

PREACHING No.42: HISTORY CONFIRMS THE REVELATION

(Preached in Locodjro, Abidjan – Ivory Coast / www.matth25v6.org)

First of all I wish to talk a little about Gen.4:15-16. Let's take our Bibles then.[Brother Philip reads Gen.4:9 to 16] Well, I would like to insist on verses 15 and 16. We see there one of the very first courts of humanity. Cain was tried and condemned to execution and appealed. To the supreme authority, he was condemned to be marked. And according to verse 16, he left the court, the presence of God. Why? Because it was under the grace. First, it was the law: "*do not do this, do not eat that...*" and when Adam and Eve fell and God smote them and drove them out in his anger, one day when He went down in the garden, He remembered them and changed that law into grace and went even towards them as He did it in Jesus towards us.

A sign or a seal in the Bible means in this sense a spirit. God put an evil spirit upon Cain. From that moment, Cain saw in dream that he was fighting, killing and wounding people causing them to bleed. Because the sign that had been put upon him was a spirit of murder and he should look for being delivered from it for him not to go to hell. If he is delivered from that spirit, at the last judgement, that crime will not be imputed to him. But also, if he is not delivered, as soon as God sees him coming, he will see that sign on him and He will know that it's the assassin of Abel. And until his death, Cain will never stop seeing those things in dream. It is hell shouting against him.

And after that, one day, he masturbated himself and spilled his seed of copulation upon the ground like Onan in Genesis 38, the ground cried to God for a curse without any cause upon it and God put another sign upon Cain. Then, in some dreams, he would defile himself and sometimes he woke up wet with his seed of copulation. Why? God had put upon him a spirit that caused his seed to spill upon himself to defile him. The curse he threw upon the ground fell on himself and on all that belonged to him and on all that he laid his hand on. Each sin put a sign upon Cain so that now, he had sexual relations in dream, he would eat, he would fly in dream, he was pursued... What is this? Under the law, he deserved death but under the grace, God put signs, evil spirits upon him and gave him the opportunity to be delivered before he died and have the eternal Life. Yet, the same way God treated at the beginning, thus will He treat up to us.

Now I would like to broach the subject which refers to the comparison between *Darby*, *Ostervald*, *Martin* and *Louis Segond*. The same way the Church has had a history, thus has the Bible had its history too. I read through the history of the world at the national library, I read through books among which: *The world and its history, encyclopaedia Universalis*, *the Church of the Apostles and martyrs, Clarity* (Volume: history), *Church History* [J Lortz], *Origins of cults, myths and religions, universal History of missions...* And I do not have anything to rectify in all I have preached so far. History confirms the true Word of God. I saw like Eusebus, Polycarp, Cyprian, Luther, Calvin, Wesley...

But I am not saying that it is on the basis of such things or such errors that King James or Louis Segond is of devil but on the basis of the revelation. Yet, Jesus-Christ promised to build his Church upon the revelation. That's what is important for us. Burning the Louis Segond bible is nothing compared to what our forefathers experienced at the advent of Christianity. They had powerful fetishes which gave them children, all kinds of blessings, geniuses "benefactors"... And so, somebody appears and says that all that is bad and they must burn those fetishes. Without any evidence! Isn't this trying to colonise them again? That was hard, harder for people who cannot read... but they obeyed. Amen! Then, some centuries later, they were asked to break in pieces the statues of Paul, Peter, Jesus, Mary... that they erected in churches and that they had been venerating for so many years. They must have said: "*They are statues of Peter, the man to whom Jesus gave the keys and those are the statues of Jesus himself, it was the bishop himself who brought them last year*". But, some insignificant men like us told them to break them in pieces because Satan was lying behind. Those who are of God obeyed. Satan behind holy things? Behind a statue of Jesus Himself? Even behind a bible? That's what man does not understand...

Now, I would like to say things that might scandalize some: Know that if in William Branham's days somebody comes to baptise by aspersion, that his name is Martin Luther or John Wesley, he is a false prophet! And today while the Church is at midnight, and in accordance with the revelation of the hour, if somebody comes preaching, making use of two or three or several versions of the Bible, he is a false prophet, a liar even if his name is Martin Luther, John Wesley or William Branham. You see? He is a liar because where such version proves him wrong, another version will prove him right. [Ed: *the congregation says: Amen!*].

But how has the Bible got transmitted so far, it is about that I wish to speak now. First, the books of the Old Testament were written in Hebrew but Daniel 2:4 to Daniel 7:28 was written in Aramaic, the official language of the East since the 8th century before JC, while the New Testament is in Greek [old Greek]. Now notice this: after the cover of the Darby version, it is written: "*Translated from the original Hebrew and Greek texts*" and after the cover of Louis Segond, it is also written: "*translated from the original Hebrew and Greek texts*", and yet they are not the same original texts. The translation of the quasi-totality of the bibles that we see comes from the "*textus receptus*" [received text], Latin transposition by Erasmus of Rotterdam from the original-master texts with a harmonisation because of public readings. That is to say, he takes Ezekiel 1:1 and translates it word for word in the following manner: "*In the middle of - and I - of the month - the fifth - the fourth - year - in the thirtieth - and it occurred - of Elohim - visions - and I saw - the heavens - were open - Chebar - the river - on - the deportation*". What gives way to confusion is that, this text is also called: "*original texts*" yet it is already translated into Latin, French, English... And it is that text which was used for the translation of several versions among which Louis Segond, William Tyndall which was itself also of use to the group that translated *King James*, of the doctor of theology John Frederick Ostervald, of the reformer Luther ... in the 16th century. They are revisions of translation. I have nothing against a faithful translation from one language to the other. I

learnt that one of the fifty four translators of King James was so good at languages that had he been at the time when God confounded the languages, he would be an interpreter.

But from among them, like J.N. Darby, William Tyndall this worthy son of God impacted his epoch, he had a nobler mission than that of translating the Bible. Like, Darby, he could speak Hebrew, Greek, Latin, English, Italian, Spanish and French, so that each one of these languages could have been his mother tongue. His misfortune, it is to have met Erasmus, the author of the *Textus Receptus*. William Tyndall said in 1522 at Cambridge: *"I challenge the pope and all his laws, and if God grants me to live, I will make so that in England the boy that ploughs should know the Scriptures better than the pope himself."* William Tyndall was burnt alive on October 06, 1536 and at the moment when the flames were wrapping him, he made this request: *"Lord, open the eyes of the king of England..."*

For the public readings, the *"Textus Receptus"* was carefully harmonised. Thus, there was an addition of a multitude of verses in the Old and New Testament. For example, there was an addition of a verse 14 to Matth.23 in order to harmonise this text with that of Mark 12:40. Addition of: *"it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him"* to Acts 9:5-6 with the view to harmonising the text of Acts 9 with that of Acts 26:14.[Addition of: *"spoken of by Daniel the prophet"* to Mark 13:14 with the view to harmonising this text of Mark with that of Matthew 24:15. Addition of: *"Our Father which art in heaven"* and of: *"Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth."* and of: *"but deliver us from evil."* to Luke 11:2-4 with the view to harmonising this text with that of Matth.6:9-13]. Addition of a verse thirty seven to Acts 8 with the view to, certainly, harmonising this text with Acts 16 and especially for public readings. Addition of: *"who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit"* to Rom.8:1, what dangerously places the effort of man above the grace of God. Addition of: *"... For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth."* to 1 Jo. 5:7. This is not only false but also the presence of these witnesses in the heaven is a confusion for who do these in the heaven bear witness to and with which aim? You see? Addition of: *"... against them. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city."* to Mark 6:11 with the view to harmonising this text of Mark with that of Matthew 10:15. And all the bibles which were therefore inspired by that famous manuscript recopied most of these additions according as they are unaware of it or they find it normal.

Thus, from the foundation of the Church, there were no texts gathered in a book as we see it and that till the third century, the canon Muratori and in 382, the preacher Jerome began the translation of the vulgate. He had spent nineteen years at Bethlehem and could perfectly speak Hebrew and Greek. It was not the version inspired by God like Darby but God tolerated that and it was the Bible that was used for the translation of tens of others for more than ten centuries. Lefèvre of Etaples translated it into French, John Wycliff translated it into English... But Hebrew and Greek words were replaced by their synonyms or their equivalents. Thus, "penitence" was put instead of "repentance". For example, if you steal, do penance! You must knee upon some gravel under a blazing sun with a twenty-kilogram brick upon your head and then God will forgive you. Then secondly, in the 16th century, at the request of the Vaudois, the preacher Robert Olivetan [Louis Olivier], cousin of Calvin, translated from the originals a better version than the vulgate. A version which was published in 1535 and which was used as a support for the bible of Geneva, of Ostervald and for the synodal one... This version remained the most faithful to the original-Master texts until that of the lawyer J.N. Darby in around 1859. And the edition of Olivetan was prefaced by John Calvin in these terms and that impressed me a lot ... [Brother Philip reads the preface of Calvin: *"To all the emperors, kings, princes and people of the earth of God... This sacred work does not have a recent origin. It does not also seem to us that it needs men's approbation. In the same way, our adversaries will murmur and feel indignant. What does it mean, if not that they reproach God for having permitted this good? Oh! If they had lived at the time when Philip had four virgin daughters who prophesied, how they would have found it difficult to bear with them! ...*

*But if they come across some of these sides, I invite them not to attack and not to blame a scholar who did deserve some precious studies. As for those whose no consideration can contain the pen or the tongue, I ask them to remember that it is very easy to storm with slanders, and that, in this concern, the gossips * of crossroads themselves will always get the better of the most skilful rhetors *... Let them know that they are dealing with a man who can be attacked with impunity, without fearing the reciprocity of a language with no restraint, but let them not expect any great glory from their venomous eloquence.*

But you, O noble little and despised Church, go and wash your dirty hands for having made the servile work of iniquity! Clean your eyes very sticky in superstition! Receive this Word, promise and Testament... where you will be able to see the will of Christ, the Bride of yours and take leave of your masters and that cruel mother who you called mother for so long. This good is yours! The good habit has got it from any seniority to be so and those who give it to you will hold on to get a great gain. However, it remains entirely to Him that gives it to you "].

The three versions are (literal) traditional translations but, almost all the other versions of bible are modern translations said "classic". The traditional versions try to show what the original said and even how it said it while the classic or modern versions try to show what the original meant through theological, linguistic, archaeological and scientific discoveries. It is a pure interpretation, for the care for the comprehension is God's. Why did not God use a simpler language? Hebrew having no vowel. Should the Bible be lowered to the level of man or man to be raised to the level of the Bible? Yet the sacred cannot be adapted knowing that man in his culture, his language...is constantly evolving. You see that we are heading for a translation for the man of the street. I can already hear saying that Jesus wore white clothes in Tergal with hidden seam lines. It only remains them to say "suit" because it is the equivalent for coats, tunics, long robes and bubus of the East. It is necessary to say what the original said, with the words and how it was said. I prefer the sacred expression of God that I find it difficult to understand. And those

who do not have any notion of the sacred or who were not born and did not grow up beside the sacred must keep quiet... The parchments, scrolls, skins and sheep scapulas can be replaced but the text must be left as such. If the Bible should be understood directly, Philip should advise another version to the Ethiopian eunuch. In the traditional translation, the vocabulary comprises words whose meaning has progressed and a style very distant from that of today. The words were not replaced by their equivalents but the classic translation is an adaptation, an evolution of the sacred. For example, Eph.1:3-14 is a sentence in the Greek original and it should be translated the way it is. If the sacred should progress, one day, it will not be sacred any longer. Developed or obsolete words are noted at the foot of page.

And we see that people approve such version in such language and such other version in such part of the world and yet these versions contradict one another. For example, the Louis Segond version is used by protestant and evangelical churches in the French speaking countries. The King James version is used by protestant and evangelical churches in some English speaking countries. In some countries it is Ostervald, in others it is David Martin... If God approves that then He must do the same with the churches! You see? ... And to end, I would like to say something: since the beginning of this Message, talking about the versions of the Bible, I wanted to say only one thing, a secret for us who believe this Message: the J.N. Darby Bible is not a version of the Bible but the Bible itself and that is a secret. He that hath ears to hear let him hear...[Brother Philip prays while the congregation sings: *How couldn't I praise You for all ...*].Oh! God, send us always some prophets! I am not the first and I will not be the last but when You send one, give our children to recognize him because the greatest blessing on earth, it is the prophet...

CONTACT: Brother Kacou Philip E-mail: kacou.philippe@yahoo.fr / Cell: +225-0252-252

Website: www.matth25v6.org or, launch the search "prophet Kacou Philip" on Google.