

To : Mr G D Buss
Chairman of the Trinitarian Bible Society
William Tyndale House, 29 Deer Park Road
London SW19 3NN

Copied to Mr John Metcalfe, Minister of the Gospel

Misrepresentations

1. Instead of answering my argument regarding the translation 'by one righteousness' you have chosen to misrepresent my argument.
2. Instead of answering my argument regarding the translation concerning Abraham's faith and justification, again you have chosen, rather, to misrepresent my argument.
3. Instead of submitting to the word of the apostles, you have then made a breathtaking assertion regarding the Holy Spirit, misrepresenting His inspiration.
4. And finally, having failed to answer my letter in any way, and having - in effect - asserted your own interpretation above the words on the page of scripture, you attempt to deny me any right of reply by stating 'We have nothing further to add to this correspondence'.

=====

Well I do have something further to add, sir - as follows - and I shall freely publish it.

=====

But first I note that in previous email correspondence it appeared that you were unable or unwilling to, yourself, answer my queries regarding what is preached in the assemblies with which you are associated in Wiltshire, namely - and in particular - the erroneous assertion that blood was shed (and that redemptively) in Gethsemane and the erroneous assertion that Jesus Christ disobeyed Deity by partaking of the tree of knowledge of good and evil and that this act results in the transference to others of a legal righteousness.

Being unwilling to answer me yourself, you made it clear that you would be taking the advice of 'scholars' as you call them. I take it, therefore, that I am actually addressing these 'scholars' but it is your own signature at the bottom of the letter and therefore the responsibility lies with yourself, sir.

Despite that I had offered, more than once, to give up half a day of my time to drive down to Wiltshire and back again in order to civilly discuss matters with you, you have repeatedly chosen to reject my offers on the grounds that you are too busy.

Thus our correspondence, sir. Had you been unwilling to properly enter into written discussion, you should have not answered my letter. But having misrepresented my arguments and having made a shocking assertion regarding the word of God on the page of holy scripture it behoves me to write a full answer to you, whether you want it or not and whether you read it or not.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

1. Your letter states "You appeal to Romans 5:12 maintaining that it should have been consistently translated 'by the man of one'."

I definitely did not so 'appeal' and 'maintain' nor do I do so.

Hearken again to my words : 'But if 'by the man of one' be nonsense in Romans 5:12, then so is 'by the righteousness of one' nonsense in Romans 5:18.

With subtlety, you totally ignore my main argument regarding the prepositional genitive δι ενος δικαιοματος, Romans 5:18, which results in the correct translation 'by one righteousness' and you sidestep it to talk about context.

You completely ignore the fact that Paul uses a preposition and then uses the genitive case required by that preposition. And you choose, rather, to add a definite article - which he does not - then to cover up your use of it by not italicising it. You choose to misrepresent Paul's concept as a possessive 'of one' when it is a prepositional genitive not a possessive genitive.

And you choose to completely ignore my argument that you might as well translate his words in Romans 5:12 likewise - 'by the man of one' - which would be nonsensical.

Ignoring what I have actually said, you choose, rather, to misrepresent what I have said. Just as you do with Paul's words.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

2. You further state in your letter 'Your argument appeals to the fact that *logitsomai* is a so-called 'deponent' verb and therefore cannot be translated as passive.'

I definitely did not so appeal, nor do I do so, sir.

Hearken again to my words, and not to your misrepresentation of them :

'[...] taking account of the fact that a deponent verb is used; that it is not only *intransitive* (and therefore cannot be transformed into a passive [...])' .

However, the outcome is not a matter of argument for I do not dispute the wording 'it was reckoned'. I do not like 'it' because no 'it' is in the original and some have misunderstood the 'it' to refer to faith as though 'faith' is a *substitute* for righteousness - which it is not. But I wish not to labour this point here.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

3. But lastly - and by far the worsely - you state, or rather (presumably) your 'scholars' have put in your letter for you to sign : **'Ultimately, it is the Holy Spirit's use of Greek that is normative, not the rules of any Greek grammar textbook, however helpful they may be'.**

So if we cannot assess the words on the page by the usual rules of Greek, to whom do we turn ?

If Paul was inspired to use the Greek language in a way which is not 'normal', how would we ever know what he is talking about ?

If what is there in the Received Text - as we have it by the Computensian Polyglot, Beza, Erasmus, Stephanus, Elzevir and Scrivener - all of whom, together, have provided us with the Critical Summation of over five thousand manuscripts, Uncial and miniscule - together with Lectionary evidence, Version references and Patristic Citations - thus to provide us with as close a text as possible to that which was used by the early Church in the second century; if what is there, I say, cannot be comprehended properly by us because Paul wrote in a grammar all of his own which does not obey the 'normal' rules of language - then where are we ?

Where are you leading us, sirs ? I say sirs for I address not Mr Buss, the signatory, I address the 'scholars' (the scribes) behind his letter. For it is you, scholars, who would, by such terms as 'dynamic equivalence' assert your supposed learning above the words that are visible on the page.

Where are we ?

I will tell you where we are :

Back in the Middle Ages. Back with Roman Catholicism (which, by the way, is exactly where you get your doctrine of bloodshed in Gethsemane from). Back with a bible which the 'common people' cannot translate for themselves. They need the clergy (or the scribes of the clergy) to do it for them.

You wish to rob us of the bible, by misrepresenting the inspiration of the Holy Spirit of God.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

The Holy Spirit's inspiration came through chosen apostles.

Who spoke Greek.

They were Greek speakers. They knew exactly what they were talking about. And they spoke a highly developed, magnificently structured language which far - far - surpasses English as a means of conveying concept and logic.

Anyone who gives me a bible to read is answerable - utterly and absolutely answerable - to the actual words of the apostles themselves. *And that is exactly where I will take that bible in order to confirm the translation.*

Those apostolic words have been uttered in a language that was Providentially guided for over fifteen hundred years - all the way from Linear A and Linear B - and was developed by a regime that aimed for cultural and artistic expression devoid of oppressive bureaucracy. I believe that God was instrumental in the overseeing of the development of that magnificent language.

And you seem to think that everything can be overturned, grammar and all, so that you may assert your false doctrine which falsity is blatantly apparent when one matches it to the inspired words of the holy writings of the chosen apostles.

You stop at nothing - absolutely nothing - in your stubbornness to cling to a legal righteousness.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

In approaching you in the first place, some long time ago - for I have patiently put up with your tardiness for many months - I had originally hoped I would receive better from you than from your compatriots in Wiltshire. But you have proved with this letter, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that you, also, deserve to read the letter which I sent to others regarding the dream I had before going to the Gospel Standard Library in Hove.

On the very morning as I woke to catch the train down to Hove, I had a dream. I dreamed of a black clothed parasite which attached itself to a dog and sucked the life out of it until it's head - the means of intelligence - was shrunken grotesquely. I am still waiting for any of your number to reply and to tell me what may be the interpretation of this, my dream.

Nigel Johnstone
Director, Belmont Publications.

Enclosed - *'The Black-Clothed Parasite' (Reproduced from 'The Everlasting Testament')*