in which I am concerned with the false claims of Romanists with regard to Matt. 16:18. Hence I am concerned with the adoption of semi-Romanist interpretations of Matt. 16:18 in such neo-Alexandrian versions as the Moffatt Bible, New English Bible, Revised English Bible, and New International Version, all of which reintroduce the old Romish HERESY that in Matt. 16:18, Peter, not Christ, is the “rock;” in opposition to the clear teaching of Scripture that Christ is the rock upon which the church is built. For “other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ” (I Cor. 3:11). The Romish view that Peter is the rock of Matt. 16:18 is heresy because it attacks the doctrine of what the *Apostles’ Creed* calls, “the holy catholic (universal) church,” or the *Nicene Creed* calls the “one Catholick and Apostolick Church;” as in connection with this claim the Roman Church further commits the “blasphemy” (Rev. 13:1) of calling herself “the Catholic Church,” and makes associated claims that the Pope of Rome is “the vicar of Christ” with a “universal” jurisdiction in the church.

Thus in looking at Larson’s demise I wish to primarily warn the reader of the dangers that occur when an Evangelical first gets into the entangling alliance of the ecumenical compromise with unorthodox non-Protestant groups such as Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, Charismatics, or Pentecostals.

In “The Devil Inside – Down Under: The Vatican Exorcism Edition” or “An Interview With The Pope’s Exorcist” (2006), reference is made by a commentator to the “Protestant Reverend Bob Larson,” and his “fundamental Evangelical approach.” Larson is pictured shaking hands with and kissing “Father” Amorth, the Vatican’s chief exorcist who is referred to in the name of this DVD as “The Pope’s Exorcist.” The Popish Amorth then says to Larson, “we belong to the same Faith.” And Larson says, “To be with Father Amorth ... we’re building a bridge ... that for hundreds of years has existed” i.e., between Roman Catholics and Protestants, and “Father” Amorth is pictured blessing both Bob Larson and his wife, Laura. Then near the end of this DVD, as Larson and Amorth are shown hugging and kissing each other, the commentator says, “Could religion be moving in the 21st century? After all, it would have been unthinkable only a few years ago that a senior [Roman] Catholic priest would side with an Evangelical Protestant” (emphasis mine).

Larson is thus clearly one that “biddeth” “God speed” to the Church of “antichrist,” who “confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” via the transubstantiation heresy (I John 2:18; 4:3; II John 7,11); for “the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one” (Final Rubric, The Communion Service, Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*). Hence Larson is made a “partaker of” the “evil deeds” of Amorth and the Roman Church (II John 11). Larson is clearly using his standing as a professed “Evangelical Protestant” to try and promote the “ecumenical” compromise with “BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH” which sits upon the Seven Hills of Rome (Rev. 17:5,9). A “mother of harlots” by definition has “daughter harlots.” Sadly, with this type of “building a bridge” to Rome that Larson is talking about, it

follows that his own “Spiritual Freedom Church” that he pastors in Arizona USA is such a daughter church. *The message and warning is clear. Let us eschew the “ecumenical” compromise with Roman Catholics and all non-Evangelicals. Let us bring low the Roman whore and all other systems of false religion by the proclamation of “the everlasting gospel” (Rev. 14:6). For “The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved” (Rom. 10:8,9). “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them” (Rom. 16:17).*

The characters of William Shakespeare (d. 1616) sometimes exhibit a fault or weakness of character that leads to their ultimate demise. In answer to the question, *What’s happened to Bob Larson?*, it must first be said that Bob Larson always had a major and a minor Shakespearean type fault of character from the early days of his Ministry. His minor Shakespearean type character fault was a tendency to sometime have loose lips and exaggerate in order to get crowd attention. But this fairly quickly developed into the abandonment of his more unpopular 1970s view that the gyrating rhythmic qualities of heavy rock music were intrinsically dangerous, to a 1980s and later position that as with lighter rock music, only the lyrics and presentation images were a problem. Thus e.g., in “Metal Connection” (1992) Larson endorses a focus on such “worldly lusts” (Titus 2:12) as men with “long hair” (I Cor. 11:14) in a purportedly “Christian” group play and sing as “Christian metal musicians,” in such groups as “Vengeance Rising.” Or in “Heavy Metal” (1992), neither Larson nor his guest Jimmy Brown of the “Christian” metal group, “Deliverance,” can understand why a talk-back radio listener finds no tension between listening to both secular heavy metal groups like *Knights in Satan’s Service (KISS)*, and “Christian” heavy metal groups such as “Petra” or “Deliverance.” Larson has forgotten his earlier 1970s teaching that because the fan of such music *feels the beat* of such music, and *intellectually very largely switches off*, as he *engages in fleshly lusts of pulsating and gyrating to this evil music, to a large extent he is not consciously listening to the lyrics all that much*. Thus while the “Christian” heavy metal groups are certainly much better in their lyrics than the secular ones which spew out all kinds of ungodly filth, at heart, *both are pandering to and seeking to feed many of the same fleshly lusts*. Thus Larson’s desire to pander to the widest audience possible, *even at the expense of Biblical truth*, though starting in the 1970s in a smaller Shakespearean type character fault with a tendency to sometimes have loose lips and exaggerate in order to get crowd attention; grew and grew to become an ever larger and ever more serious character fault, till by the 1980s and 1990s he was endorsing the fleshly lusts of e.g., “Christian” heavy metal groups.

But Larson also had a major Shakespearean type character fault from the outset of his Ministry in the 1970s. This was his embrace of the ecumenical compromise with Roman Catholics, Charismatics, and others who were not orthodox Evangelical Protestant Christians. This same sad tale could be told of others also. E.g., though I find much that is good and useful in Bernard Ramm’s *Protestant Christian Evidences* (1953), that book is sullied in less than 10% of it by this same type of ecumenical

compromise with Papists and the figure of Billy Graham (b. 1918). Bernard Ramm (1916-1992) then wrote a number of subsequent books whose standard went from bad to worse; so that this earlier 1953 book is the only one that is generally sound, notwithstanding some problems with it. Bernard Ramm's decline was so great, that whereas in *Protestant Christian Evidences* he correctly said, "The sinnerhood of man is traced to a *historical* fall¹⁴³;" he ended up as a Pelagian heretic who encapsulated in the title of another book what he thought of such a historical fall and original sin, namely, *Offense To Reason* (1985)¹⁴⁴.

Whether we are talking about an apostate Protestant Minister like Bob Larson (b. 1944) who is now a trichotomist heretic, or an apostate Protestant theologian like Bernard Ramm (d. 1992) who became a Pelagian heretic, *the basic point is the same*. If a religiously conservative Protestant Christian forgets about *the defence of Evangelical Protestant truth*, if he sets aside the clear Biblical teaching of the Book of Romans that those who are "not ashamed of the gospel of Christ," "The just shall live by faith" (Rom. 1:16,17), must "mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them" (Rom. 16:17); if he sets aside the clear Biblical teaching of the Book of Galatians concerning those who deny the gospel of "grace," "The just shall live by faith," for "Christ hath redeemed us" when he hung "on a tree" (Gal. 1:6; 3:11,13), namely, "if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed" (Gal. 1:9); then such a religiously conservative Protestant Christian starts to go down a slippery pathway. As seen by the horrible ends of Bernard Ramm as a Pelagian heretic who attacked the teaching of man's fall and original sin as an "offence to reason;" or as seen by the tragic decline of Bob Larson into a trichotomist heretic who is claiming a Christian can be saved in his "spirit" while devil-possessed in his "soul," and using this to gratuitously and frivolously call upon Christians who e.g., manifest fleshly lusts to regard this as the work of devil-possession, or e.g., to consider they have picked up devils from curses on an ancestor or blood-transfusion blood, that they should come to him to have an exorcism for; the salient point is, that in the end, the Devil has his ways with them. That is because God has clearly warned us, he that "biddeth" "an antichrist" "God speed," is made a "partaker of his evil deeds" (II John 7,11).

GOOD CHRISTIAN READER. SEEK BY GOD'S GRACE TO BE SEPARATE FROM SUCH APOSTASY.

Unlike Origen or Tertullian in the time of St. Jerome's or the 39 Articles, and unlike Bernard Ramm in contemporary times, as at 2012 A.D., Bob Larson (b. 1944) is still alive. Thus Bob Larson's story is not yet complete, and therefore LET US PRAY. "Almighty God and Father, we thank thee for that which has been good in the Ministry of

¹⁴³ Ramm, B.L., *Protestant Christian Evidences*, 1963, Moody Press reprint 1978, Chicago, USA, p. 245.

¹⁴⁴ Ramm, B.L., *Offense To Reason*, Harper & Row, San Francisco, USA, 1985, e.g., pp. 27-28,51,76.

Bob Larson in times past. We pray that before he dies, Bob Larson may yet repent of his many sins, and turn to thee in all contrition, so that when he shall ‘remember’ his ‘own evil ways, and’ ‘doings that were not good,’ he ‘shall loathe’ himself ‘in your own sight for’ his ‘iniquities and for’ his ‘abominations¹⁴⁵.’ And this with pray subject to the words that thy Son himself taught us to pray, ‘Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven¹⁴⁶,’ through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. Amen.”

This also raises the issue of why do I sometimes quote from works like Bernard Ramm’s *Protestant Christian Evidences* (1953) or Bob Larson’s *Book of Rock* (1987). My precedent for this is to some extent, the prophet Baalim. On the one hand, “Balaam the son of Beor” was a prophet of God “whose eyes are open” when he gave the Messianic prophesy, “there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel” (Num. 24:15,17), which was wonderfully fulfilled in Christ. But on the other hand, Balaam went into apostasy, for the heathen “hired against” Israel “Balaam the son of Beor,” “to curse” them (Deut. 23:4). This later apostasy of Balaam does not invalidate his earlier work; and so just as we may still use his prophesy in Num. 24:17 for Christ, so I think we may still use earlier works of apostates like Ramm, or Larson, or Bob Dylan’s album, “Saved,” *supra*. If however, a “weak” brother (Rom. 14:2) cannot make such a distinction, “and their conscience being weak is defiled” (I Cor. 8:7) by such usage of Ramm, Larson, or Dylan, then I think they are right to leave them alone.

I also take the view that we must “by reason of use have” our “senses exercised to discern both good and evil” (Heb. 5:14). Thus in learning to “refuse the evil and choose the good” (Isa. 7:16) I sometimes sift good things out of the bad that is in the Apocrypha, and I do likewise for other works. It is thus with these type of qualifications that I select the good, and refuse the evil, in works like Ramm’s *Protestant Christian Evidences* (1953) or Bob Larson’s *Book of Rock* (1987).

There is nothing new or novel about such a methodology. It is the type of methodology used for the writings of Origen (d. 254) or Tertullian (d. after 220) by both the church father and doctor, St. Jerome (d. 420), and also the Homilies of Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles. Thus e.g., on the one hand, Jerome, rightly rejects Origen’s trichotomist view on pre-existent souls, saying, “It is impossible that you should hold the opinion of Origen,” “and other heretics that it is for the deeds done in a former life that souls are confined in earthly and mortal bodies. This opinion is indeed, flatly contradicted by the Apostle who says of Jacob and Esau that before they were born they had done neither good nor evil (Rom. 9:11)¹⁴⁷.” Likewise, Jerome fairly describes

¹⁴⁵ Ezek. 36:31.

¹⁴⁶ Matt. 6:10.

¹⁴⁷ Wace, H. & Schaff, P. (Editors), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, 1892, James Parker & Co., Oxford and Christian Literature Co., New York, USA, 1893, Vol. 6, St. Jerome: Letters & Select Works, p. 284 (Letter 144).

Origen's denial of a *bodily* resurrection as "poison"¹⁴⁸." But on the other hand, where Origen's view do not conflict with orthodoxy, Jerome is happy to cite them. E.g., in his "Preface to the translation of Origen's two homilies on the Song of Songs," Jerome says, "Origen, whilst in his other books he has surpassed all others, has in the Song of Songs surpassed himself. He wrote ten volumes upon it," "and I have translated these two short treatises, which he composed in the form of daily lectures for those who were still like babes and sucklings, and I have studied faithfulness rather than elegance. You can conceive how great value the larger work possesses, when the smaller gives you such satisfaction"¹⁴⁹."

Jerome clearly stated his methodological approach to the sometimes heretical Origen in his Letter to Tranquillinus. Hence in Letter 62, St. Jerome says, "you ask me" "for an opinion as the advisability of reading Origen's works. Are we, you say, to reject him altogether," "or are we," "to read him in part? My opinion is that we should sometimes read him for his learning just as we read Tertullian" (a Montanist heretic,) "and some other church writers," "and that we should select what is good and avoid what is bad in their writings according to the words of the Apostle, 'Prove all things, hold fast that which is good' (I Thess. 5:21). Those, however, who are led by some perversity in their dispositions to conceive for him too much fondness or too much aversion seem to me to lie under the curse of the prophet, 'Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil; that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter!' (Isa. 5:20). For while the ability of his teaching must not lead us to embrace his wrong opinions, the wrongness of his opinions should not cause us altogether to reject the useful commentaries which he has published on the Holy Scriptures"¹⁵⁰."

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 436 (Pamachius 25) cf. e.g., pp. 428,432-6.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 485 (Jerome to Damasus, 383 A.D.).

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 133-4 (Letter 62:2).