FOR LOVE OF THE BIBLE

The Battle for the Authorized Version and the Received Text from 1800 to Present

By David W. Cloud

Copyright © 1995 by David W. Cloud
First printing, July 1995
Revised and enlarged, October 1995
Second Edition, December 1999
Third Edition, October 2002
Fourth Edition, February 2006
Fifth Edition, illustrated, October 2008

ISBN 1-58318-004-4

Published by

Way of Life Literature

P.O. Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061-0368
866-295-4143 (toll free) • fbns@wayoflife.org (e-mail)
http://www.wayoflife.org (web site)

Canada:
Bethel Baptist Church,
4212 Campbell St. N., London, Ont. N6P 1A6
• 519-652-2619 (voice) • info@bethelbaptist.ca (e-mail)

Printed in Canada by
Bethel Baptist Print Ministry

DEDICATION

I dedicate this volume to two men who have been used of God to encourage the hearts of thousands in this generation in the Bible version issue: David Otis Fuller and Donald A. Waite. These men have been instrumental not only in standing in defense of the preserved text of Holy Scripture but of reprinting the position of our forefathers on this most crucial issue. They have made the words of John Burgon, Edward Miller, George Miller, Herman Hoskier, Joseph Philpot, S.C. Malan, Philip Mauro, and many others available to a generation that otherwise has largely been kept in the dark.

Contents

Preface 5

Introduction 8

Major Points of King James Bible Defense 12

- The Modern Critical Text Came from Egypt 13
- We Reject Modern Textual Criticism 24
- The Modern Texts and Versions Are a Product of End-Time Apostasy 38

From 1800 to 1870: Battle against the Pre-Westcott-Hort Texts 48

From 1870 to 1950: The Battle against Westcott-Hort and the ERV 106

From 1950 to 1970: The Battle against the Revised Standard Version 204

From 1970 to Present: The Battle against NIV and Multiplicity Versions 255

Bibliography 444

Index 499

Preface to the First Edition

The author's research on this subject began nearly thirty years ago, not long after we began our missionary work in South Asia. (We have spent seventeen years in church planting.) During my training at Tennessee Temple Bible School, I was not taught anything about the history of the various texts and versions. The King James Bible was the only version used in the pulpit, but our teachers frequently corrected it. One of my teachers used the New American Standard Version in the classroom. In Greek class I was given a United Bible Societies Greek New Testament, and though we assumed it was the preserved Word of God, we were not told that it differed dramatically from the Greek Received Text (TR) underlying the great Reformation Bibles. My Greek teacher held the position that the TR and the Eclectic text and the NASV and the KJV are all conservative and accurate. As a result of this training I began to question the absolute dependability of the KJV, so after settling down in Asia, I began to examine the Bible Version issue for myself. I looked at all sides, but I do not hesitate to say that the TR-only position struck a chord in my heart as soon as I began to hear it. I remember the thrill I received the first time I heard an audio recording of David Otis Fuller preaching on this subject. Something inside of me responded heartily to his bold defense of the Old Bible. It still does!

I have made a strenuous effort to get a proper overview of this subject. I have written at least 1,500 letters, faxes, and e-mail messages in connection with this report. I have corresponded with an estimated 500 men. I have conducted dozens of personal interviews. I have made countless phone calls. (I am tremendously thankful for those who took the time from their busy schedules to reply to my questions. Many have been most gracious in this regard. To try to list them here would be tedious, I fear, to the reader. Those who contributed significantly to this report are cited in the book.)

I have read thousands of pages of text, and not being content to read what others have quoted, I have obtained or examined the materials listed in the bibliography. At this writing my library contains roughly 1,500 books and reports on the subject of Bible texts and versions, plus more than 2,000 letters. In the first year of the research for this book I received considerable help from the library jointly operated by Regent College/Carey Theological College in Vancouver, B.C. They had roughly 90 titles of the rare books on this subject that I was unable to obtain from any other source at that time. I copied 5,500 pages of text from their microfiche and books for my own library. Another excellent resource was the British Library, where I have spent many profitable days on trips to England. Many materials that I could not otherwise obtain were loaned to me by various men. At one point, Walter Schmidt in Minnesota

was very helpful in supplying out-of-print books and making copies of materials from libraries in his area. Dr. D.A. Waite's The Bible for Today ministry has done a great service by reprinting many rare titles on this subject, and we have availed ourselves of all of these reprints. Further, The Bible for Today maintains an extensive inventory of contemporary works on the Bible version issue. From these and other sources I have been able to obtain all of the important histories of the English Bible, several unpublished master's and doctoral theses on the subject, *The Quarterly Review* articles on this subject dating from 1818, the *Bibliotheca Sacra* articles from 1921, all of the works of Burgon, Westcott, Hort, Scrivener, Miller, Hoskier, Malan, Nolan, Samson, Kenyon, Metzger, Lightfoot, Bruce, etc. I have spent several thousand dollars on this project on books alone, not counting travel and other expenses.

The research for this book has been fascinating and intensely edifying. What a thrill it has been to read 200-year-old documents that defend the same Bible that we hold dear today, a Bible that was already 200 years old then. What an encouragement it has been to see that the arguments used to support the modern versions in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries were refuted by godly men in the nineteenth. Do I hear someone say, "Yes, but the modern versions won out in the end"? I disagree. Modern versions have not won out in the end, because the end has not yet come! The Bible warns that apostasy will rule at the end of the church age, which tells me that the majority opinion among professing Christians cannot be trusted; but apostasy *will not* win out in the end. We believe the modern versions are a reflection of end-time apostasy.

Truth has always been held by the minority, the remnant. This can be seen throughout the centuries of Israel's kingdom, as the prophets of old maintained their lonely vigils. It can be seen in the years of Christ's earthly ministry. The religious scholars of Jesus' day exhibited their pride when they said: "Have any of the rulers of the Pharisees believed on him? But this people who knoweth not the law are cursed" (John 7:48, 49). It was the proud religious scholars that were blind, but they looked down upon the "common men" who believed the Word of God and accepted the testimony of Christ. As a wise man has said, "No man is more blind than he who *will not* see." By the way, it interesting that the Pharisees were misrepresenting the true situation as it existed even among themselves. In John 9:16 we learn that the Pharisees actually were divided among themselves as to Christ's miracles. In a similar manner, textual critics today would have their readers believe that scholarship is solemnly and only arrayed against the old Text, whereas that is an untrue portrayal of the situation.

The Bible warns that the spirit of error and religious apostasy will increase throughout this age. In light of the prophecies of the Scriptures that foresee the apostasy of the visible "church," I do not find it strange that the pure Bible is rejected by the majority of those that profess to be Christians today. *Truth has long been a remnant position in this dark world.*

A glorious day will soon dawn, though, in which truth will reign and lies and corruptions will be gone. Jesus said that His Word will judge men in that day (Jn. 12:48), and we are convinced that we have His very Word today in the Hebrew Masoretic and the Greek Received Text and in the Authorized English Version as an accurate translation thereof.

We close this Preface with an excerpt from a message preached at the Dean Burgon Society meeting in 1994, comparing the situation in ancient Israel with that of today:

> "In the 14th chapter of 1 Samuel the nation of Israel was under King Saul. The Philistines had overrun the land of Palestine and they had destroyed the forges that the Israelites needed to make their weapons. It was a very similar period to what we are experiencing today. Our publishing companies are no longer publishing the sharp two-edged sword. During that period of time, it was only Saul and his son Jonathan that had swords. Even so, Jonathan and his armor bearer determined to go up to the garrison of the Philistines, and the armor bearer said, 'It may be that the Lord will work for us: for there is no restraint to the Lord to save by many or by few' (v. 6**). I want to encourage you who stand today for the King James Bible that God is not restrained to save by few or by many**. He has given you and me a Sword, a sharp two-edged Sword. God will still confirm His truth through us. I want to encourage you that if God be for us, who can be against us?" (Russell Dennis, Dean Burgon Society annual meeting, August 18, 1994).

INTRODUCTION

The "Cult" of "King James Onlyism"?

It has been said that today's defenders of the King James Bible form a new cult that was created by a handful of misguided men. One writer claims that the "King James Only position can be traced to Seventh-day Adventist Benjamin Wilkinson, who wrote *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* in 1930. This is as incredible as claiming that fundamentalism can be traced to a snake handler or that Dispensationalism can be traced to a Jesuit priest. Others think the defense of the KJV can be linked to Peter Ruckman of Pensacola, Florida.

This type of misrepresentation has always been part and parcel with the defense of the modern texts and versions, but it has increased in intensity in recent years and is finding a home even among those who claim to be fundamentalists and Bible-believing Baptists. Pastor Denis Gibson, Calvary Baptist Church, Brampton, Ontario, Canada, who has been in the ministry since 1958, gives the following testimony:

> I see a real hostility that has been generated in the minds of some of the younger pastors. There does not seem to be, on their part, a serious interest in dealing with this issue. ... It is the hostility, however, that is troubling. Sides are forming and deep prejudices are evident. To be 'a King James man' is now a term of opprobrium. This opposition is within 'so-called' evangelicalism, not as in the past, from the liberal-modernist camp (Letter of April 19, 1995).

Pastor Gibson has considerable experience on both sides of this issue. He was a Presbyterian minister for 10 years, then pastored a Fellowship of Evangelical Baptist Churches in Canada congregation for 17 years before becoming an Independent Baptist.

There can be no doubt that the King James Bible has been the historic Bible of English-speaking believers for almost four centuries. In fact, the King James Bible is a revision of that line of Received Text English Bibles stretching back to Tyndale in 1525. Today, though, this ancient position is looked upon as new and divisive! King Ahab charged faithful Elijah with troubling Israel when, in fact, it was Ahab, with his apostasies and improvisations, who was doing the troubling (1 Kings 18:17, 18). We are convinced that this is the case today. It is the modern version supporters, with their roots in nineteenth-century Rationalism, who are troubling the churches with their innovations.

Before we show the fallacy of claiming that King James defenders are a twentieth-century cult, we must establish our definition of terms. What is "King James Only? To make proper sense of things, it must be recognized that there is a tremendous variety of opinion among those who defend the *Textus Receptus* (also called the TR, the Received Text, and the Traditional Text in this study) and the King James Bible. Those who fall into the scope of our study are those who see the Received Text as the preserved text of Holy Scripture and who view the major Protestant translations thereof (the KJV, the Luther Bible, etc.) as accurate translations of the correct Text. Within this general camp there are differences pertaining to *exactly* how the TR and the KJV are perceived. There are differences in regard to the Received Text, some believing it is settled and perfect in the standard Reformation editions, others believing it still needs some minor revision. There are also differences of opinion in regard to the KJV. Some exalt the KJV to the same level of authority as the underlying Text. Others have respect for the KJV as a generally accurate translation of the correct manuscripts but believe it needs minor improvement. A number of the writers whose works appear in David Otis Fuller' books took this position:

> We fully admit that there are here and there passages of which the translation might be improved, as, for instance, 'love' for 'charity' throughout I Cor. 13. But we deprecate any alteration as a measure that the smallest sprinkling of good would deluge us with a flood of evil (Joseph Philpot, "The Authorized Version 1611," *True Or False?* Third Printing, 1978, p. 21).

> No reasonable person imagines that the translators were infallible or that their work was perfect, but no one acquainted with the facts can deny that they were men of outstanding scholarship, well qualified for their important work, or that with God's blessing they completed their great task with scrupulous care and fidelity (Terence Brow, "The Learned Men," *Which Bible?* fifth edition, 1984 reprint, p. 13).

> In speaking of this class of changes we do not fail to recognize, what is admitted by all competent authorities, that the A.V. could be corrected in a number of passages where the meaning is now obscured because of changes which three centuries have brought about in the meaning of English words, or where diligent study or recent discoveries have brought to light better readings. Such instances, however, are comparatively few, whereas the R.V. gives us about 36,000 departures, small and great, from the A.V. What shall we say of such a host of changes? (Philip Mauro, "Which Version?" *True Or False?* pp. 101, 102).

This is the type of variety to which I refer. All of these positions could be summarized as "King James Only" in that all believe that the King James Bible is the *only accurate English translation* of the preserved text of Scripture currently published. All of the varied positions on the TR and the KJV are based upon the same promises of Scripture and the same basic theological platform. All reject the critical Westcott-Hort line of Greek texts. All believe the modern English versions are founded upon a corrupted family of Greek manuscripts. All

emphasize the importance of the doctrine of biblical preservation in settling this issue.

Some, though, as we have noted, persist in identifying every King James defender as a follower of Peter Ruckman, who, from his base in Pensacola, Florida, has been occupied for many years with his weird, angry tirade toward the members of "the Alexandrian cult."

One fellow who is guilty of this defines a "KJV onlyite" as "one who believes that the KJV is the only legitimate translation in English, that it perfectly preserves God's word in the form He intended for us to have, *that it is unalterable, and any revision would de facto constitute corruption*, that the English is inherently adequate for all matters, and *therefore the Greek and Hebrew are now irrelevant, even unnecessary*. It is this point of view that had its seeds in Benjamin Wilkinson's writings, was transmitted through J.J. Ray, then expounded in a modified and more extreme form by Fuller and Ruckman, evolving into the movement as it is now constituted."

This is a slanderous caricature of what probably the majority of King James defenders believe, including the late J.J. Ray and D.O. Fuller. Neither man believed that the King James Bible is incapable of revision. Dr. Fuller said: "We do not say that the KJV does not permit of changes. There are a number *that could be and should be made*, but there is a vast difference between a change and an error" (Fuller, *Is the King James Version Nearest to the Original Autographs?* nd., p. 1). J.J. Ray said, "There are a few mis-translations in the King James English, but every word is based upon a Greek word in the Textus Receptus which was given by the inspiration of God, and has been providentially preserved for us today" (*God Wrote Only One Bible*, p. 102).

Though Ray and Fuller believed the Authorized Version is an adequate translation, neither man taught that Greek and Hebrew are irrelevant or that the KJV could in no wise be revised. To say that the KJV is the only legitimate existing standard translation in English is not to say that it is unalterable. To say that the KJV accurately preserves God's Word is not to say that any revision would *de facto* constitute corruption. To say that the English translation is inherently adequate is not to say that the Greek and Hebrew are irrelevant and unnecessary.

It is this type of careless, inaccurate, unfair, broad-brushed characterization which has darkened the entire debate surrounding the KJV vs. modern versions.

To lump every defender of the King James Bible into one monolithic camp and to pretend that all believe the same thing and march to the same piper's tune in regard to Bible texts and versions is either ignorance or dishonesty. It is one thing to criticize the perceived errors and extremism and peculiarities of some individual personality. That is easy to do inasmuch as every member of the human race has some peculiarities! It is quite another thing to pretend that all

defenders of the King James Bible are followers of some man. Many, though, are guilty of making this very charge. They are caught up with the personalities of the movement.

Let me also emphasize, because I know from past experience that some will misunderstand and misrepresent my position, that I am not encouraging the variety which exists among King James Bible defenders. I'm simply saying that this variety is a reality that must be acknowledged. If I had my way everyone would hold the *RIGHT* position, which is, of course, *MY* position! I believe the King James Bible is an accurate and lovely translation of the preserved Greek and Hebrew texts of Scripture. I do not believe the King James Bible contains any errors. I believe that God had His hand upon the KJV in a special way because of the singular role it would play in the transmission of the Word of God during a long and crucial epoch of church history. In contrast with the modern English versions, I believe the KJV is based upon a superior underlying text; it was produced by superior translators; it incorporates superior translation techniques; it demonstrates a superior theology; it embodies a superior style of English; it was created in a superior era; and it has a superior history. I believe the King James Bible is the inspired Word of God because it accurately translates the inspired, preserved text.

To reject the King James Bible for the modern versions is one's privilege this side of eternity; to claim or imply, on the other hand, that the King James Bible is no longer defensible and is only guarded today by sentimental, tradition-bound cultists is to darken the truth.

CHAPTER ONE

Major Points of King James Bible Defense

The detractors of so-called "King James Onlyism" are quick to point out alleged mistakes in the writings of King James Bible defenders while lightly passing over the major arguments in favor of the Received Text and the King James Bible. There are exceptions, but those who criticize King James Bible defenders commonly strain at gnats and swallow camels; they focus on the exceptions and ignore the rules; they discover grains of error among mountains of truth! They have a strange inclination to "cling to all sorts of small details, which they seek to use as arguments against the clear and decisive evidence."

For example, they try to make something of the fact that the KJV *is* copyrighted in Britain, whereas some KJV defenders have said it has no copyright. They fail to note, though, that *effectively* there is no copyright outside of Britain since the copyright on the KJV owned by the British crown does not restrict its publication outside of the U.K.; they also fail to note that there is a vast difference between using a copyright on a Bible to fatten one's financial bottom line, as modern version publishers do, and using it to maintain the integrity of the text, as the Trinitarian Bible Society and similar organizations do.

They point out that Frank Logsdon, who publicly repudiated the modern versions, was not an actual translator of the New American Standard Version as some have mistakenly said he was. (He helped set up the NASV project, but he did not do any actual translation.)

They try to make something of the supposed fact that the KJV was never formally authorized. In actuality, there can be no doubt that the KJV WAS authorized in any normal sense of the term; its very creation was formally authorized by King James, and he decreed that the "whole Church in the kingdom" was to be bound by the new translation, and none other. The KJV formally replaced the Bishops' Bible which had been authorized by the crown, thus assuming the authority of its predecessor. The KJV is the only English Bible whose copyright belongs to the British crown. If this does not add up to authorization, the word means nothing. Further, even Matthew Riddle, final editor of the American Standard Version, admitted in *The Story of the Revised*

New Testament that it is possible that documents detailing the authorization of the KJV were destroyed: "the official documents that presumably gave the authorization were destroyed by fire in 1618.").

KJV detractors point out that St. Catherine's monastery at Mt. Sinai is Orthodox and not Roman Catholic as some KJV defenders have mistakenly said.

Yea, they worry over all sorts of gnats while passing too lightly over many weighty arguments.

This is not wise. Every man makes mistakes. Every book written by a man is prone to contain mistakes, because man is fallible. I often marvel that man, with his constant bent toward error, can get anything right. Only by God's grace is it possible. We need to focus on the major points of a man's position. It's not wise to worry over a bent hubcap when examining a lovely old Rolls Royce.

Forget the gnats and consider with me some of the "camels" which a man must swallow if he is to reject the King James Bible and its underlying text. Strangely, these are issues which are given only passing notice (if that) in many textbooks and Bible college/seminary courses today.

1. We hold to the King James Bible because the modern critical text came from Egypt, a hotbed of theological heresy.

The Greek text underlying the modern versions can be traced to Egypt in the early centuries following the death of the apostles. It is called the Alexandrian text after the Egyptian city of Alexandrian, which was a center of learning during the early centuries of the church age. The article "Textual Criticism and the Alexandrian Text" at the www.earlham.edu web site summarizes the standard view of modern textual criticism as follows:

> This text arose in Egypt and is generally conceded to be the most important one. Westcott and Hort, who named this the Neutral Text, thought that Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus had preserved a pure form of the Alexandrian type of text." Jacobus Petzer admits: "… the vast majority of textual scholars today agrees that the Alexandrian text is most probably the closest representative of the original text available today" (Petzer, "The History of the New Testament Text," *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History*, edited by B. Aland and J. Delobel, 1994, p. 25). And Peter van Minnen, in *Dating the Oldest New Testament Manuscripts*, concludes: "It is to be noticed that all the manuscripts listed above come from Egypt. The papyri … Sinaiticus … B [Vaticanus] … We owe the early Egyptian Christians an immense debt (http://www.clt.astate.edu/wnarey/Bible%20as%20Literature%20documents/content2.htm).

Egypt is not the place where the Spirit of God gave the New Testament Scriptures. God chose to deliver the Scriptures to churches in Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, and Europe. Not one book of the New Testament is associated with Egypt.

Beginning in the book of Genesis, the Bible warns about Egypt. The first mention of Egypt is Genesis 12:10-13 -- "And there was a famine in the land: and Abram went down into Egypt to sojourn there; for the famine was grievous in the land. And it came to pass, when he was come near to enter into Egypt, that he said unto Sarai his wife, Behold now, I know that thou art a fair woman to look upon. Therefore it shall come to pass, when the Egyptians shall see thee, that they shall say, This is his wife: and they will kill me, but they will save thee alive. Say, I pray thee, thou art my sister: that it may be well with me for thy sake; and my soul shall live because of thee."

This was a step of *Disobedience* on Abraham's part, for there is no record that God spoke to him about this. God had told him to leave Ur and go to Canaan, and when he did this he was walking in faith and obedience, because "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. 10:17). But when Abraham turned aside and went down to Egypt, he was walking by natural sight and disobedience.

Abraham's disobedience quickly led to *Deception*. Thus the very first thing that we see about Egypt in the Scriptures is that it is associated with disobedience and deception. We know that the principle of "first mention" is important, and that this is therefore an important spiritual lesson. "Going down to Egypt in the first two references of Scripture were times of disobedience and deception. Does God have a lesson here for us? The New Testament tells us in 1 Corinthians 10:11 that '…all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.' I believe He does have a lesson here and it concerns faith in His preserved Word and Words. Why do some, including some of our fundamentalist brethren, go to Egypt when it comes to recovering the manuscripts underlying our New Testament Scriptures?" (David Bennett, *Preserved in Egypt or Preserved in God's Churches*, 2004, p. 1).

Abraham's journey to Egypt also represented a *Misplaced Trust*. Another important reference to the danger of Egypt is Isaiah 31:1 -- "Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help; and stay on horses, and trust in chariots, because they are many; and in horsemen, because they are very strong; but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the LORD!" Instead of trusting in God, the Israelites were trusting in man. And this is exactly what we see in modern textual criticism. Its theories were not founded on faith in God's promise of preservation. Rather, its theories were gathered from unregenerate men in secular fields. It trusts not in God's promises but in the manuscript record.

After the death of the apostles there was a vicious satanic attack upon the Scriptures. Heretics multiplied and they were not afraid of tampering with the New Testament.

> It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that THE WORST CORRUPTIONS TO WHICH THE NEW TESTAMENT HAS EVER BEEN SUBJECTED, ORIGINATED WITHIN A HUNDRED YEARS AFTER IT WAS COMPOSED ... the African Fathers and the whole Western, with a portion of the Syrian Church, used far inferior manuscripts to those employed by Stunica, or Erasmus, or Stephen, thirteen centuries after, when moulding the Textus Receptus (F.H.A. Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, II, 4th edition, 1894, pp. 264, 265).

John Burgon, who did extensive research into the history of the Bible, proved that the manuscripts favored by modern textual critics (e.g., the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) contain corruptions introduced by heretics in those early centuries.

> In the age which immediately succeeded the Apostolic there were heretical teachers not a few, who finding their tenets refuted by the plain Word of God bent themselves against the written Word with all their power. From seeking to evacuate its teaching, it was but a single step to seeking to falsify its testimony" (John Burgon and Edward Miller, *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, 1896). "WE KNOW THAT ORIGEN IN PALESTINE, LUCIAN AT ANTIOCH, HESCHIUS IN EGYPT, 'REVISED' THE TEXT OF THE N.T. Unfortunately, they did their work in an age when such fatal misapprehension prevailed on the subject, that each in turn will have inevitably imported a fresh assortment of *monstra* into the sacred writings. Add, the baneful influence of such spirits as Theophilus (sixth Bishop of Antioch, A.D. 168), Tatian, Ammonius, &c., of whom there must have been a vast number in the primitive age,--some of whose productions, we know for certain, were freely multiplied in every quarter of ancient Christendom:--add, the fabricated gospels which anciently abounded ... and WE HAVE SUFFICIENTLY EXPLAINED HOW IT COMES TO PASS THAT NOT A FEW OF THE CODICES OF ANCIENT CHRISTENDOM MUST HAVE EXHIBITED A TEXT WHICH WAS EVEN SCANDALOUSLY CORRUPT (Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, pp. 29, 30).

Egypt in particular was a hotbed of heresy and fanaticism. Prominent Gnostics were associated with Alexandria. "Egypt was soon filled with religious and philosophical sectaries of every kind, and particularly that almost every Grecian sect found an advocate and professor in Alexandria."

A Heretical School at Alexandria

This school was established in about 180 A.D. by **Pantaenus** He mixed pagan philosophy with Christianity. He is called "a Christian philosopher of the Stoic sect" (*McClintock & Strong Cyclopedia*).

Clement of Alexandria (his full name was Titus Flavius Clement) (115-215 A.D.), a student of Pantaenus, taught at Alexandria from about 190-202 A.D. Clement also intermingled Christianity with pagan philosophy; he was one of

the fathers of purgatory; he taught baptismal regeneration; he taught that most men will be saved; he accepted apocryphal books as divinely inspired; he believed that men could become God. Clement "saw Greek philosophy as a preliminary discipline, a schoolmaster, to point the pagan world the way to Christ" (Sightler, *Tabernacle Essays on Bible Translation*, 1992, p. 7).

Another heretic associated with Alexandria was **Origen** (185-254 A.D.), who succeeded Clement. He laid the foundation for modern versions with his commentaries and textual changes. Philip Schaff admitted that Origen's "predilection for Plato (the pagan philosopher) led him into many grand and fascinating errors." The Lutheran historian Johann Mosheim describes him as "a compound of contraries, wise and unwise, acute and stupid, judicious and injudicious; the enemy of superstition, and its patron; a strenuous defender of Christianity, and its corrupter; energetic and irresolute; one to whom the Bible owes much, and from whom it has suffered much" (*An Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern, from the Birth of Christ to the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century*, 1840).

Origen held the following doctrinal errors, among others. He denied the infallible inspiration of Scripture. He rejected the literal history of the early chapters in Genesis and of Satan taking the Lord Jesus up to a high mountain and offering him the kingdoms of the world (Will Durant, *The Story of Civilization,* Vol. III, p. 614). He accepted infant baptism and taught baptismal regeneration and salvation by works. He believed the Holy Spirit was possibly a created being of some sort. He believed in a form of purgatory and universalism, denying the literal fire of hell and believing that even Satan would be saved eventually. He believed that men's souls are preexistent and that stars and planets possibly have souls. He believed that Jesus was a created being and not eternal. He denied the bodily resurrection, claiming that the resurrection body is spherical, non-material, and does not have members. Origen allegorized the Bible saying, "The Scriptures have little use to those who understand them literally."

Origen was the first textual critic. "To Origen is attributed the earliest substantial work in the field of textual criticism" (Kenneth I. Brown, *The Church Fathers and the Text of the New Testament*, p. 21). He produced the *Hexapla*, which consisted of six translations of the Old Testament. Origen used his own faulty reason to determine the text of Scripture. The following example is from *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Scriptures* by John Burgon and Edward Miller (1896): "In this Commentary Origen, the leading Christian critic of antiquity, gives us an insight into the arbitrary and highly subjective manner in which New Testament textual criticism was carried on at Alexandria about 230 AD. In his comment on Matthew 19:17-21 (Jesus' reply to the rich young man) Origen reasons that Jesus could not have concluded his list of God's commandments with the comprehensive requirement, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. For the reply of the young man was, All these things have I

kept from my youth up, and Jesus evidently accepted this statement as true. But if the young man had loved his neighbor as himself, he would have been perfect, for Paul says that the whole law is summed up in this saying, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. But Jesus answered, If thou wilt be perfect etc., implying, that the young man was not yet perfect. Therefore, Origen argued, the commandment, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, could not have been spoken by Jesus on this occasion and was not part of the original text of Matthew. The clause had been added, Origen concluded, by some tasteless scribe." Thus, Origen made crucial textual decisions based on his own faulty reasoning. Contrary to Origen's claim, it is very obvious that the Lord Jesus *did not* accept the rich young ruler's profession that he had kept the law from his youth up, for the simple reason that no man has done such a thing (Rom. 3:19-23; Gal. 3:10; Jam. 2:10-11). In His reply to the rich young ruler, Christ was exposing the sinful condition of the young man's heart and his deceit in thinking that he was righteous. Christ was using the law for its divinely-intended purpose, which is to reveal man's sin and to lead him to repentance and faith in the Gospel.

Origen brazenly tampered with the text of Scripture. Consider the testimony of Presbyterian scholar Robert Dabney:

> Origen exercised a powerful influence over the transmission of the Greek text in the period before some of the most ancient copies now in existence were written. ... HE WAS THE GREAT CORRUPTER, AND THE SOURCE, OR AT LEAST THE CHANNEL, OF NEARLY ALL THE SPECULATIVE ERRORS WHICH PLAGUED THE CHURCH IN AFTER AGES. Nolan asserts that the most characteristic discrepancies between the common Greek text and the texts current in Palestine and Egypt in Origen's day are distinctly traceable to a Marcionite or Valentinian source, and that ORIGEN'S WAS THE MEDIATING HAND FOR INTRODUCING THESE CORRUPTIONS INTO THE LATTER TEXTS. IT IS HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT THAT IMPORTANT TEXTS BEARING ON THE TRINITARIAN DOCTRINE, WHICH APPEAR IN THE GREEK AND LATIN ARE LACKING IN THE OLD MSS OF THE PALESTINIAN AND EGYPTIAN. The disputed texts were designed to condemn and refute the errors of the Ebionites and Gnostics, Corinthians and Nicolaitanes. It is not surprising that the influence of Origen should result in the suppression of some of these authentic testimonies in the Greek copies, while the old Latin which circulated in areas not much affected by Origen's influence, should preserve such a reading as that found in 1 John 5:7 (Robert Dabney, "The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek," *Southern Presbyterian Review*, April 1871).

Of Origen's textual efforts, Frederick Nolan makes the following important observation: "… HE CONTRIBUTED TO WEAKEN THE AUTHORITY OF THE RECEIVED TEXT OF THE NEW [TESTAMENT]. In the course of his Commentaries, he cited the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, on the former part of the Canon, he appealed to the authority of Valentinus and Heracleon on the latter. WHILE HE THUS RAISED THE CREDIT OF THOSE REVISALS, WHICH HAD BEEN MADE BY THE HERETICKS, HE DETRACTED FROM THE AUTHORITY OF THAT TEXT WHICH HAD BEEN RECEIVED BY THE

ORTHODOX. Some difficulties which he found himself unable to solve in the Evangelists, he undertook to remove, BY EXPRESSING HIS DOUBTS OF THE INTEGRITY OF THE TEXT. In some instances he ventured to impeach the reading of the New Testament on the testimony of the Old, and to convict the copies of one Gospel on the evidence of another: *thus giving loose to his fancy, and indulging in many wild conjectures, HE CONSIDERABLY IMPAIRED THE CREDIT OF THE VULGAR OR COMMON EDITION, as well in the New as in the Old Testament*" (emphasis added) (Nolan, *Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate*, 1815, pp. 432-34).

Origen's textual work is used to support the Alexandrian text preferred by modern textual critics. He is treated by them with great respect. He is mentioned repeatedly and favorably by modern textual critics. For example, he is mentioned on 12 pages of Kurt and Barbara Aland's *The Text of the New Testament* and on four pages of Bruce Metzger's *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, corruption, and Restoration*. These prominent textual critics see Origen in a positive light rather than as a corruptor of God's Word. Kurt and Barbara Aland call him "the most significant and widely influential Greek theologian of the early Church..." (*The Text of the New Testament*, p. 181). They call Origen's Alexandrian School "most impressive" (p. 200). Metzger calls him "one of the most assiduous and erudite scholars of his age" (*The Text of the New Testament*, p. 151). Frederic Kenyon testified that the Alexandrian family of manuscripts "makes its first appearance in the writings of Origen" and that it "is now generally regarded as a text produced in Egypt and probably at Alexandria under editorial care…" (*The Text of the Greek Bible*, pp. 151, 208).

The Codex Sinaiticus was corrected in the Old Testament according to Origen's work (Alexander Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, p. 23).

Eusebius (270-340 A.D.) was another influential name in Alexandria. He collected the writings of Origen and promoted his false teachings. "Eusebius worshiped at the altar of Origen's teachings. He claims to have collected eight hundred of Origen's letters, to have used Origen's six-column Bible, the *Hexapla*, in his Biblical labours. Assisted by Pamphilus, he restored and preserved Origen's library" (Jack Moorman, *Forever Settled*, p. 130). Eusebius "founded at Caesarea a library of biblical and patristic writings on papyrus rolls, the nucleus of which consisted of Origen's voluminous writings, especially his editions and interpretations of biblical books" (Alexander Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament,* p. 23).

Eusebius produced 50 Greek Bibles for Constantine, father of the church state. These copies were to "be written on prepared parchment in a legible manner" (Geisler and Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible,* p. 181). It is possible that Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are two of these Bibles. This was believed by Constantine Tischendorf, F.J.A. Hort, Alexander Souter, Edward Miller, Caspar Gregory, and A.T. Robertson, among others. T.C. Skeat of the British Museum believed that

Vaticanus was a "reject" among the 50 copies (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, p. 48).

Frederick Nolan and other authorities have charged Eusebius with making many changes in the text of Scripture. Nolan charged Eusebius with removing Mark 16:9-20 and John 8:1-11, among other things.

> As it is thus apparent that Eusebius wanted [lacked] not the power, so it may be shewn that he wanted not the will, to make those alterations in the sacred text, with which I have ventured to accuse him. ... The works of those early writers lie under the positive imputation of being corrupted. The copies of Clement and Origen were corrupted in their life time; the manuscripts from which Tertullian's works have been printed are notoriously faulty; and the copies of Cyprian demonstrate their own corruption, by their disagreement among themselves, and their agreement with different texts and revisals of Scripture. It is likewise indisputable, that these fathers not only followed each other, adopting the arguments and quotations of one another; but that they quoted from the heterodox as well as the orthodox. They were thus likely to transmit from one to another erroneous quotations, originally adopted from sources not more pure than heretical revisals of Scripture. ... New revisals of Scripture were thus formed, which were interpolated with the peculiar readings of scholiasts and fathers. NOR DID THIS SYSTEMATIC CORRUPTION TERMINATE HERE; BUT WHEN NEW TEXTS WERE THUS FORMED, THEY BECAME THE STANDARD BY WHICH THE LATER COPIES OF THE EARLY WRITERS WERE IN SUCCESSION CORRECTED (Nolan, *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate*, 1815, pp. 35, 326-332).

Alexandria was the source, and for some time the principal stronghold, of the heresy of Arianism. Arius was an elder in the church at Alexandria around 315 A.D. Arianism arose in Alexandria and spread rapidly in that area and to regions beyond.

Thus, the fact that the Alexandrian Greek text is favored by the modern textual critics and the translators of the modern Bible versions is a very loud warning to the Bible believer.

An Opposing School at Antioch

Here we move for a moment from Egypt to Syria where the great missionary church was located at Antioch. "Antioch soon became a central point for the diffusion of Christianity among the Gentiles, and maintained for several centuries a high rank in the Christian world" (*McClintock & Strong Cyclopedia*). The *McClintock & Strong Cyclopedia* claims that the "theological seminary" at Antioch was established at the end of the 4th century, but that was only in a more formal sense, and it is admitted even in that volume that the school "had been prepared for a century before by the learned presbyters of the Church" (McClintock & Strong). In fact, the church at Antioch was a serious Christian discipleship and missionary training school from its inception. The principles that Paul taught pertaining to the thorough training of Christian workers (2 Tim. 2:2) and the

necessity of pastors being grounded in the faithful Word (Titus 1:9) would no doubt have been practiced at Antioch, his sending church.

Ignatius was a prominent pastor at Antioch until his death in the early part of the second century. It is probable that he, along with Polycarp, knew the apostle John and had heard him preach. Ignatius was martyred in Rome between 107 and 115 A.D. by being thrown to the wild beasts.

Theophilus was a prominent pastor at Antioch in the second half of the second century, having been ordained in about 170 A.D. He died in about 193 A.D. He was converted to Christ from heathenism by studying the Scriptures and wrote an apology for the Christian faith in the form of three letters to his friend Autolycus that are still extant. "The work shows much learning and more simplicity of mind" and "contains a more detailed examination of the evidence for Christianity, derived both from Scripture and from history" (*McClintock & Strong*). Theophilus was the author of other works, including writings against the heresies of Marcion and Hermogenes, a commentary on the Gospels (still extant in Latin), and a commentary on the book of Proverbs.

Dorotheus was a pastor at Antioch at the end of the third century. According to Eusebius, Dorotheus was "much devoted to the study of the Hebrew language, so that he read the Hebrew Scriptures with great facility" and could be heard in the church "expounding the Scriptures with great judgment."

While the school at Alexandria was promoting Gnosticism and allegoricalism, Antioch was promoting faithfulness to the apostolic teaching and the literal method of Bible interpretation. "As distinguished from the school of Alexandria, its tendency was logical rather than intuitional or mystical" (*McClintock & Strong*). Wilbur Pickering observes that this fact has serious implications in regard to the issue of texts and translations, because "a literalist is obliged to be concerned about the precise wording of the text since his interpretation or exegesis hinges upon it." He notes that the 1,000 extant manuscripts of the Syriac Peshitta "are unparalleled for their consistency" and that "it is not unreasonable to suppose that the Antiochian antipathy toward the Alexandrian allegorical interpretation of Scripture would rather indispose them to view with favor any competing forms of the text coming out of Egypt" (*Identity of the New Testament Text*, chapter 5).

Antioch long resisted Roman Catholic doctrinal novelties, such as Mary as the mother of God and purgatory and infant baptism and reverence for relics, but gradually the Antioch church weakened, became affected by Arian heresy at one point, and eventually submitted to Rome.

What text of the New Testament was used at Antioch? The text of the church at Antioch was the Traditional Text. This is why Hort called the Received Text "the Antiochan text" and "the Syrian text." Hort said, "The fundamental text of the late extant Greek MSS. generally is, beyond all question, identical with the dominant Antiochian or Graeco-Syrian text of the second half of the IVth century" (Westcott

and Hort, *The Greek New Testament*, Introduction, p. 92). John Burgon, who looked carefully into the history of the early biblical text and particularly into the writings of "church fathers" (his index of quotations from early church leaders handled more than 86,000 references), testified that the New Testament text used by Chrysostom (a pastor at Antioch until A.D. 398, when he moved to Constantinople) was practically identical to that of the Traditional Text of the Reformation (*The Revision Revised*, p. 296).

It is unreasonable to think that the church at Antioch would look to any other realm in textual matters or would have countenanced any sort of "recension" that "conflated" three competing texts. In fact, it is unreasonable to believe that it would have allowed the cherished apostolic text to become corrupted in a mere three centuries.

> Why should the great apostolic and mission-minded church at Antioch send to Alexandria or any other center for Scripture copies by which to correct her own? The Church at Antioch, conscious of her heritage and the excellence of her own first copies of the Scriptures, would have little reason to consider the resources of others superior. .... Antioch may well have been the prime source of the earliest copies of most of the New Testament Scriptures for newly established churches. ... It might appear more logical to reason that if Antioch would send anywhere for copies of New Testament Scriptures in order to purify its own text, it would most likely send to Ephesus, Galatia, Colosse, Thessalonica, Philippi, Corinth, and Rome in order to acquire more perfect copies of the epistles originally sent to these locales. Another reason for questioning Antioch's dependence upon manuscripts whose provenance was Alexandria is the difference of attitude toward Scripture and its interpretation which existed between the theological schools of the two cities. Beginning as early as Theophilus (died before 188) who, as an advocate of the literal interpretation of Scripture, is considered a forerunner of the 'School of Antioch,' Antioch developed a school of literal interpretation which was almost diametrically opposed to the 'School of Alexandria' with its principles of allegorical interpretation. This makes it difficult to believe that Antioch would look to Alexandria for help in either the earliest period or later when the differences between the schools became even more marked (Harry Sturz, *The Byzantine Text-type*, pp. 104, 105, 106).

Missionary Jack Moorman describes the battle between the traditional text and the modern critical text as "A Tale of Two Cities."

> There is one point upon which both sides of the current Bible text-version debate agree: the early transmissional history of the New Testament is a 'tale of two cities', Antioch and Alexandria. And just as surely as the KJV Text was woven into the spiritual life of Antioch in Syria, so was also the Modern Version Text in Alexandria. ... The choice is a clear one, as there is very little common ground between them.
>
> Certainly Antioch has by far the more glorious Biblical heritage. It became to the Gentile Christians what Jerusalem had been to the Jews, and superseded Jerusalem as the base for the spread of the Gospel. The 'disciples were called Christians first in Antioch' (Acts 11:26). It was the starting point for the Apostle Paul's missionary journeys. Mark, Barnabas, and Silas were there; as was Peter

and probably Luke. The Book of Acts leaves us with no doubt that Antioch was the centre of early church activity.

Egypt shares no such glory. It has always been looked upon as a symbol of the world-system which is opposed to the things of God. God would not allow His Son (Mt. 2), His nation (Ex. 12), His patriarchs (Gen. 50), or even the bones of the patriarchs (Ex. 13:19) to remain there. The Jews were warned repeatedly not to return to Egypt, not to rely upon it for help, not to even purchase horses there, etc. Thus, in contrast to what is being claimed today, it is hard to believe that Egypt and Alexandria would have been the central place where God would preserve His Holy Word. Frankly, it was the last place on earth that one could trust in doctrinal and biblical matters. It certainly wasn't safe to get a Bible there! Even Bruce Metzger, a supporter of the Alexandrian Text, is compelled to catalogue the vast amount of religious corruption which came from Alexandria: 'Among Christians which during the second century either originated in Egypt or circulated there among both the orthodox and the Gnostics are numerous apocryphal gospels, acts, epistles, and apocalypses. Some of the more noteworthy are the Gospel according to the Egyptians, the Gospel of Truth, the Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Philip, the Kerygma of Peter, the Acts of John, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Epistle of the Apostles, and the Apocalypse of Peter. There are also fragments of exegetical and dogmatic works composed by Alexandrian Christians, chiefly Gnostics during the second century. We know, for example, of such teachers as Basilides and his son Isidore, and of Valentinus, Ptolemaeus, Heracleon, and Pantaenus. All but the last-mentioned were unorthodox in one respect or another.* In fact, to judge by the comments made by Clement of Alexandria, almost every deviant Christian sect was represented in Egypt during the second century; Clement mentions the Valentinians, the Basilidians, the Marcionites, the Peratae, the Encratites, the Docetists, the Haimetites, the Cainites, the Ophites, the Simonians, and the Eutychites. What proportion of Christians in Egypt during the second century were orthodox is not known' (Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, Clarendon Press, 1977, p. 101). [* Metzger errs in implying that Pantaenus was orthodox. In fact, he mixed pagan philosophy with Christianity.]

Let it be said again: Alexandria was the worst possible place to go for a Bible! Yet it is precisely the place that our present-day translators have gone in gathering the major sources of the modern Bible"(Moorman, *Modern Bible Versions: The Dark Secret*).

What do these facts about the early centuries have to do with the modern Bible versions?

First, the Westcott-Hort principle that "oldest is best" in regard to Greek New Testament manuscripts is proven to be bogus. In light of the conditions that existed in the Post-Apostolic centuries, "oldest" means absolutely nothing in regard to the purity of New Testament manuscripts. An ancient Greek manuscript could as easily represent a corrupted text as it could a pure one, and if it came from Egypt, the likelihood that it is corrupt is multiplied greatly.

Second, the "Antiochian text" has the best claim to purity. Asia Minor was where the apostolic churches were located; it is where Greek was spoken natively. Egypt,

on the other hand was a hotbed of anti-christ heresy and Gnostic fanaticism. "The use of such designations as 'Syrian,' 'Antiochian,' and 'Byzantine' for the Majority Text reflects its general association with that region. I know of no reason to doubt that the 'Byzantine' text is in fact the form of the text that was known and transmitted in the Aegean area from the beginning. In sum, I believe that the evidence clearly favors that interpretation of the history of the text which sees the normal transmission of the text as centered in the Aegean region, the area that was best qualified, from every point of view, to transmit the text, from the very first. The result of that normal transmission is the 'Byzantine' text-type. In every age, including the second and third centuries, it has been the traditional text" (Wilbur Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, ch. 5).

Third, the ancient Greek manuscripts most favored by modern textual criticism are Egyptian. This includes Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Ephraem Syrus, Freer Washington, the Beatty Papyri, and the Bodmer Papyri (Pickering, *Identity of the New Testament Text*, ch. 6).

Fourth, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus contain many readings that denigrate the full deity of Jesus Christ and give evidence that they are representatives of manuscripts that were corrupted by heretics. Consider the testimony of nineteenth-century Presbyterian Robert Dabney:

> The Sabellian and Arian controversies raged in the 3rd and 4th centuries and the copies now held in such high repute among scholars were written in the 4th and 5th centuries. THE HOSTILITY OF THESE DOCUMENTS TO THE TRINITARIAN DOCTRINE IMPELS THE MIND TO THE CONCLUSION THAT THEIR OMISSIONS AND ALTERATIONS ARE NOT MERELY THE CHANCE ERRORS OF TRANSCRIBERS, BUT THE WORK OF A DELIBERATE HAND. When we remember the date of the great Trinitarian contest in the Church, and compare it with the supposed date of these documents, our suspicion becomes much more pronounced. ... The so-called oldest codices agree with each other in omitting a number of striking testimonies to the divinity of Christ, and they also agree in other omissions relating to Gospel faith and practice (Robert Dabney, "The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek," *Southern Presbyterian Review*, April 1871).

Following are some examples:

Mark 9:24 -- "Lord" is omitted in both Sinaiticus (Aleph) and Vaticanus (B)

Mark 16:9-20 -- These verses are omitted in Aleph and B, thus ending Mark's gospel with the disciples in fear and confusion, with no resurrection and glorious ascension.

Luke 2:33 -- "Joseph" is changed to "the child's father" Aleph, B

Luke 23:42 -- "Lord" changed to "Jesus" in Aleph and B, thus destroying this powerful reference to Christ's deity.

John 1:18 -- "the only begotten son" changed to "the only begotten God" in Aleph

and B. John Burgon proved that this reading, which appears in only five Greek manuscripts, could be traced to the heretic Valentinus, who denied the Godhead of Jesus Christ by making a distinction between the Word and the Son of God. In the Received Text there is no question that the Word is also the Son and that both are God. The Word is God (Jn. 1:1); the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us (Jn. 1:14); the Word is the Son (Jn. 1:18). By changing Jn. 1:18 to "the only begotten God," Valentinus and his followers broke the clear association between the Word and the Son.

John 1:27 -- "is preferred before me" omitted in Aleph, B

John 3:13 -- "who is in heaven" omitted by Aleph and B

John 6:69 -- "the Christ, the Son of the living God" is changed to "the Holy One of God" in Aleph and B

John 9:35 -- "Son of God" changed to "Son of man" in Aleph and B

John 9:38 -- "Lord, I believe. And he worshipped Him" omitted in Aleph, thus removing this powerful and incontrovertible confession of Christ as God

Acts 2:30 -- "according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ" omitted in Aleph and B, thus destroying this clear testimony that Christ himself fulfills the promise of David

Acts 20:28 -- "church of God" changed to "church of the Lord" in Aleph and B; the Traditional Text says plainly that it was God who died on the cross and shed His blood, whereas the Alexandrian text allows for the heretical view that Jesus is the Lord but that he is not actually God. Jehovah's Witnesses, for example, follow in the footsteps of ancient 2nd century heretics, claiming Jesus as Lord but not as God.

Acts 14:10 -- "judgment seat of Christ" changed to "judgment seat of God" in Aleph and B, thus destroying this plain identification of Jesus Christ with Jehovah God (Isaiah 45:23)

1 Corinthians 15:47 -- "the Lord" omitted in Aleph, B

Ephesians 3:9 -- "by Jesus Christ" omitted in Aleph, B

1 Timothy 3:16 -- "God" is omitted and replaced with "who" in the Sinaiticus (the Vaticanus does not contain the epistle to Timothy)

2. We hold to the King James Bible because we reject modern textual criticism.

Consider some facts about modern textual criticism:

Textual criticism is the application of modern linguistic theories to the recovery of ancient documents. The theories of modern textual criticism were initially developed over a period of roughly 100 years from the late 1700s to

the late 1800s. During that introductory period its popularity was limited to textual scholars, for the most part, while it was resisted by Bible believers in general. After the publication of the Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament in 1881, the theories of modern textual criticism quickly gained dominancy in the field of biblical scholarship.

Modern textual criticism was devised largely by men who treated the Bible as another book and who either did not believe in the doctrine of Bible preservation or refused to predicate their textual theories on this doctrine. Consider two examples. Karl Lachmann, the first textual critic to entirely reject the Received Text, was a "classical scholar" who approached the Bible in the same way that he approached ordinary classical books. Bruce Metzger, who says Lachmann is one of the most important names in the history of modern textual criticism, admits that Lachmann "ventured to apply to the New Testament the criteria that he had used in editing texts of the classics" (Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 1975, p. xxiii). Westcott and Hort, the editors of the influential Greek New Testament of 1881, operated under the following principle: "In matters of textual criticism the Bible is to be treated like any other ancient book. No special considerations are to be made concerning its claims of inspiration and preservation" (Westcott and Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Introduction and Appendix, 1881).

Modern textual criticism claims that the Traditional Greek Text, the Text underlying the Reformation Bibles, is corrupt and has a special distaste for it. This was recognized in the 19th century by Presbyterian scholar Robert Dabney:

> Their common traits may be said to be AN ALMOST CONTEMPTUOUS DISMISSAL OF THE RECEIVED TEXT, as unworthy not only of confidence, but almost of notice; the rejection of the great mass of the codices of the common text as recent and devoid of nearly all authority; and the settlement of the text by the testimony of a very few MSS. for which they claim a superior antiquity, with the support of a few fathers and versions, whom they are pleased to regard as judicious and trustworthy (Robert Dabney, *Discussions: Evangelical and Theological*, pp. 354, 55).

Westcott and Hort despised the Greek Received Text. Following is what F.J.A. Hort wrote in 1851, when he was only 23 years old and before he had developed his textual theories or done any serious research in this field: "I had no idea till the last few weeks of the importance of texts, having read so little Greek Testament, and dragged on with THE VILLAINOUS TEXTUS RECEPTUS...Think of THAT VILE TEXTUS RECEPTUS leaning entirely on late MSS.; it is a blessing there are such early ones" (*Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, vol. 1, p. 211). Textual critic Ernest Colwell observed that Hort's goal was *to dethrone the Received Text* (Colwell, *Scribal Habits in Early Papyri, The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, Abingdon, 1965, p. 370). Wilbur Pickering observes: "It appears that Hort did not arrive at his theory through unprejudiced intercourse with the facts.

Rather, he deliberately set out to construct a theory that would vindicate his preconceived animosity for the Received Text" (*Identity of the New Testament Text*, ch. 3). Note, too, that Hort was deceived into thinking that the Received Text leans "entirely on late manuscripts."

Bruce Metzger calls the TR "CORRUPT" and Christian people's love for it "SUPERSTITIOUS" (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 1968, p. 106). He further calls it "DEBASED" and "DISFIGURED" (Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 1975, xxi, xxiii).

Barbara Aland called the TR "FLAWED, preserving the text of the New Testament in a form FULL OF ERRORS" (Barbara Aland, "A Century of New Testament Textual Criticism 1898-1998," http://www.bibleresourcecenter.org/vsItemDisplay.dsp&objectID=BF4714BC-53F6-48EB-94FEA6BF73FD88A5&method=display).

This bias, based upon a mythical "recension," has tainted most of the serious research into ancient texts and translations since the beginning of the 20th century. Modern textual critics are so biased against the Received Text as to be undependable as witnesses to the textual evidence. After examining the way influential textual critics misuse the manuscript evidence, Wilbur Pickering observed, "It seems clear that the 'Byzantine' text cannot win in a court presided over by a judge of Kenyon's bent" and "there is reason to ask whether editors with an anti-Byzantine bias can be trusted to report the evidence in an impartial manner" (Pickering, *Identity of the New Testament Text*, ch. 4).

The Greek text produced by modern textual criticism is much shorter than the Received Text New Testament.

It is shorter by 2,886 words. This is equivalent to removing the entire books of 1 and 2 Peter from the Bible (Jack Moorman, *Missing in Modern Bibles: Is the full Story Being Told*, Bible for Today, 1981). Modern textual criticism removes or questions dozens of entire verses:

Matthew 17:21; 18:11; 23:14

Mark 7:16; 9:44, 46; 11:26; 15:28; 16:9-20

Luke 17:36; 23:17

John 5:4; 7:53-8:11

Acts 8:37; 15:34; 24:7; 28:29

Romans 16:24

1 John 5:7

It further removes a significant portion of 147 other verses.

Modern textual criticism was not popular until the publication of the Westcott and Hort Greek N.T. in 1881.

The first two English versions of any influence based on this text were the English Revised Version of 1881 and the American Standard Version of 1901.

Modern textual criticism favors A FEW GREEK UNCIAL MANUSCRIPTS (e.g. Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) and a small number of other manuscripts of similar character over the vast majority of the 5,471 Greek manuscripts and lectionaries extant.

Writing in 1883, John Burgon observed, "...especially B [Vaticanus and Aleph [Sinaiticus], have within the last twenty years established a tyrannical ascendancy over the imagination of the Critics, which can only be fitly spoken of as a blind superstition" (*The Revision Revised*, p. 11). Since the discovery of the Egyptian papyri in the 20th century, the number of Alexandrian manuscripts has increased; but compared to the vast number that support the Traditional text, they still represent a very tiny and "eccentric" minority.

The **Vaticanus (B) Greek manuscript** gets its name from its location, which is the Vatican Library. Its history is unknown prior to 1475, when it first appeared in that library's catalog. It is thought to date from the mid-4th century and to have originated in Egypt (Frederic Kenyon, *The Text of the Greek Bible*). The home of Codex Vaticanus is unholy and is certainly not the place one would expect to find the preserved Word of God. I toured the Vatican in 1992 and again in 2003 and 2005 and was astounded at how pagan the place is. It reminds me of the many idolatrous temples we have visited during our years of missionary work in Asia. Fitting to the home of the man who claims the titles and position of Jesus Christ and who accepts adulation, the Vatican is a monument to idolatry and blasphemy and man's shameless rebellion to God's revelation. There are statues and paintings of all sorts of pagan gods and goddesses; there are statues of Mary and the Popes and the "saints" and angels and the infant Jesus and crucifixes. The Vatican Library contains large paintings of Isis and Mercury. The "Cathedra Petri" or "Chair of Peter" contains woodcarvings that represent the labors of Hercules. The massive obelisk in the center of St. Peter's Piazza is a pagan object from Egypt. Near the main altar of St. Peter's is a bronze statue of Peter sitting in a chair. It is reported that this statue was originally the pagan god Jupiter that was taken from the Pantheon in Rome (when it was a pagan temple) and moved into St. Peter's Basilica and renamed Peter! Jupiter was one of the chief gods of ancient Rome and was called the "pater" (father) in Latin. One foot of the statue is made of silver and Catholic pilgrims superstitiously touch or kiss it. In fact, the Vatican is one gigantic idol. The great altar over the supposed tomb of St. Peter is overwhelmed by massive, golden, spiraling columns that look like coiling serpents. One can almost hear the sinister hiss. The Vatican is also a graveyard. Beneath "St. Peter's" Basilica are rows of marble caskets containing dead Popes! A life-size statue of each Pope is carved in marble and reclines on the lid of his casket. Candles and incense are burning profusely. In the supposed tomb of Peter, 99 oil lamps are kept burning day and night. For those familiar with pagan

religions, such as Hinduism and Buddhism, the origin of such things is obvious. The place is as eerie and pagan as any temple in darkest India. Pitifully deluded Catholics light their pagan candles in a vain attempt to merit God's blessing after the fashion of benighted Hindus. There is no biblical authority for any of it. The Lord Jesus warned the Pharisees, "Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition" (Mark 7:9). The Vatican is one of the last places on earth one would expect to find the preserved Word of God.

Westcott and Hort preferred the Vaticanus manuscript as their chief authority above all other Greek manuscripts. It was "their touchstone" (Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, p. 14).

The Vaticanus is very strange and corrupt. It was corrected by revisers in the 8th, 10th, and 15th centuries (W. Eugene Scott, *Codex Vaticanus*, 1996). The entire manuscript has been mutilated.

> [E]very letter has been run over with a pen, making exact identification of many of the characters impossible" (*Vaticanus and Sinaiticus* - ww.waynejackson.freeserve.co.uk/kjv /v2.htm). This was probably done in the 10th or 11th century. All of the revision and overwriting "makes precise paleographic analysis impossible" (Scott, *Codex Vaticanus*). Dr. David Brown observes: "I question the 'great witness' value of any manuscript that has been overwritten, doctored, changed and added to for more than 10 centuries (*The Great Uncials*).

Missing portions were supplied in the 15th century by copying other Greek manuscripts. This segment (pages 1519-1536) of the manuscript "is catalogued separately as minuscule 1957" (Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, p. 109).

In the Gospels it leaves out 749 entire sentences and 452 clauses, plus 237 other words, all of which are found in hundreds of other Greek manuscripts. The total number of words omitted in B in the Gospels alone is 2,877 as compared with the majority of manuscripts (Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, p. 75).

Vaticanus omits Mark 16:9-20, but a blank space is left for that section of Scripture. John Burgon first wrote about this in *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel of St. Mark Vindicated*, 1871, pp. 86-87.

Vaticanus identifies itself as a product of gnostic corruption in John 1:18, where "the only begotten Son" is changed to "the only begotten God," thus perpetuating the ancient Arian heresy that disassociates the Son of God Jesus Christ from God Himself by claiming that the Word was not the same as the Son. John's Gospel identifies the Son directly with the Word (John 1:1, 18), but by changing "Son" to "God" in verse 18, this direct association is broken.

The **Sinaiticus (Aleph) codex** was discovered by Constantine Tischendorf at St. Catherine's Monastery (Greek Orthodox) at Mt. Sinai. He discovered the first part in 1844 and the second in 1859. Like Catholicism, the Greek Orthodox Church has a false gospel of grace plus works and sacraments and holds the

unscriptural doctrine of venerating relics. St. Catherine's Monastery has one entire room filled with skulls!

The Sinaiticus was written by three different scribes and was corrected later by several others. (This was the conclusion of an extensive investigation by H.J.M. Milne and T.C. Skeat of the British Museum, which was published in *Scribes and Correctors of Codex Sinaiticus*, London, 1938.) Tischendorf counted 14,800 corrections in this manuscript (David Brown, *The Great Uncials*, 2000). Dr. F.H.A. Scrivener, who published *A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus* in 1864 testified: "The Codex is covered with alterations of an obviously correctional character--brought in by at least ten different revisers, some of them systematically spread over every page, others occasional, or limited to separate portions of the Ms., many of these being contemporaneous with the first writer, but for the greater part belonging to the sixth or seventh century." Thus it is evident that scribes in bygone centuries did not consider the Sinaiticus to represent a pure text. Why it should be so revered by modern textual critics is a mystery.

A great amount of carelessness is exhibited in the copying and correction. "Codex Sinaiticus 'abounds with errors of the eye and pen to an extent not indeed unparalleled, but happily rather unusual in documents of first-rate importance.' On many occasions 10, 20, 30, 40 words are dropped through very carelessness. Letters and words, even whole sentences, are frequently written twice over, or begun and immediately cancelled; while that gross blunder, whereby a clause is omitted because it happens to end in the same words as the clause preceding, occurs no less than 115 times in the New Testament" (John Burgon, *The Revision Revised*). It is clear that the scribes who copied the Sinaiticus were not faithful men of God who treated the Scriptures with utmost reverence. The total number of words omitted in Aleph in the Gospels alone is 3,455 compared with the Greek Received Text (Burgon, p. 75).

Mark 16:9-20 is omitted in the Sinaiticus, but it was originally there and has been erased.

Like the Vaticanus, the Sinaiticus exhibits gnostic influence upon its face by changing "the only begotten Son" to "the only begotten God" in John 1:18.

These manuscripts bear evidence of being corrupt above all other Greek uncials or minuscules. Consider this important testimony by John Burgon, who dedicated much of his life to the study of Greek manuscripts and who personally analyzed the Vaticanus in Rome:

> When we study the New Testament by the light of such Codexes as B Aleph D L, we find ourselves in an entirely new region of experience; confronted by phenomena not only unique but even portentous. The text has undergone apparently AN HABITUAL, IF NOT SYSTEMATIC, DEPRAVATION; has been manipulated throughout in a wild way. Influences have been demonstrably at work which altogether perplex the judgment. The result is simply calamitous.

> There are evidences of persistent mutilation, not only of words and clauses, but of entire sentences. The substitution of one expression for another, and the arbitrary transposition of words, are phenomena of such perpetual occurrence, that it becomes evident at last that which lies before us is not so much an ancient copy, as an ancient recension of the Sacred Text. And yet not by any means a recension in the usual sense of the word as an authoritative revision; but only as the name may be applied to the product of individual inaccuracy or caprice, or tasteless assiduity on the part of one or many, at a particular time or in a long series of years. There are reasons for inferring, that we have alighted on five specimens of what the misguided piety of a primitive age is known to have been fruitful in producing. ... THESE CODEXES ABOUND WITH SO MUCH LICENTIOUSNESS OR CARELESSNESS AS TO SUGGEST THE INFERENCE, THAT THEY ARE IN FACT INDEBTED FOR THEIR PRESERVATION TO THEIR HOPELESS CHARACTER. Thus it would appear that an evil reputation ensured their neglect in ancient times; and has procured that they should survive to our own, long after multitudes which were much better had perished in the Master's service (Burgon and Miller, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated*, 1896, pp. 32, 33).

Not only do Vaticanus and Sinaiticus disagree in thousands of places with the vast majority of other Greek manuscripts, they disagree with one another in as many or more places! There are 3,036 differences between the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus *in the Gospels alone*, not counting minor errors such as spelling (Herman Hoskier, *Codex B and Its Allies*, Vol. II, p. 1).

In spite of these facts, Vaticanus (B) or Sinaiticus (Aleph), either individually or together, are the source of most of the omissions and glaring changes in the modern versions. We have already listed a few of these that touch on the doctrine of Christ's deity and of the Trinity.

Biblical "common sense" informs us that these manuscripts owe their amazing survival solely to the fact that they are so corrupt. John Burgon, who calls B and Aleph "TWO FALSE WITNESSES," observes: "We suspect that these two Manuscripts are indebted for their preservation, *SOLELY TO THEIR ASCERTAINED EVIL CHARACTER*; which has occasioned that the one eventually found its way, four centuries ago, to a forgotten shelf in the Vatican library: while the other, after exercising the ingenuity of several generations of critical Correctors, eventually (viz. in A.D. 1844) got deposited in the waste-paper basket of the Convent at the foot of Mount Sinai. Had B and Aleph been copies of average purity, they must long since have shared the inevitable fate of books which are freely *used* and highly prized; namely, they would have fallen into decadence and disappeared from sight" (Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, p. 319; see also pp. 30-31). If these two witnesses were put on a witness stand in a court of law, they would be rejected. Not only do they disagree together against the vast majority of other witnesses, but they also disagree with one another as much as they disagree with the majority!

(For a study of the Papyri see the book *Faith vs. the Modern Bible Versions*, which

is available from Way of Life Literature.)

Modern textual criticism's goal is unscriptural.

Constantine Tischendorf stated the goal of modern textual criticism as "the struggle to REGAIN the original form of the New Testament" (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, p. 126). This implies, of course, that the original form of the New Testament had been lost prior to the 19th century when Tischendorf lived.

The very title of Bruce Metzger' popular book--*The New Testament's Transmission, CORRUPTION, AND RESTORATION*--describes modern textual criticism's principle that the Scriptures *were not* divinely preserved, because they must allegedly be recovered after having been corrupted for 1,500 years.

Thus, modern textual criticism is built upon the premise that the original text of the New Testament needed to be restored in the 19th century.

If this goal is true, then divine preservation is false. In fact, most standard works on textual criticism do not even mention divine preservation. Following are a few examples:

The New Testament in the Original Greek (Introduction) by Westcott and Hort (1881)
The Text of the New Testament by Kirsopp Lake (1900, 1949)
Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament by Eberhard Nestle (1901)
The Canon and Text of the New Testament by Casper Rene Gregory (1907)
The Text and Canon of the New Testament by Alexander Souter (1912)
The Text of the Greek Bible by F.G. Kenyon (1936, 1975
New Testament Manuscript Studies by Parvis and Wikgren (1950)
The Text of the New Testament by Bruce Metzger (1968)
The Text of the New Testament by Kurt and Barbara Aland (1981)

Modern textual criticism's theories are strange and unscriptural.

While not all of the following principle are held by any one textual critic, these are standard principles that have been promoted by prominent textual critics at various stages in its history.

Note: The theories of modern textual criticism are examined more thoroughly in *Faith vs. the Modern Bible Versions* and in *The Modern Bible Version Question-Answer Database*, available from Way of Life Literature.

Modern Textual Criticism Principle: In matters of textual criticism the Bible is to be treated like any other ancient book.

No special consideration is to be made concerning its claims of inspiration and preservation. "The principles of criticism explained in the foregoing section hold good for all ancient texts preserved in a plurality of documents. In dealing with the text of the New Testament no new principle whatever is needed or legitimate"

(Westcott and Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, vol. 2, Introduction and Appendix, 1881). The Bible cannot be treated like any other book, because it alone has the divine and supernatural element, which holds true not only for its origin but also for its history. Other books were not written by divine inspiration or preserved by divine providence. Other books are not hated by the devil and attacked by false teachers.

Modern Textual Criticism Principle: The Greek Received Text is the product of an official ecclesiastical revision.

> Nearly all text critics assume that between 250 and 350 A.D. there was a revision of the Greek text which produced the traditional text (A.H. McNeile, *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, p. 428).

The theory of recension is how Westcott and Hort accounted for the dominance of the Greek Received Text in the manuscript record, but there is no historical evidence that the Traditional Text was produced by a Recension. John Burgon, who knew as much about the history of the Bible text as any man in the last two centuries, called Hort's theory 'an excursion into cloud-land; a dream, and nothing more' and "mere moonshine."

Frederic Cook was just as blunt: "The supposition [of a Lucian Recension] is a manifest absurdity" (*The Revised Version of the First Three Gospels Considered, 1882*, p. 202).

If Hort's theory of a formal ecclesiastical recension were true, it would mean that the most influential church leaders of the 3rd and 4th centuries rejected the Egyptian text as corrupt, which would be a powerful testimony IN FAVOR OF the Traditional Text! John Burgon observed this in his masterpiece *The Revision Revised*, and it is a fact that devastates the modern textual criticism's theory of recension. Consider the following very carefully.

> Somewhere between A.D. 250 and 350, therefore,--('it is impossible to say with confidence' [Hort, p. 137] what was the actual date, but these Editors evidently incline to the latter half of the IIIrd century, i.e. *circa* A.D. 275);--we are to believe that the Ecclesiastical heads of the four great Patriarchates of Eastern Christendom,--Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople,--had become so troubled at witnessing the prevalence of depraved copies of Holy Scripture in their respective churches, that they resolved by common consent on achieving an authoritative Revision which should henceforth become the standard Text of all the Patriarchates of the East. ... The inference is at least inevitable that men in high place at that time deemed themselves competent to grapple with the problem. Enough was familiarly known about the character and the sources of these corrupt texts to make it certain that they would be recognizable when produced; and that, when condemned by authority, they would no longer be propagated, and in the end would cease to molest the Church. This much, at all events, is legitimately to be inferred from the hypothesis. Behold then from every principal Diocese of ancient Christendom, and in the Church's palmiest days, the most famous of the ante-Nicene Fathers

repair to Antioch. They go up by authority, and are attended by skilled Ecclesiastics of the highest theological attainment. Bearers are they perforce of a vast number of Copies of the Scriptures, and (by the hypothesis) *the latest possible dates* of any of these Copies must range between A.D. 250 and 350. But the Delegates of so many ancient Sees will have been supremely careful, before starting on so important and solemn an errand, to make diligent search for the oldest copies anywhere discoverable: and when they reach the scene of their deliberations, we may be certain that they are able to appeal to not a few codices *written within a hundred years of the* date of the *inspired Autographs* themselves. Copies of the Scripture authenticated as having belonged to the most famous of their predecessors,--and held by them in high repute for the presumed purity of their Texts,--will have been stowed away--for purposes of comparison and avoidance--specimens of those dreaded Texts whose existence has been the sole reason why (by the hypothesis) this extraordinary concourse of learned Ecclesiastics has taken place. After solemnly invoking the Divine blessing, these men address themselves assiduously to their task; and (by the hypothesis) they proceed to condemn every codex which exhibits a 'strictly Western,' or a 'strictly Alexandrian,' or a 'strictly Neutral' type. In plain English, if codices B, Aleph, and D had been before them, they would have unceremoniously rejected all three... When, therefore, at the end of a thousand and half a thousand years, Dr. Hort ... proposes to reverse the deliberate sentence of Antiquity,--his position strikes us as bordering on the ludicrous. ... Yes, we repeat it,--Dr. Hort is in direct antagonism with the Fathers of the IIIrd and the IVth Century. HIS OWN FANTASTIC HYPOTHESIS OF A 'SYRIAN TEXT,'--the solemn expression of the collective wisdom and deliberate judgment of the Fathers of the Nicene Age (A.D. 250--A.D. 350),--is the best answer which can by possibility be invented to his own pages,--IS, IN OUR ACCOUNT, THE ONE SUFFICIENT AND CONCLUSIVE REFUTATION OF HIS OWN TEXT. ... The essential thing to be borne in mind is that, according to Dr. Hort,--*on two distinct occasions between* A.D. 250 *and* 350--the whole Eastern Church, meeting by representation in her palmiest days, deliberately put forth that Traditional Text of the N.T. with which we at this day are chiefly familiar. That this is indeed his view of the matter there can at least be no doubt. ... Be it so. It follows that the text exhibited by such codices as B and Aleph *was deliberately condemned* by the assembled piety, learning, and judgment of the four great Patriarchates of Eastern Christendom. At a period when there existed *nothing more modern* than Codices B and Aleph,--nothing *so* modern as A and C,--all specimens of the former class were rejected, while such codices as bore a general resemblance to A were by common consent pointed out as deserving of confidence and *recommended for repeated transcription* (Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, pp. 278-287).

That being said, it is evident that Burgon turned Hort's Syrian recension theory on its head and demonstrated that if such a thing actually occurred it would provide devastating evidence AGAINST Hort's Alexandrian text. If churches actually met together in the 3rd or 4th centuries to revise the New Testament text so as to purge away any impurities that had crept in, they would surely have had the resources and understanding to accomplish such a task. They lived only a short time from the passing of the apostles. They would have had the testimony of the apostolic churches themselves, because they still existed. They would have had

the testimony of countless treasured manuscripts that have long since disappeared from the record. They would have had an intimate knowledge of the devises of heretics that had operated in the previous century or two. For scholars of the 19th and 20th centuries to claim that they are better able, with the pathetically slim manuscript evidence that has survived from those earliest centuries, to discern the apostolic text than the majority of churches in the 3rd and 4th centuries is simply ridiculous.

Some contemporary textual critics have abandoned the idea that the Received Text was created through one historical revision, replacing this with the theory that it was created over a long process. But whereas the first idea has no historical evidence, the second is absurd upon its very face. Zane Hodges wisely observes: "No one has yet explained how a long, slow process spread out over many centuries as well as over a wide geographical area, and involving a multitude of copyists, who often knew nothing of the state of the text outside of their own monasteries or scriptoria, could achieve this widespread uniformity out of the diversity presented by the earlier [Western and Alexandrian] forms of text ... An unguided process achieving relative stability and uniformity in the diversified textual, historical, and cultural circumstances in which the New Testament was copied, imposes impossible strains on our imagination" (Hodges, "The Implications of Statistical Probability for the History of the Text," Appendix C in Wilbur N. Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, 1980 edition, p. 168). Indeed.

If modern textual criticism's principle of a Recension were true, it would destroy the doctrine of Bible preservation in any conceivably practical sense, because it would mean that the apostolic text was, for all practical purposes, discarded for 15 centuries!

If modern textual criticism's principle of a recension is rejected, the entire superstructure falls to the ground. Why do the modern textual critics reject the Traditional or Majority Text out of hand and give it no serious consideration? Why, for example, can Kurt and Barbara Aland say of a "great many" of the uncials that "since they offer nothing more than a Byzantine text ... they are in consequence quite irrelevant for textual criticism" (*The Text of the New Testament*, p. 104)? They do so on the ground that this text was allegedly created in the 4th century by means of a recension, thus allowing them to treat the thousands of Traditional text manuscripts merely as so many copies of one alleged and, in their eyes, inauthentic revision. Without such a theory, they have no reason to despise the witness of the majority of manuscripts. "But it is clear that with this hypothesis of a 'Syrian' text,--the immediate source and actual prototype of the commonly received Text of the N.T.,--*stands or falls their entire Textual theory*. Reject it, and the entire fabric is observed to collapse, and subside into a shapeless ruin" (Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, p. 294).

Modern Textual Criticism Principle: The shorter reading is to be preferred, because

corruption by addition is more likely than corruption by omission.

This rule was stated by Westcott and Hort in their Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek, but it was invented by Johann Wettstein, a Unitarian, and Johann Griesbach, a modernist. It has not been proven by actual textual evidence; it is merely a theory designed to support the shorter Alexandrian text. In fact, the evidence points in the other direction, as stated by B.H. Streeter: "The notion is completely refuted that the regular tendency of scribes was to choose the longer reading. ... The whole question of interpolations in ancient MSS has been set in an entirely new light by the researches of Mr. A.C. Clark, Corpus Professor of Latin at Oxford. ... in *The Descent of Manuscripts*, an investigation of the manuscript tradition of the Greek and Latin Classics, he proves conclusively that the error to which scribes were most prone was not interpolation [addition] but accidental omission" (Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*, 1930).

Everyday experience demonstrates the truth of this. When copying something, it is easier to omit things than add things. And when heretics are tampering with the text, it is easier to get away with omissions than additions.

The vast majority of extant manuscripts throughout the church age have the "longer readings" that are left out of or questioned in the modern versions, such as the "long" ending to Mark 16.

Modern Textual Criticism Principle: The hard reading is to be preferred to the easy reading.

This was one of Johann Bengel' principles as stated in his Greek New Testament, p. 420. It is another theory that is backed by no evidence but was devised specifically to support the Alexandrian text.

Bengel developed this principle because he believed orthodox Christian scribes tended to simply difficult texts. Thus he believed that orthodox Christians corrupted their own New Testament! This flies in the face of the love that Bible-believing Christians have for the Scriptures and their fear of tampering with God's Word (Deut. 4:2; Prov. 30:6; Isa. 66:2; 2 Thess. 2:17; Rev. 22:18-19).

The Bible warns that it is the devil that corrupts the simplicity of God's truth (2 Cor. 11:3).

This theory ignores the fact that there were countless heretics tampering with manuscripts and creating spurious ones in the second and third centuries. Wilbur Pickering observes, "In any case, the amply documented fact that numerous people in the second century made deliberate changes in the text, whether for doctrinal or other reasons, introduces an unpredictable variable which invalidates this canon. Once a person arrogates to himself the authority to alter the text there is nothing in principle to keep individual caprice from intruding or taking over--we have no way of knowing what factors influenced the originator of a variant (whoever he was) or whether the result would appear to us to be 'harder' or

'easier.' This canon is simply inapplicable" (Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, chapter 4).

This theory ignores the fact that many Egyptian manuscripts contain nonsensical readings created by the carelessness and ineptitude of the scribes. The papyri are notorious for this. A nonsensical reading would be the harder reading, but it is foolish to think that it is correct.

We see that the principles of modern textual criticism are strange and unscriptural.

Note that the modern textual critic's rules are loaded in favor of his theories.

> You will not have to look at these 'rules' for long before realizing that they are 'weighted' in the direction of their own pre-determined preference for the Alexandrian Text. For example, if the Alexandrian Text is shorter than the Traditional, then one firm rule is 'The shorter reading is to be preferred.' And, if ninety percent of the manuscripts support the Traditional Text and the remaining ten percent must be divided between the Alexandrian, Western and Caesarean texts, then of course, 'numerical preponderance counts for nothing, the Traditional Text is merely one of four competing text types.' And, should it be pointed out that the Alexandrian Text is less distinct doctrinally: then it is an established fact that 'there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for doctrinal purposes during the early centuries.' And on it goes! (Jack Moorman, *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look*, 1990, p. 6).

We would also point out that the principles of modern textual criticism are very complicated. They involve such things as conflation, recension, inversion, eclecticism, conjectural emendation, intrinsic and transcriptional probability, interpolation, statistical probability, harmonistic assimilation, cognate groups, hypothesized intermediate archetypes, stemmatic reconstruction, and genealogical methods. It is impossible to reconcile this scholarly complexity with the simplicity that is in Christ (2 Cor. 11:3) and with the scriptural fact that God has chosen the weak of this world to confound the mighty (Mat. 11:25; 1 Cor. 1:20-29).

Modern textual criticism has resulted in uncertainty in the Biblical text.

Whereas prior to the late 19th century the vast majority of Bible-believing Christians were confident that the Masoretic Hebrew and the Greek Received texts were the preserved Word of God, today there is no real certainty where textual criticism has been accepted. The Masoretic Hebrew has been challenged by the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Septuagint, and other sources, so that some twenty to thirty thousand textual changes have been suggested for the Old Testament. The Greek Received Text has been replaced with a constantly changing so-called "eclectic" text. Note the following statements by prominent textual critics of the last 100 years testifying to the gross uncertainty produced by modern textual

criticism. For more of these see *Faith vs. the Modern Bible Versions*.

> [The New Testament text is more unsettled] than ever, and PERHAPS FINALLY, UNSETTLED (Rendel Harris, *Side Lights on New Testament Research*, 1908, p. 3).
>
> The ultimate text, if there ever was one that deserves to be so called, IS FOR EVER IRRECOVERABLE (F.C. Conybeare, *History of New Testament Criticism*, 1910, p. 129).
>
> In spite of the claims of Westcott and Hort and of von Soden, WE DO NOT KNOW THE ORIGINAL FORM OF THE GOSPELS, AND IT IS QUITE LIKELY THAT WE NEVER SHALL (Kirsopp Lake, *Family 13*, *The Ferrar Group*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941, p. vii).
>
> ... it is generally recognized that THE ORIGINAL TEXT OF THE BIBLE CANNOT BE RECOVERED (R.M. Grant, "The Bible of Theophilus of Antioch," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 66, 1947, p. 173).
>
> ...the optimism of the earlier editors has given way to that SKEPTICISM WHICH INCLINES TOWARDS REGARDING 'THE ORIGINAL TEXT' AS AN UNATTAINABLE MIRAGE (G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles*, 1953, p. 9).
>
> The primary goal of New Testament textual study remains the recovery of what the New Testament writers wrote. We have already suggested that TO ACHIEVE THIS GOAL IS WELL NIGH IMPOSSIBLE. Therefore we must be content with what Reinhold Niebuhr and others have called, in other contexts, AN 'IMPOSSIBLE POSSIBILITY' (R.M. Grant, *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament*, 1963, p. 51).
>
> ...every textual critic knows that this similarity of text indicates, rather, that WE HAVE MADE LITTLE PROGRESS IN TEXTUAL THEORY SINCE WESTCOTT-HORT; THAT WE SIMPLY DO NOT KNOW HOW TO MAKE A DEFINITIVE DETERMINATION AS TO WHAT THE BEST TEXT IS; THAT WE DO NOT HAVE A CLEAR PICTURE OF THE TRANSMISSION AND ALTERNATION OF THE TEXT IN THE FIRST FEW CENTURIES; and, accordingly, that the Westcott-Hort kind of text has maintained its dominant position largely by default (Eldon J. Epp, "The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 43, 1974, pp. 390-391).

Suggestions for further reading on this topic: (1) The Modern Bible Version Question-Answer Database goes into the issue of modern textual criticism in some detail. (2) John Burgon's exposure of the error of the Westcott-Hort theories, as contained in *The Revision Revised*, is devastating. David Otis Fuller published an abbreviated form of this in *True or False?* (3) Another scholarly critique of the Westcott-Hort textual theories is *The Identity of the New Testament Text* by Wilbur Pickering (Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1977). This is available online at http://www.esgm.org/ingles/imenu.html. Pickering, who has a Ph.D. in Linguistics from the University of Toronto, dismantles the principles of Westcott and Hort point by point. The research

for the first edition of this book was done for a master's thesis Pickering submitted to the Dallas Theological Seminary in 1968. The thesis was published in 1973 in *True or False?* (We strongly disagree with Pickering's support for the *Hodges-Farstad Majority Text* and his proposed revision of the Greek Received Text and the King James Bible, but one does not have to agree with all of Pickering's conclusions to benefit from his extensive research in this field.) (4) Edward F. Hills' *The King James Version Defended* contains a masterly refutation of modern textual criticism. (5) An excellent brief summary of the Westcott-Hort theory of textual criticism is contained in Jack Moorman's *Modern Bibles--the Dark Secret*. This is available online at http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/fbcdarks.htm. All of these are available in print from Bible for Today, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ 08108.

3. We hold to the King James Bible because the modern texts and versions are a product of end-time apostasy.

Another of the reasons why we reject modern textual criticism is its affinity to and intimate association with end-time apostasy. I don't see how this can be denied in light of the following documentation. The following portions of the Word of God should be read very carefully in this light, as they contain warnings about the believer's association with apostasy: Romans 16:17-18; 2 Corinthians 6:14; Col. 2:8; 1 Timothy 6:20; 2 Timothy 2:16-18; 3:5; 2 John 7-11; Revelation 18:4.

The following information is abbreviated from *The Modern Bible Version Hall of Shame*, which is available from Way of Life Literature.

This information is the fruit of nearly 30 years of research. When I first began studying the Bible text-version issue in about 1979, I wanted to check my sources and base my research upon primary documents as much as possible, and I have pursued that goal through the years. Today my personal library contains a large percentage of the books that have been published in this field in English in the past 200 years. I have researched this issue at important libraries in many parts of the world.

Bible believers of the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries were busy rejoicing in, preaching, and obeying the Scriptures. On the other hand, the textual critics were flying in the face of the doctrine of preservation. Rejecting the Traditional Text that had been handed down to them by Bible-believing Christians, they were groping around in dark monasteries and papal libraries trying to rediscover the supposed lost Word of God. Their ears were attuned to the vain philosophies emanating from Germany, and they were applying secular principles of textual criticism to the biblical text.

While not every adherent of modern textual criticism is a modernist or a Unitarian or a skeptic or a rationalist, most of its chief architects and proponents have been. Evangelicals such as the Baptist A.T. Robertson and the Presbyterian B.B. Warfield did not develop textual criticism but merely rehashed and passed along that which they received from the rationalistic fathers in this field. The same was true for Samuel Tregelles in England. Presbyterian scholar Robert Dabney in 1871 observed that evangelicals adopted the critical text "FROM THE MINT OF INFIDEL RATIONALISM" (Dabney, "The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek," *Discussions Evangelical and Theological*, pp. 361; this first appeared in the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, April 1871).

George Samson, president of Columbian College and Rutgers Female College, observed that "studied effort to undermine the integrity of the Textus Receptus began in Germany, among the rejecters of the supernatural interposition clearly manifest in the Old and New Testament records," and, "It was fostered by German speculative tendencies of thought" (*The English Revisers' Greek Text*, 1882, p. 97).

The Trinitarian Bible Society issued the following wise warning: "We must not permit our judgment to be overawed by great names in the realm of biblical 'scholarship' when it is so clearly evident that the distinguished scholars of the present century are merely reproducing the case presented by rationalists during the last two hundred years. Nor should we fail to recognise that scholarship of this kind has degenerated into a skeptical crusade against the Bible, tending to lower it to the level of an ordinary book of merely human composition" (*If the Foundations Be Destroyed,* T.B.S. Article No. 14, p. 13).

Zane Hodge, former professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis at Dallas Theological Seminary, gave the same warning: "The acceptance of the newer critical editions of the New Testament does not rest on factual data which can be objectively verified, but rather upon a prevailing consensus of critical thought. IT WILL BE THE PURPOSE OF THIS DISCUSSION TO SHOW THAT CONTEMPORARY CRITICAL TEXTS ARE, IN FACT, THE FRUIT OF A RATIONALISTIC APPROACH TO NEW TESTAMENT TEXTUAL CRITICISM" (Hodges, "Rationalism and Contemporary New Testament Textual Criticism," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January 1971, pp. 27-35).

Edward F. Hill, who had a doctorate in modern textual criticism from Harvard University, said: "WEAKENED BY DEAD ORTHODOXY AND PIETISM, CONSERVATIVE PROTESTANTS OF THE LATE 17TH AND 18TH CENTURIES FAILED TO RESIST THE RISING NEUTRAL WORLD-VIEW AS VIGOROUSLY AS THEY SHOULD HAVE DONE. Instead of taking their stand upon God's revelation of Himself in holy Scripture and pointing out that the neutral world-view is not really neutral but antichristian and full of contradictions, they began to adopt it themselves, especially in those areas of thought not specifically covered by their Reformation creeds, namely, philosophy and biblical introduction and above all

New Testament textual criticism" (Edward Hills, *The King James Bible Defended*, pp. 1, 44).

The last half of the nineteenth century, when modern textual criticism was developed, was an hour of deepening apostasy. Theological modernism was blossoming. Human philosophy was brazenly exalting itself against God's Word (e.g., Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Ingersoll). Unitarianism was making great gains. Evolution, Communism, and Cults such as Mormonism, Jehovah's Witness, Theosophy, Unity, and Christian Science were on the rise. Roman Catholicism was also making new advances and was sweeping through England on the back of the Oxford Movement. In 1840 there were not 500 Roman priests in all of England, but by 1890 there were 2,600 (H.G. Guinness, *Romanism and the Reformation*, 1891, pp. 2-3). In the same period the number of Catholic convents rose from 16 to over 400 and the number of Catholic colleges from two to 29.

Many of the prominent early textual critics were Unitarian, including Daniel Mac (1685-1753), Johann Wettstein (1693-1754), Alexander Geddes (1737-1802), Edward Harwood (1729-94), George Vance Smith (1816-1902), Ezra Abbot (1819-84), Joseph Henry Thayer (1828-1901), and Caspar Rene Gregory (1846-1917). Unitarians influenced not only the development of modern textual criticism, but also worked directly on key Bible translations such as the English Revised of 1881 and the American Standard of 1901.

Consider just a few of the prominent modern textual critics of past and present:

Johann Jakob Griesbach (1745-1812)

Griesbach a German, was one of the most important names in the development of modern textual criticism. While some (particularly evangelicals and fundamentalists) have tried to downplay his role, he was, in fact, extremely influential. Marvin R. Vincent says, "With Griesbach, really critical texts may be said to have begun" (Marvin Vincent, *A History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 1899, p. 100). Westcott and Hort said that in certain matters they venerated the name of Griesbach "above that of every other textual critic of the New Testament" (*New Testament in Greek*, 1881, vol. 2, p. 185). They adopted many of his principles of textual criticism and popularized them in their writings. A.T. Robertson states that Hort held Griesbach "to be the great man in textual criticism before his own day" (*An Introduction to Textual Criticism*, p. 30). In fact, Hort felt that "he was in reality taking up the work of Griesbach afresh" (Robertson, *An Introduction*, p. 29). Bruce Metzger observes: "Griesbach laid foundations for all subsequent work on the Greek text of the New Testament ... The importance of Griesbach for New Testament textual criticism can scarcely be overestimated" (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, pp. 119, 121). Metzger reminds us that Westcott and Hort did not collate any manuscripts or provide a critical apparatus; rather they "refined the critical methodology developed by

Griesbach, Lachmann, and others, and applied it rigorously" (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, p. 129).

Griesbach was influenced from his undergraduate days by the rising tide of Rationalism sweeping over Germany and "was a foe of orthodox Christianity" (D.A. Thompson, The Controversy Concerning the Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to Mark, p. 40). Griesbach was strongly influenced by his teacher at Halle, the modernist Johann Semler (1725-91). Semler is "often regarded as the father of German rationalism" (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, p. 115). Semler rejected the view that the entire canon of Scripture is infallibly inspired. He taught that the writers of the New Testament accommodated the teachings of Christianity to the needs of various classes of people, "which explains the appeal to miracles." He looked upon the book of Revelation as "the production of an extravagant dreamer" and argued that it was not inspired or canonical.

George Vance Smith (1816-1902)

Smith was on the British committee that produced the English Revised Version New Testament (1870-81). He was the Unitarian minister of St. Saviourgate Chapel, York, denying the deity and atonement of Jesus Christ, the personality of the Holy Spirit, and the divine inspiration of Scripture. Consider some of the heresies and blasphemies that came from the pen of this man. The following are from his book *The Bible and Popular Theology*, which appeared in 1871 and continued to be published until 1901. (For more documentation of Smith's heresies, see *The Modern Bible Version Hall of Shame*.) He denied the deity of Jesus Christ, the personality of the Holy Spirit, and the Trinity. He denied the substitutionary atonement, the infallible inspiration of Scripture, and the necessity of the new birth.

When an attempt was made to have Smith removed from the ERV translation committee, four other members of the committee (Westcott, Hort, Stanley, and Thirlwall) stood by him and threatened that they would resign if Smith were removed. The sordid story is given by A.G. Hobbs in the foreword to the Centennial Edition of Burgon's *The Revision Revised*: "[Smith's participation in the communion service] led to a public protest signed by 'some thousands of the Clergy.' The Upper House passed a Resolution that 'no person who denies the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ ought to be invited to join either company to which was committed the Revision of the Authorized Version of Holy Scripture: and that it is further the judgment of this House that any person now on either Company should cease to act therewith.' This Resolution was also passed by the Lower House. And still they could not get this non-believer off the Committee. Here is a real shocker: Dean Stanley, Westcott, Hort, and Bishop Thirlwall all refused to serve if Smith were dismissed. Let us remember that the Bible teaches that those who uphold and bid a false teacher God speed are equally guilty. 'For

he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds' (2 John 9-11). No wonder that the Deity of Chris is played down in so many passages!" (A.G. Hobbs, foreword, *The Revision Revised Centennial Edition*).

Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892)

B.F. Westcott was Canon of Peterborough, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and Bishop of Durham (consecrated 1890). F.J.A. Hort was Hulsean Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. These two men edited the critical Greek N.T. published in 1881 and were on the British committee that produced the English Revised Version (ERV). They secretly introduced their pre-publication critical Greek New Testament to the ERV committee, beginning in 1870.

Zane Hodges of Dallas Theological Seminary said: "The charge of rationalism is easily substantiated for Westcott and Hort and may be demonstrated from direct statements found in their introduction to *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. To begin with, Westcott and Hort are clearly unwilling to commit themselves to the inerrancy of the original Scriptures" (Zane C. Hodges, "Rationalism and Contemporary New Testament Textual Criticism," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January 1971).

Alfred Martin, Vice President of Moody Bible Institute, in his 1951 doctoral dissertation to the faculty of the Graduate School of Dallas Theological Seminary said: "At precisely the time when liberalism was carrying the field in the English churches the theory of Westcott and Hort received wide acclaim. These are not isolated facts. Recent contributions on the subject--that is, in the present century--following mainly the Westcott-Hort principles and method, have been made largely by men who deny the inspiration of the Bible" (Alfred Martin, "A Critical Examination of the Westcott-Hort Textual Theory." Th.D. Thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, May 1951, p. 70).

Donald Waite, who studied 1,291 pages of their writings, concluded that, among other things, Westcott and Hort did not affirm the infallibility of Scripture; they undermined the vicarious substitutionary atonement of Christ; they embraced the Fatherhood of God and evolution. Dr. Waite warns that the heresy of Westcott and Hort is subtle. Like many neo-orthodox and modernistic theologians, Westcott and Hort did not so much deny the doctrines of the Word of God directly; they undermined orthodox doctrine with clever doubt and with subtle questioning. Dr. Waite's books on this subject (*The Theological Heresies of Westcott and Hort: As Seen in Their Own Writings* and *Heresies of Westcott & Hort*) are available from Bible for Today, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ 08108, http://www.biblefortoday.org.

Consider the testimony of the biographies of Westcott and Hort published by

their sons (Arthur Fenton Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, London: MacMillan and Co., 1896, and Arthur Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, Sometime Bishop of Durham*, London: MacMillan and Co., 1903). The following are some samples from these biographies. For further quotes see *The Modern Bible Version Hall of Shame*.

> But I am not able to go as far as you in asserting the infallibility of a canonical writing (Hort writing to Westcott in 1860, cited in *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, Vol. I, p. 422). [*COMMENT*: Hort plainly denied the infallible inspiration of Scripture; as we will see, Westcott also rejected this doctrine.]
>
> For I too 'must disclaim settling for infallibility.' In the front of my convictions all I hold is the more I learn, the more I am convinced that fresh doubts come from my own ignorance, and that at present I find the presumption in favor of the absolute truth--I reject the word infallibility--of the Holy Scripture overwhelming (Westcott writing to Hort in 1860, cited in *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, Vol. I, p. 207). [*COMMENT*: This is standard Westcottism. He wants to hold the Bible as absolute truth but not as infallible, which is impossible except to deluded minds such as Westcott's. His writings often appear to be doctrinally sound but he will redefine terms so that what he seems to say is not what he really means; and he contradicts himself as he does in this exchange with Hort, speaking the truth on the one hand while taking it away on the other. In this, Westcott was a contrast to Hort, who was more forthright about his unbelief.]
>
> I am glad that you take the same provisional ground as to infallibility that I do (Hort writing to Lightfoot in 1860, *Life of Hort*, Vol. 1, p. 424). [*COMMENT*: Thus, after corresponding with his friend Lightfoot, another translator of the English Revised Version, on the issue of biblical inspiration, it was Hort's understanding that Lightfoot held the same heretical view of inspiration that he held.]
>
> But the book which has most engaged me is Darwin. Whatever may be thought of it, it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with. ... My feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable (Hort writing on April 3, 1860, *Life of Hort*, Vol. 1). [*COMMENT*: Darwinianism is a direct assault upon the Scriptures and upon the Gospel (which is predicated upon man's literal creation, fall, and subsequent need of redemption).]
>
> No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis give literal history--I could never understand how any one reading them with open eyes could think they did--yet they disclose to us a Gospel. So it is probably elsewhere [in the Bible] (Westcott, writing to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1890, cited in *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, Vol. II, p. 69). [*COMMENT*: Westcott wrote this in his old age. It is obvious that even when he spoke of the Gospel, he was speaking allegorically, because in his view the very foundation of the Bible was not literal history. Like Plato, Westcott held that myth could present spiritual truth. Of course, the denial of the historicity of Genesis 1-3 is a denial of Redemption and of Jesus Christ, who taught a literal Adam and Eve. If there is no literal fall there is no literal salvation, and if the first chapters of Genesis are myth the rest of the Bible is nonsense.]

> I am inclined to think that no such state as 'Eden' (I mean the popular notion) ever existed, and that Adam's fall in no degree differed from the fall of each of his descendants, as Coleridge justly argues (Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, Vol. I, p. 78). [*COMMENT*: This is a plain denial of the Bible and also of Jesus Christ and the Apostles, for they testified plainly to the historicity of the early chapters of Genesis and of the account of Adam's fall. See Mat. 19:4-6; 23:35; Rom. 5:12, 14; 1 Cor. 15:22, 45; 2 Cor. 11:3; 1 Tim. 2:13-14; Jude 14.]
>
> ... the popular doctrine of substitution is an immoral and material counterfeit. ... Certainly nothing could be more unscriptural than the modern limiting of Christ's bearing our sins and sufferings to his death; but indeed that is only one aspect of an almost universal heresy (Hort to Westcott, 1860, cited in *Life of Hort*, Vol. I, p. 430). [*COMMENT*: What Hort called heresy is, in fact, the truth. The atonement of Christ was made through His literal blood and death, not by His life. We are justified by His blood and reconciled by His death (Rom. 5:9-10). Note that Hort decries a "material" doctrine of the atonement, referring to literal blood and death. The heresy is on Hort's side, and it is not merely heresy; it is "damnable heresy" (2 Pet. 2:1), meaning that those who hold it cannot be saved.]

Westcott and Hort were instrumental in getting the Unitarian Christ-rejecter George Vance Smith on the ERV translation committee, and when an outcry was made by Anglican ministers against the Unitarian's presence on the committee, these men threatened to resign unless he remained.

Westcott was exceedingly clever in the statement of his heresies and ordinarily refused to state things plainly. He acknowledged that those of his party hid their views so as to avoid "persecution" (*Life and Letters of Westcott*, Vol. I, p. 229). After studying Westcott's writings, Dr. Donald Waite observed:

> Westcott's attack on the bodily resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ is not by any means a direct clash of out-and-out denial, but rather AN ADROIT, SKILLFUL, OBLIQUE UNDERMINING of the bodily resurrection of Christ BY MEANS OF A RE-DEFINITION OF TERMS" (Waite, *Westcott's Denial of Bodily Resurrection*). Writing in 1922, modernistic textual critic Kirsopp Lake stated: "Bishop Westcott is really the author of the great change [in the doctrine of the resurrection]. He entirely abandoned belief in the resurrection of the flesh as formulated in the creed; BUT HE NEVER SAID SO. On the contrary he used all HIS MATCHLESS POWERS OF SHADING LANGUAGE, so that the change from white to black appeared inevitable, natural, indeed, SCARCELY PERCEPTIBLE (Lake, *Immortality and the Modern Mind*, pp. 38-40).

Ezra Abbot (1819-1884

Abbot, a Harvard theology professor and one of the foremost textual critics in America, was on the American Standard Version (ASV) translation committee (1901). Abbot was a Christ-denier He authored the footnotes in the ASV that say that Christ should not be worshipped and that question his deity. For

example, at John 9:3, the wicked footnote states, "The Greek word denotes an act of reverence, whether paid to a creature (as here) or to the Creator." I cite this from an edition of the 1901 ASV that I have in my library. He argued that the last clause of Romans 9:5 was a doxology to God and does not refer to Christ. In Acts 20:28 Abbot led the committee to remove "God" and replace it with "the Lord," thus corrupting this powerful witness to the deity of Jesus Christ. Unitarians and theological modernists and even Jehovah's Witnesses alleged that Jesus is "the Lord" but they deny that He is actually God. Abbot wrote a long article arguing for the omission of "God" in 1 Timothy 3:1.

Joseph Henry Thayer (1828-1901)

Thayer was also on the American Standard Version translation team and was the translator and reviser of the Greek Lexicon that bears his name today. A Harvard professor of New Testament criticism, he was assistant to Unitarian Ezra Abbot and succeeded him in 1884 as Bussey professor of New Testament criticism and interpretation. Like Abbot, Thayer was a Unitarian who denied the deity of Jesus Christ and the infallibility of Scripture.

Eberhard Nestle (1851-1913)

Eberhard Nestle was the editor of an influential Greek New Testament that has become a standard among those committed to the critical text. He was an influential father of modern textual criticism and authored *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1898, 1901). Nestle denied the infallible inspiration of the Bible. In *Introduction to Textual Criticism* he claimed that it is possible that the authors of the New Testament did not write what they "thought or intended to be read" (p. 23). He believed the writing of the New Testament was completely happenstance. Like most other fathers of modern textual criticism, Nestle believed the Bible is to be treated like any other book. One of his foundational principles was that "… the task and the method [of textual criticism] are the same for all literary productions."

United Bible Societies Greek New Testament

Consider, too, the editors of the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament. The original editors of the UBS Greek text were Kurt Aland, Bruce Metzger, Matthew Black, and Allen Wikgren. Carlo M. Martini joined the editorial committee in 1967 (until his retirement in 2002), and the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome became a partner in the project at the same time. Johannes Karavidopoulos and Barbara Aland are listed on the editorial committee beginning with the fourth edition (they joined the work in or before 1981).

Carlo Maria Martini (1927-)

Carlo Martin is a Jesuit priest and the Archbishop Emeritus of Milan. He was consecrated Archbishop of Milan by Pope John Paul II in January 1980 and proclaimed a Cardinal on February 2, 1983. His diocese in Europe is the largest in the world, with two thousand priests and five million "laity." Martini was a professor at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome, which promotes the theory of evolution and the modernistic documentary views of biblical studies, etc. Carlo Martini is also committed to strange universalistic, New Age doctrine.

Kurt Aland (1915-1994)

Aland was co-editor of the Nestle-Aland Greek N.T. as well as one of the editors of the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament. He rejected verbal inspiration, calling it merely an "idea." As a contributor to the 1982 revised edition of Peake's Commentary, Aland put his stamp of approval upon its modernistic theology, which claimed, for example, that the Old Testament contains myths and the Gospels were the product of uncertain naturalistic processes. Aland even claimed that the canon of Scripture is yet unsettled.

Barbara Aland (1937-)

Barbara, the wife of the late Kurt Aland, is a professor of New Testament and Ecclesiastical History at the University of Munster, Germany, and (since 1983) Director of the Institute for New Testament Textual Research (Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung), Munster. She was co-editor of the Nestle-Aland text with her husband beginning in 1979. She is listed as an editor of the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament beginning with the fourth edition and started work with that committee in about 1981. That Barbara Aland shares her late husband's theological modernism is evident from her writings.

Bruce Metzger (1914-2007)

Metzger was probably the most influential textual critic of this generation. Every book defending the modern versions lists his works. He is popular across all denominational lines, Catholic, liberal Protestant, evangelical, even fundamentalist. His 1997 autobiography, *Reminisces of an Octogenarian*, omitted any reference to a personal salvation experience. Metzger denied the infallible inspiration of the Bible. In the notes to the Reader's Digest Condensed Bible, of which he was the chairman, he questioned the authorship, traditional date, and supernatural inspiration of books penned by Moses, Daniel, Paul, James, and Peter. In the notes to the 1962 New Oxford Annotated Bible RSV, which he co-edited with Herbert May, Metzger said the O.T. is "a matrix of myth, legend, and history." He denied the worldwide flood, called Job an "ancient folktale," claimed there are two authors of Isaiah, called Jonah a "popular legend," and

otherwise attacked the divine inspiration of Holy Scripture.

The previous information is only the "tip of the iceberg." We have merely touched on a few of the high points of the apostasy of the past 200 years, and it is in the midst of and in the context of this end-time apostasy that the unscriptural theories of modern textual criticism were developed and have gained favor and the modern English versions have appeared to challenge the King James Bible. The book *The Modern Bible Version Hall of Shame* features extensive documentation of this fact. Also, the book *Faith vs. the Modern Bible Versions* gives a 10-fold defense of the King James Bible. Both of these are available from Way of Life Literature.

Conclusion

None of these arguments are dependent upon Benjamin Wilkinson or J.J. Ray or Peter Ruckman or D.O. Fuller. Many men of God have looked at this issue and arrived at similar conclusions. To group all King James defenders into the same lump and to characterize them as "a teeming uncongealed mass of incredibly misinformed writers, editors, preachers and evangelists," as one writer has done, is libelous. There are plenty of crackpots on any side of an issue, but I know a great many of the "King James Only" men of this present generation, and they are among the finest Christians alive, in my estimation. Their "crime" and "error" is an unrestrained zeal for the Word of God which is grossly lacking in most circles today and which is frequently misunderstood.

The Psalmist displayed a truly spiritual attitude toward God's Word: "For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven. ... Therefore I love thy commandments above gold; yea, above fine gold. Therefore I ESTEEM ALL thy precepts concerning ALL things to be right; and I HATE EVERY false way" (Psalm 119:89, 127, 128). It is one thing to say you hold the Bible to be the Word of God in a general sense; it is quite another thing to believe its every word was settled in Heaven, to love it above fine gold, to ESTEEM every detail of it and to HATE everything that is contrary to it. This attitude is in direct contradiction to the positive-emphasis, easy-going, don't-get-uptight attitude that dominates Christendom today.

CHAPTER TWO

FROM 1800 TO 1870

The Battle against the Pre-Westcott-Hort Critical Texts

As I have immersed myself in studying the history of the modern texts, I have become increasingly impressed with the fact that most histories of the English Bible are revisionist. They commonly slight the rationalistim atmosphere out of which the critical text and the modern English versions have risen. How many books on this subject examine the theological aberrations of Westcott and Hort? How many describe the deception that surrounded the creation of the 1881 Revision? How many document the influence of religious Rationalism on nineteenth-century textual critics? How many expose the wretched theological apostasy of the RS translators or of the editors of the popular United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament? How many explain the destructive influence of Modernism and Romanism on nineteenth-century British denominations that laid the foundation for the modern versions? How many trace the influence of New Evangelical compromise on twentieth-century Bible versions?

We are convinced that it is impossible to understand the issue of Bible texts and versions apart from a correct understanding of these matters. In the following chapters we will attempt to highlight the social and theological influences of the last two centuries that have played a key role in the development of the modern versions.

By the early 1800s the King James Bible had ruled supreme in the English-speaking world for 200 years. Its predecessors, going back to the Tyndale Version, were the same basic Bibles. They were based upon the same Greek text and employed the same type of translation methodology. They were "formal equivalencies," meaning the translators labored to carry the precise words and phrasings of the underlying Greek and Hebrew texts into the receptor language. Those who used the King James Bible in the early nineteenth century were using a Bible with 300 years of antiquity in English. The underlying Greek text had been accepted by Bible-believing Christians of the sixteenth century as the authentic representation of the apostolic writings. Thus they called it the

"Received Text." In their estimation, this text had been transmitted through the centuries. This carries the antiquity of the King James Bible back, we believe, to the apostles.

The dominance of the King James Bible in the first half of the nineteenth century was complete. Its lovely words were considered a national treasure in Britain and America alike. It was largely the words of the King James Bible that motivated the great missionary movement of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Missionaries and evangelists and pastors, great and humble, preached from the Authorized Bible. Its words inspired revival movements that changed the moral character of entire nations. Its words inspired the greatest outpouring of sound theological research the world has ever seen, an era called by many the "Golden Age" of English literature.

Many books have been written to trace the unparalleled influence of the King James Bible. Some examples are *Annals of the English Bible* by Christopher Anderson (1845), *The Greatest English Classic: A Study of the KJV and Its Influence on Life and Literature* by Cleland Boyd McAfee (Harper and Brothers, 1912*),* and *Our Grand Old Bible* by William Muir (Morgan and Scott, 1911). Consider some of the varied testimonies to the glorious and unique heritage of the King James Bible:

> **The Authorized Version is a miracle and a landmark**. Its felicities are manifold, its music has entered into the very blood and marrow of English thought and speech, it has given countless proverbs and proverbial phrases even to the unlearned and the irreligious. There is no corner of English life, no conversation ribald or reverent it has not adorned. Embedded in its tercentenary wording is the language of a century earlier. It has both broadened and retarded the stream of English Speech (H. Wheeler Robinson*, Ancient and English Versions of the Bible*, p. 205).
>
> **The influence of the Authorised Version, alike on our religion and our literature, can never be exaggerated**. Not only in the great works of our theologians, the resonant prose of the seventeenth century Fathers of the English Church, but in the writings of nearly every author, whether of prose or verse, the stamp of its language is to be seen. ... So deeply has its language entered into our common tongue, that one probably could not take up a newspaper or read a single book in which some phrase was not borrowed, consciously or unconsciously, from King James's version. No master of style has been blind to its charms; and those who have recommended its study most strongly have often been those who, like Carlyle and Matthew Arnold, were not prepared to accept its teaching to the full.
>
> But great as has been the literary value of the Authorised Version, its religious significance has been greater still. **For nearly three centuries it has been the Bible, not merely of public use, not merely of one sect or party, not even of a single country, but of the whole nation and of every English-speaking country on the face of the globe.** It has been the literature of millions who have read little else, it has been the guide of conduct to men and women of

every class in life and of every rank in learning and education. No small part of the attachment of the English people to their national church is due to the common love borne by every party and well-nigh every individual for the English Bible. It was a national work in its creation, and it has been a national treasure since its completion. **It was the work, not of one man, nor of one age, but of many labourers, of diverse and even opposing views, over a period of ninety years. It has watered with the blood of martyrs, and its slow growth gave time for the casting off of imperfections and for the full accomplishment of its destiny as the Bible of the English nation.**

With the publication of the Authorised Version the history of the English Bible closes for many a long year. ... The scholarship of the day was satisfied with it as it had been satisfied with no version before it; and the common people found its language appeal to them with a greater charm and dignity than that of the Genevan version, to which they had been accustomed. As time went on the Authorised Version acquired the prescriptive right of age; its rhythms became familiar to the ears of all classes; its language entered into our literature; and English-men became prouder of their Bible than of any of the creative works of their own literature (Frederic Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, pp. 233, 34).

For more than two centuries English Protestant writers have spoken of it in terms of almost unanimous praise—its 'grace and dignity,' its 'flowing words,' its 'masterly English style.' Even a Roman Catholic divine, Dr. Geddes (1786), declares that 'if accuracy and strictest attention to the letter of the text be supposed to constitute an excellent version, this is of all versions the most excellent.' And an almost touching tribute is paid it by one who evidently looked back on it with yearning regret, after having exchanged its beauties for the uncouthness of the Romanist versions. 'Who will say,' writes [Priest] Faber, 'that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country? **It lives on the ear like a music that can never be forgotten**, like the sound of church bells, which the convert scarcely knows how he can forego. **Its felicities seem often to be almost things rather than words.** It is part of the national mind, and the anchor of the national seriousness. Nay, it is worshipped with a positive idolatry, in extenuation of whose fanaticism its intrinsic beauty pleads availingly with the scholar. The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. It is the representative of a man's best moments; all that there has been about him of soft, and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good speaks to him forever out of his English Bible. It is his sacred thing, which doubt never dimmed and controversy never soiled; and in the length and breadth of the land there is not a Protestant with one spark of religiousness about him whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible' (J. Paterson Smyth, *How We Got Our Bible*, pp. 131, 32).

... we find that the outcome of the labours of the translators was **a volume which ever since it first appeared has gone forth conquering and to conquer, and which under God and through the testimony of His Holy Spirit, has been not merely the source of Britain's greatness, but a source of blessing and consolation, of inspiration and revival**. It has been a well of water for the thirsty; a river of life which has turned many a wilderness into a fruitful field; a key which has unlocked many a dungeon door and set the

captives of ignorance and error, of superstition and sin, free for ever. It has opened blind eyes, and brought out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sat in darkness out of the prison-house. ...

The Authorized Version has often been called a well of English undefiled, and much of its purity is due to the fact that its water was drawn from the ancient springs. It has the universal note which gives it a place among the immortals. **It has the Divine touch, even in its diction, which lifts it above the limitations of locality and time, and makes it valid and living for all the ages**. **Like a rare jewel fitly set, the sacred truths of Scripture have found such suitable expression in it, that we can hardly doubt that they filled those who made it with reverence and awe, so that they walked softly in the Holy Presence**....

The English Bible is still fresh and mighty, even if it has archaic or obsolete words. It has waxed old, but it has not decayed. Its youth abides, and the sun never sets on its sphere of influence. Many volumes have perished since it first saw the light; but its message is as modern as ever. It has not only kept up-to-date, it has anticipated every need of men, and still responds to every new demand (William Muir, *Our Grand Old Bible*, p. 131, 192, 238).

The Authorized Version of the Bible and Its Influence, published by G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1910, is another example of the many books that have outlined the amazing influence of the King James Bible. The author, Albert Stanburrough Cook (1853-1927), was Professor of the English Language and Literature, Yale University. Cook was writing as an English professor, not as a preacher or a theologian. His essay was originally written as a chapter for Volume IV of *The Cambridge History of English Literature*. Cook said, "What Homer was to the Greeks, and the Koran to the Arabs, that, or something not unlike it, the Bible has become to the English." And by the Bible, he refers especially to the King James Bible. Cook saw the development of English following hand in hand with that of the Bible, from Bede to Purvey to Wycliffe to Tyndale to the KJV.

The influences which molded the English language into a proper vehicle for so stupendous a literary creation as the Bible must next be briefly considered. ... Throughout the Old English period, most of the literature produced was strongly colored by Biblical diction. Even a work like Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* was under this influence. By about the year 1000, the language was able to render the Latin of Jerome ... according to the computations of Marsh, about 93 per cent of the words of the Authorized Version, counting repetitions of the same word, are native English (pp. 35-37).

Cook discusses the translation work of Tyndale, Coverdale, and those who produced the Geneva Bible, then he focuses his attention for the rest of the book on the Authorized Version. Consider some other excerpts from this fascinating treatise:

The translators of the Authorized Version endeavored, out of the English renderings with which they were acquainted, compared with the originals and the principal versions into other tongues, ancient and modern, to

frame one which should surpass them all by appropriating the chief excellencies of each—so far, at least, as these excellencies could be harmonized with one another. ...

Whereas previously one Bible had been read in church, and another at home, now all parties and classes turned with one accord to the new version, and adopted it as their very own. It thus became bound up with the life of the nation. **Since it stilled all controversy over the best rendering, it gradually came to be accepted as so far absolute that in the minds of myriad's there was no distinction between this version and the original texts**, and they may almost be said to have believed in the literal inspiration of the very words which composed it.

It must not be overlooked that the Authorized Version profited by all the controversy regarding previous translations. **Practically every word that could be challenged had been challenged.** The fate of a doctrine, even the fate of a party, had at times seemed to depend upon a phrase. The whole ground had been fought over so long that great intimacy with the Bible had resulted. Not only did the mind take cognizance of it, but the emotions seized upon it; much of it was literally learned by heart by great numbers of the English people. Thus it grew to be a national possession ... No other book has so penetrated and permeated the hearts and speech of the English race as has the Bible. What Homer was to the Greeks, and the Koran to the Arabs, that, or something not unlike it, the Bible has become to the English. Huxley writes:

'Consider the great historical fact that for three centuries this book has been woven into the life of all that is best and noblest in English history; that it has become the national epic of Britain, and is as familiar to noble and simple, from John'o'Groat's House to Land's End, as Dante and Tasso once were to the Italians; that **it is written in the noblest and purest English and abounds in exquisite beauties of pure literary form**...'

Swift writes, almost exactly a hundred years after the date of the Authorized Version: **'The translators of our Bible were masters of an English style much fitter for that work than any which we see in our present writings, which I take to be owing to the simplicity that runs through the whole'**; and again, of the changes which had been introduced into the language: 'They have taken off a great deal from the simplicity which is one of the greatest perfections in any language.'

Hallam ... admits that the style of the Authorized Version is 'the perfection of our English language' ... declaring that the English of the Jacobean version [The King James Bible] 'is not the English of Daniel, or Raleigh, or Bacon'—in fact, that '**it is not the language of the reign of James**.' ... this is strictly true, and for the reason that he assigns, namely, '**in consequence of the principle of adherence to the original versions** which had been kept up since the time of Henry VIII.' ...

Great thought and great feeling draw their own appropriate diction to themselves, somewhat as the magnet attracts steel filings; and after the appropriate diction has thus been attracted, the union between it and the substance of discourse seems to be almost indissoluble. It is as if a soul had been clothed upon with flesh. From that moment, nothing can be changed with

> impunity; if you wrench away a word, it is as if a portion of the life-blood followed it. Now the time when the soul of the Bible began to take upon itself flesh for us was nearly three-quarters of a century before the work of the Jacobean revisers. **But since the life-process, so to speak, did not absolutely begin with Tindale, it really extended over a considerably longer period than that named above, especially if we consider that Wyclif was concerned in it ... must be regarded as having initiated a process which the Jacobean revisers completed.**
>
> If the substance of the Bible may thus be compared to a soul which was to be fitted with a body, it will follow that ... **a radical change in the vocabulary at any point would be likely to throw that part out of keeping with the rest.** The truth of this was recognized by Ellicott, when, in 1870, he advised future revisers to 'limit the choice of words to the vocabulary of the present [Authorized] version, combined with that of the versions, that preceded it; and in alterations preserve as far as possible the rhythm and cadence of the Authorized Version.
>
> It is not a little remarkable that the effects wrought by the English Bible should require so few words. The editors of the *New English Dictionary* reckon the words in A to Z, inclusive, as 160,813, of which number 113,677 are what they call main words. Shakespeare, it has been estimated, employs about 21,000 (others say 15,000, or 24,000); Milton, in his verse, about 13,000. The Hebrew (with the Chaldee) of the Old Testament, according to the computations of Leusden, comprises 5,642 words, and the New Testament, it is said, has 4,800, while the whole English Bible, if we may trust Marsh, employs about 6,000. ...
>
> The elevation and nobility of Biblical diction, assisted by its slightly archaic tinge, have a tendency to keep all English style above meanness and triviality (Albert Cook, *The Authorized Version of the Bible and Its Influence*).

Thus we see the power that the King James Bible has wielded upon the English-speaking people across the centuries. We could also consider the influence of the Authorized Version in a worldwide sense. Its influence has probably surpassed that of any other translation of the Bible in church history. To trace this influence, though, would take us too far afield of the direct pursuit of our subject.

Though there were lonely voices here and there degrading the Received Text and expounding the theories which would eventually result in the Westcott-Hort Greek text and the new English versions founded upon it, these voices had practically no impact outside the circles of the professional textual critic until the end of the nineteenth century.

Thousands of faithful pastors stood for the Greek Received Text and the King James Bible across Britain and North America. Writing in the 1930s, H.S. Miller gave this testimony of the attitude of the average Bible believer toward the King James Bible:

> FOR MORE THAN THREE CENTURIES THE KING JAMES' VERSION HAS BEEN THE BIBLE OF THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD, AND THERE

> DOES NOT SEEM TO BE MUCH ABATEMENT, EVEN IN FAVOR OF THE REVISED VERSION. More copies [of the KJV] are being sold each year. Its simple, majestic, Anglo-Saxon tongue, its clear, sparkling style, its directness and force of utterance, have made it the model in language, style, and dignity of some of the choicest writers of the last two centuries. Added to the above characteristics, its reverential and spiritual tone and attitude have made it the idol of the Christian church, for its own words have been regarded as authoritative and binding. It has endeared itself to the hearts and lives of millions of Christians and has molded the characters of the leaders in every walk of life in the greatest nation of the world. During all these centuries, King James' Version has become a vital part of the English-speaking world, socially, morally, religiously, and politically. Launched with the endorsement of the regal and scholarly authority of the seventeenth century, its conquest and rule have been supreme (H.S. Miller, *General Biblical Introduction*, pp. 365,66; Miller quotes part of this paragraph from Ira Price's *The Ancestry of Our English Bible*).

H.S. Miller supported the Westcott-Hort text and the Revised Version, but he admits the preeminence of the King James Bible throughout the nineteenth century and extending even to the first half of the twentieth. He was writing in 1937 when he said, "For more than three centuries the King James' Version has been the Bible of the English-speaking world, and *there does not seem to be much abatement, even in favor of the Revised Version*" (emphasis added) (Miller, *General Biblical Introduction,* p. 365).

The King James Bible IS the ancient scriptural landmark for the English-speaking peoples of the world. Those who follow the new versions have departed from a clear landmark. "Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set" (Prov. 22:28). The audacity of Westcott-Hort and the Revisers of 1881 was incredible to behold. By their own profession, they tossed aside 15 centuries of history to replace the generally-received text of Scripture with a different one. Even Westcott and Hort admitted the antiquity of the Received Text. "Hort recognised the Textus Receptus as being quite as old as 350 A.D. or older" (Herman C. Hoskier*, Codex B and Its Allies: A Study and an Indictment*, p. viii).

Bishop Ellicott, Chairman of the English Revision New Testament committee, said this about the age of the Received Text:

> The manuscripts which Erasmus used differ, for the most part, only in small and insignificant details from the bulk of the cursive manuscripts. The general character of their text is the same. By this observation the pedigree of the Received Text is carried up beyond the individual manuscripts used by Erasmus. ... **That pedigree stretches back to a remote antiquity. The first ancestor of the Received Text was at least contemporary with the oldest of our extant manuscripts, if not older than any one of them** (Charles John Ellicott, *The Revisers and the Greek Text of the New Testament, by Two Members of the New Testament Company*, 1882, pp. 11, 12).

Only a spiritually weak generation would have allowed the ancient, traditionally-received text of Scripture to be overthrown, but such a generation was foretold: "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And *they shall turn away* their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables" (2 Timothy 4:3-4).

Bishop Ellicott also said: "Nothing is more satisfactory at the present time than *THE EVIDENT FEELINGS OF VENERATION FOR OUR AUTHORIZED VERSION*, and the very generally-felt desire for as little change as possible" (emphasis added) (*Considerations on Revision*, May 1870, p. 99, cited in *Revision Revised*, "A Letter to Bishop Ellicott in Reply to His Pamphlet," p. 369).

The deception of the Revised Version Committee is that they ignored these "feelings of veneration for the Authorized Version" and went entirely out of the bounds of their own written rules to produce, not a mere revision of the King James Bible, but an entirely new type of Greek text and a wholesale revamping of the English translation. More on this later.

Textual critics seek to overthrow the Greek Received Text

Throughout the 1700s and 1800s various textual critics were attempting to overthrow the Received Text, but these labored in relative obscurity in relation to the average pastor and the average Christian. H.S. Miller lists 17 textual scholars of note who labored between the mid-seventeenth and the mid-nineteenth centuries. Other historians add a number of other names to this list.

Chief among those who were trying to overthrow the Received Text were Richard Simon (1638-1712) (a French priest), Johann A. Bengel (1687-1752), J. S. Semler (1725-91), John J. Griesbach (1745-1812), Karl Lachmann (1793-1851), Henry Alford (1810-71), Constantin Tischendorf (1815-74), S.P. Tregelles (1813-75), B.F. Westcott (1825-1901), and F.J.A. Hort (1828-92).

It is necessary to understand that the field of textual criticism has always been divided and confused. Many of the histories would have us believe that there was a steady increase of knowledge in this field in the nineteenth century *with all facts pointing in one direction and one direction only: the discrediting of the Received Text*. This was NOT the case.

First, there were textual scholars working contemporary with those mentioned above *who did not accept the theories of these critics and who did not believe the Received Text to be corrupt*. Such men are mentioned by Miller, Metzger, Kenyon, and others, but only in passing and almost in derision, as if their scholarship were somehow suspect because they refused to reject the God-honored Received Text.

In particular, Miller acknowledges that John J. Wetstein (1693-1754), Christian F. Matthaei (1744-1811), Andrew Birch (1758-1829), J.M.A. Scholz (1794-1852),

and F.H.A. Scrivener (1813-91) largely supported the Received Text rather than the critical text.

We also could mention George Salmon (1812-1904), John Burgon (1813-1888), Edward Miller (1825-1901), and Herman Hoskier (1864-1938). All of these were textual scholars of the highest caliber. All were contemporary with Westcott and Hort. All are slighted in most histories on textual criticism because they repudiated the critical text.

Students who read works such as Miller's *General Biblical Introduction,* Metzger's *The Text of the New Testament* (said to be "the standard in the field"), Kenyon's *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,* or Kurt Aland's *The Text of the New Testament* are given the impression that there has been no serious scholarly challenge to the theories underlying the modern Greek text, but this is not true. Metzger does *mention* Burgon and Salmon, but he tells us nothing of consequence of their work apart from shallow caricatures. The same can be said for Kenyon. Aland summarizes the defense of the Received Text as mere "clamorous rhetoric" (*The Text of the New Testament*, p. 19).

Second, even the various textual critics who are exalted commonly as the giants in that field were extremely critical of one another and have held nothing like a uniformity of principle. As for their attitude even toward one another, Burgon, in his inimitable way, notes the confusion and lack of unity which reigned:

> What Griesbach attempted [1774-1805], was denounced [1782-1805] by C.F. Matthaei;—disapproved by Scholz;—demonstrated to be untenable by Abp. Laurence. Finally, in 1847, the learned J.G. Reiche, in some *Observations* prefixed to his Collations of MSS. in the Paris Library, eloquently and ably exposed the unreasonableness of *any* theory of 'Recension,'—properly so called; thereby effectually anticipating Westcott and Hort's weak imagination of a 'Syrian Text,' while he was demolishing the airy speculations of Griesbach and Hug. 'There is no royal road' (he said) 'to the Criticism of the N.T.: no plain and easy method, at once reposing on a firm foundation, and conducting securely to the wished for goal.' ... Scarcely therefore in Germany had the basement-story been laid of that 'fabric of Criticism which has been built up during the last fifty years,' and which you [Bishop Ellicott] superstitiously admire, —when a famous German scholar [J.G. Reiche] was heard denouncing the fabric as insecure. He foretold that the 'regia via' of codices B and Aleph would prove a deceit and a snare: which thing, at the end of four-and-thirty years, has punctually come to pass (Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, pp. 380, 81).

Alfred Marti also noted this in his doctoral thesis:

> It should be evident by this time that the opposing schools of textual criticism are not new, and that the lines have been drawn in practically the same way since the beginning of the conflict. Just as Bengel was opposed by Wettstein, so Griesbach was opposed by C.F. Matthaei (Martin, *A Critical Examination of the Westcott-Hort Textual Theory*, p. 35).

The chief thing that united this latter group of rationalistic textual critics was their animosity toward the Received Text. In summarizing the work of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford, Robert Dabney noted:

> Their common traits may be said to be an almost contemptuous dismissal of the received text, as unworthy not only of confidence, but almost of notice; the rejection of the great mass of the codices of the common text as recent and devoid of nearly all authority; and the settlement of the text by the testimony of a very few MSS. for which they claim a superior antiquity, with the support of a few fathers and versions, whom they are pleased to regard as judicious and trustworthy (Dabney, *Discussions: Evangelical and Theological*, pp. 354, 55).

Beyond that, all was uncertainty and change.

> Tregelles has published a vast list, covering ninety-four octavo pages, of the departures of the four leading editors whom he admires, Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, from the received text. Their number is more than nine thousand. That is, there are so many places in which one or more of these critics differs from the received text. But the same tables evince that the critics differ among each other in more than nine thousand places! (Dabney, *Discussions: Evangelical and Theological*, p. 356).

The confusion and variance among textual critics has increased over the past century. Those who launch out upon the theories espoused by these men set sail upon a sea of confusion and anarchy. Those who follow the modern textual critics have no absolute standard of authority. If that is not of the Devil, nothing is.

At the same time that the textual critics were inventing their "airy" philosophies, **various English translations were being produced privately that contained deviations from the KJV**. In the latter half of the eighteenth century, John Wesley, founder of Methodism, produced a New Testament containing "some 12,000 alterations from the 1611 text partly due to the use of a different text, and partly to a free use of the Authorized Version margins" (H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Bible in Its Ancient and English Versions*, p. 230). Editions of the Wesley New Testament were published in 1755, 1760, and 1790. In 1833 Rodolphus Dickinson published his edition of the New Testament based on the critical Greek text of Griesbach. In 1840 the (Unitarian) Samuel Sharpe version appeared. It was based upon the critical Greek text of Griesbach. That same year the Edgar Taylor version appeared, which also used the Griesbach text. In 1841 J.T. Conquest, a medical doctor, came out with his Bible version, containing 20,000 departures from the Old English Bible. In 1857 the American Bible Union issued the first of its versions of the Bible which followed the critical text in hundreds of places. In 1858 Leicester A. Sawyer issued a New Testament based on one of Tischendorf's critical Greek texts. In 1872 J.N. Darby, a founder of the Brethren movement, published a New Testament that departed from the Received Text in many instances. Darby's translation was criticized in the November and December 1872 issue of Spurgeon's *Sword and Trowel*, which

labeled it "a faulty and pitiable translation of the sacred Book." Other examples of nineteenth-century English translations could be given.

Samuel McComb, in his history of the English Bible, also notes **the influence of commentaries in undermining the Received Text and the King James Bible**:

> A succession of commentaries, embodying the results of the new Biblical learning and amending the Authorized Version, gradually educated the clergy, and, through them, the laity, in the necessity for some authoritative revision of what was proved to be a faulty translation (McComb, *The Making of the English Bible*, 1909, p. 101).

While we don't share McComb's enthusiasm for the "new Biblical learning" and we disagree with him that the Old Version is faulty, it is no doubt true that critical commentaries have wielded vast (destructive) influence. Instead of contenting themselves with expounding the Word of God, which is the preacher's duty, many modern commentators fancy themselves textual critics.

Beginning in the early 1800s, **voices began to call for a revision of the King James Bible**. H. Wheeler Robinson, who taught at Oxford and at Regent Park College in Britain, summarizes this period in *Ancient and English Versions of the Bible*. We will leave out portions of Robinson's summary because he also refers to the new translations produced in the nineteenth century as well as to some of the voices lifted in defense of the Authorized Version, both of which topics we deal with more extensively elsewhere.

> It is with the nineteenth century that the explicit demand for an improved version, as distinct from the earlier stages of adverse criticism and of premature attempts at revision, may really be said to begin. ... In *The Eclectic Review* for January 1809, Dr. John Pye Smith, President of Homerton Congregational College, made a strong appeal for an authoritative revision; and he was followed the next year by Dr. Herbert Marsh, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, in his published *Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible*. ... Sir James B. Burges [supported the replacement of the Authorized Version] in his *Reasons in Favour of a New Translation of the Scriptures* (1819)...
>
> Fresh stimulus was given to the discussion by a scholarly booklet entitled *Hints for an Improved Translation of the New Testament*, produced in 1832 by the Rev. Jas. Scholefield, Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge, and re-edited in 1836 and (in an enlarged form) in 1849. ...
>
> Some caustic remarks regarding the archaic vocabulary and literary quality of the Authorized Version were offered by Henry Hallam in the third volume of his *Literature of Europe* (1839) ...
>
> The matter was broached in the Lower House of Convocation in March 1856 by Canon William Selwyn, of Ely and Cambridge, but he met with comparatively little support; and later the same year he pleaded for revision in his *Notes on the Proposed Amendment of the Authorized Version* (re-edited 1857)—a plea which Dr. C.J. Ellicott was also passionately urging at this time in his commentaries on

the Pauline Epistles (H. Wheeler Robinson, *Ancient and English Versions of the Bible*, pp. 236-238).

We leave Robinson's summary in 1857, because we will begin our next chapter precisely at this point in history when we take up the battle over the English Revised Version.

In spite of the disparate voices calling for revision, in general there was not a great challenge to the Greek Received Text or to the King James Bible until the latter end of the 1800s. This explains why there was not a lot of activity on the side of defending the KJV in the first half of the nineteenth century. You don't defend something unless there is a challenge to it. The only real challenge to the KJV in the first half of the nineteenth century consisted of the Pre-Westcott-Hort Greek texts. A few examples of the response to these by defenders of the Old Bible follow.

Men Who Stood Against the Early Critical Greek Texts

Martin Scholz

Martin Scholz of Bonn, Germany, took a stand against J.J. Griesbach and his theory that the Alexandrian text supported by Origen is of highest authority.

> The primary fact enforced by Griesbach, that the Alexandrian readings which are supported by the quotations of Origen possess the highest authority of all, is disputed by professor Matthiae, of Moscow, in his critical edition of the New Testament, and with greater confidence by professor Martin Scholz, of Bonn, in the prolegomena to his very learned and elaborate edition, founded on a system wholly at variance with that of Griesbach. The Alexandrian manuscripts are acknowledged by Scholz to be more ancient, but he asserts them to be more corrupt than any others, and contends that in Alexandria the alterations of the text principally originated. He divides all the manuscripts, not, as Griesbach, into three, but into two classes, the Byzantine and the Alexandrian, in which latter he includes the Western; and *he gives a decided superiority to the authority of the Byzantine recensions*, *which, in opposition to Griesbach, he strenuously maintains to be directly derived from the autographs of the evangelists and apostles themselves* (emphasis added) (*McClintock & Strong Cyclopedia*).

In 1845, Scholz publicly announced that he had changed his mind and that he "would now recommend the Alexandrian readings instead" (see Scrivener and Miller, 1894, vol. 2, p. 230).

Richard Lawrence

Richard Lawrence, archbishop of Cashel in the Church of England, also took a stand against Griesbach. In 1814 he published "Remarks upon the Systematical Classification of Manuscripts adopted by Dr. Griesbach." "The learned author states that he considers Griesbach to be what bishop Marsh denominated him, 'the

most consummate critic that ever undertook an edition of the New Testament;' but in the course of his critical strictures on the origin and execution of his plan of appreciating manuscripts, *he employs the severest terms of censure*, *observing that Griesbach's mode of investigation is unsatisfactory, his classification fallacious*, *and his statement of the number of readings inaccurate*; that no such classification of the manuscripts of the New Testament is possible, the existence of three distinct species of texts being a fact only synthetically presumed, and not capable of any analytical demonstration; so that '*THE STUDENT FINDS HE IS TREADING, NOT ON SOLID GROUND, BUT ON A CRITICAL QUICKSAND*'" (emphasis added) (*McClintock & Strong Cyclopedia*).

Frederick Nolan

Frederick Nolan's (1784-1864) *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate or Received Text of the New Testament, in which the Greek manuscripts are newly classed, the integrity of the Authorised Text vindicated, and the various readings traced to their origin* was published in 1815. As the title suggests, this 576-page volume was a defense of the text underlying the Authorized Version. Nolan said:

> ... it shall be my object to vindicate those important passages of the Received Text which have been rejected from the Scripture Canon, on the principles of the German method of classification" (p. 43). Among the several passages that he thus vindicated are 1 Timothy 3:1 and 1 John 5:. Presbyterian leader R.L. Dabney described Nolan's volume as "a work which defends the received text with matchless ingenuity and profound learning (Dabney, "The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek," *Southern Presbyterian Review*, April 1871).

Nolan defended the sixteenth-century text on the basis of faith and theological purity. He opposed the critics of his day who were disparaging the work of Erasmus, Stephanus, and Beza in a manner mimicked by today's modern version proponents. In particular, Nolan was defending the TR against the text and theorizing of Griesbach. Nolan saw the hand of God guiding the sixteenth-century textual editors, and he understood that the Received Text is theologically superior to the critical texts. He also understood that the efforts to undermine the Received Text were destructive to the authority of the Bible.

> The necessary result of this process, as obviously proving the existence of a number of spurious readings in the Received Text, has been that of shaking the authority of our Authorized Version, with the foundation on which it is rested (Nolan, p. 6).

In concluding his overview of the arguments which had been arrayed against the Trinitarian statement in 1 John 5:7, Nolan says:

> On summing up the arguments which have been urged against the text of the heavenly witnesses, **I cannot therefore discover anything which materially affects the authenticity of this verse**, either in the omissions of the Greek manuscripts, or the silence of the Greek fathers; in the variations of the Latin

> version, or the allegorical explanations of the Latin polemics. The objections hence raised against that text, are perfectly consistent with that strong evidence in its favour, which is deducible from the internal evidence, and the external testimony of the African Church; which testimony remains to be disposed of, before we can consider it spurious. Nor is there any objection to which the text of the Vulgar Greek [Received Text] is exposed, in other respects, which at all detracts from its credit (Nolan, *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate*, p. 564).

Nolan refutes the popular idea that Erasmus and the Reformation editors were working with insufficient textual evidence and that they did not know about the readings preferred by today's textual critics. Consider Nolan's comments on Eramus's methodology:

> **With respect to manuscripts, it is indisputable that he [Erasmus] was acquainted with every variety which is known to us; having distributed them into two principal classes, one of which corresponds with the Complutensian edition, the other with the Vatican manuscript**. **And he has specified the positive grounds on which he received the one and rejected the other.** The former was in the possession of the Greek church, the latter in that of the Latin; judging from the internal evidence he had as good reason to conclude the Eastern church had not corrupted their received text as he had grounds to suspect the Rhodians from whom the Western church derived their manuscripts, had accommodated them to the Latin Vulgate. One short insinuation which he has thrown out, sufficiently proves that his objections to these manuscripts lay more deep; and they do immortal credit to his sagacity. In the age in which the Vulgate was formed, the church, he was aware, was infested with Origenists and Arians; an affinity between any manuscript and that version, consequently conveyed some suspicion that its text was corrupted (Nolan, *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate*, pp. 413-15).

One hundred and eighty years ago this respected scholar refuted the popular line that is promoted today in regard to the Erasmus text. The critics of the Received Text claim that Erasmus based his text upon a mere handful of manuscript evidence. They look down upon Beza for refusing to give consideration to manuscripts WHICH WERE IN HIS POSSESSION but which contained a reading contrary to the Received Text. The critics claim that the discovery of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus and similar manuscripts gave the nineteenth-century textual critics an massive advance over the Reformation editors. Read practically any introduction to the history of modern textual criticism, and this is the picture you will find. The fact is that the Reformation editors were familiar, generally, WITH NEARLY ALL OF THE VARIOUS READINGS known today, even the readings of Vaticanus. As Nolan shows, *the Reformation editors did not follow the Received Text because they lacked sufficient textual evidence, but because they consciously chose to reject the critical readings.* The fact is that the Reformation editors believed that God had preserved His Word in a certain family of manuscripts that can be called the Traditional Text and it was to this text that they looked when they were searching for the words of God. The Reformation editors recognized that the

Traditional Text is theologically pure whereas the text represented by Vaticanus and friends is impure. In a word, they did not adopt the Received Text out of *ignorance*, but out of *conviction*!

Nolan, in a careful and very technical manner, traced the history of the doctrinal corruptions that were introduced into the text of various manuscripts during the first four centuries after Christ.

> **The works of those early writers lie under the positive imputation of being corrupted**. The copies of Clement and Origen were corrupted in their life time; the manuscripts from which Tertullian's works have been printed are notoriously faulty; and the copies of Cyprian demonstrate their own corruption, by their disagreement among themselves, and their agreement with different texts and revisals of Scripture. It is likewise indisputable, that these fathers not only followed each other, adopting the arguments and quotations of one another; but that **they quoted from the heterodox as well as the orthodox**. **They were thus likely to transmit from one to another erroneous quotations, originally adopted from sources not more pure than heretical revisals of Scripture.** ... **New revisals of Scripture were thus formed, which were interpolated with the peculiar readings of scholiasts and fathers.** Nor did this systematic corruption terminate here; but when new texts were thus formed, they became the standard by which the later copies of the early writers were in succession corrected (*An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate*, pp. 326-332).

Nolan associates this textual corruption with manuscripts such as Sinaiticus and Vaticanus.

Nolan documented the overwhelming textual authority that supports various passages that are in the Received Text but that are disputed by the modern versions.

The amazing thing is that these facts, which were understood by the Reformation editors and confirmed by wise scholars in the nineteenth century, are ridiculed today, even by many supposed evangelical and fundamentalist scholars. Why? Because they are not depending on their own scholarship but upon the rationalistic scholarship of the past two centuries. Theologian Bernard Ramm admits this fact: "Much evangelical scholarship is piggy-backing on non-evangelical scholarship. It does not have an authentic scholarship of its own" (Ramm, *After Fundamentalism: The Future of Evangelical Theology*, New York: Harper & Row, 1983). Ramm was not speaking specifically of textual criticism, but the shoe does fit.

Henry John Todd

Henry John Todd (1763-1845), M.A., in 1819, published *A Vindication of Our Authorised Translation and Translators of the Bible, and of preceding Versions, from the Objections of Mr. John Bellamy, and of Sir J.B. Burges*. Todd was chaplain to the King of England and keeper of the Archbishop of Canterbury's records. He was Archdeacon of Cleveland and Canon of Durham. He published *The Life of John*

Milton (1801) and edited a small edition of *Johnson's Dictionary of the English Language* (1818).

In *A Vindication of Our Authorised Translation*, Todd was writing in opposition to those voices (mentioned earlier) that were calling for a revision of the Authorized Version and a replacement of its underlying Hebrew and Greek texts. In particular Todd contradicted statements made by John Bellamy defending his own private version of the Old Testament and harshly criticizing the King James Bible. In the following excerpt Todd is quoting Thomas Rennell (1754-1840), Dean of Winchester:

> From either of these schemes, the bold project of a new translation, or the more specious one of a revisal of the present version of the Holy Scriptures, there can be so little gained, and may be so much hazarded, **that the probable good bears no manner of proportion to the threatened danger**. ... With regard to revision, it is of little importance that a few particles be adjusted, a few phrases polished, **if the whole fabric of that faith which was once delivered to the saints is thereby shaken to its foundation** (emphasis added) (Thomas Rennell, "Discourses on Various Subjects," cited by H.J. Todd, *A Vindication of Our Translation and Translators of the Bible*, p. vi).

This represented the popular opinion at that point in time, and I believe Rennell's words are prophetic.

Bellamy had claimed that the King James Bible and its predecessors were translated by men who were not skilled in the Hebrew language. Todd countered by examining the qualifications of a number of the esteemed Reformation translators and by bringing forth many respected testimonies in defense of the scholarship of the Authorized Version translation committee. Todd described Tyndale's excellent skills in the Hebrew language. He noted the exalted linguistic abilities of the men who produced the Geneva Bible. He gave details of 17 of the KJV translators who were highly skilled in Hebrew.

In Section VII of his treatise, Todd gives the testimonies of 15 scholars who attest to the beauty and accuracy of the King James Bible. He then concludes with these words:

> To the preceding notices I presume to add, that when we consider the very few real faults, which the most minute and scrupulous inquirer has been able to find in our present Translation; when we perceive critics, of the highest name, producing very discordant interpretations of the same text or word; we cannot but call to mind, with reverence and admiration, the effect of deliberate and united consideration, recorded by one of the venerable Translators, and already noticed: 'The preacher need not have filled his auditors' ears with needless exceptions against the late Translation; and for that word for which he offered three reasons why it ought to have been translated as he said, he and others had considered all of them, and found thirteen more considerable reasons why it was translated as now printed.'

> And when with all the respect, (and very great is both the respect and gratitude,) which we feel for the labours of judicious and enlightened scholars of modern times, we are still led to concur in a doubt expressed, 'whether any new translation of even a single book of Scripture has appeared since the publication of the authorized Version, which, taken as a whole, has come up to its standard, either for the general correctness with which it conveys the sense of the original, or the dignity, simplicity, and propriety of the language in which that sense is conveyed;'—instead of being impatient for a revision of the present text, instead of regarding what has been lately called 'an improved one' with any other feeling than that of indignation against presumptuous ignorance, we shall take up THE BOOK, which from our infancy we have known and loved, with increased delight, and resolve not hastily to violate, in regard to itself, the rule which it records; 'Forsake not an old friend, for the new is not comparable to him" (Todd, *A Vindication of Our Authorized Translation and Translators*, 1819, pp. 82, 93).

J.W. Whittaker

J.W. Whittaker, M.A., Fellow of St. John's, Cambridge, in 1820, published *An Historical and Critical Enquiry into the Interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures, with Remarks on Mr. Bellamy's New Translation*. This was a brilliant defense of the Authorized Version against John Bellamy's harsh criticisms. As noted in the previous paragraphs, Bellamy had launched a vicious attack on the authenticity of the King James Bible and had made the accusation that the translators of the KJV and its predecessors were not skilled in Hebrew. Whittaker, a Hebrew scholar, carefully described the linguistic excellencies of Tyndale, Miles Coverdale, John Rogers, and the translators of the Great Bible, the Geneva, the Bishops, and the Authorized 1611. Whittaker gave examples from these translations, demonstrating that these versions conformed to the Hebrew rather than to the Greek Septuagint or the Latin Vulgate. His examination of the credentials of the translators of the Bishops' Bible is particularly interesting, as little is said in most histories available today on this subject:

> Fortunately we are not left in ignorance of the attainments of these learned men, and the names of some of them would be sufficient evidence of the care with which this translation was conducted. Dr. [William] Alley, Bishop of Exeter, was educated at King's College, from which place he went to Oxford, and there wrote a Hebrew Grammar. Dr. [Richard] Davies, Bishop of St. David's, to which see he was promoted from St. Asaph, had been employed in translating the Bible into Welsh in conjunction with one Morgan, which employment he probably forsook when the English version required his assistance. Dr. [Edward] Sandys was Bishop of Worcester, afterwards of London, and ultimately Archbishop of York. He, as well as Dr. [Robert] Horne, Bishop of Winchester, received his education at St. John's College, Cambridge; and Strype says that 'he was a man well skilled in the original languages.' In a letter which he wrote to the Archbishop, he complains that the Hebrew had not everywhere been diligently followed in the Great Bible, and that too great attention had been paid to Münster's Latin translation. Dr. [Thomas] Bentham, Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry, had been Fellow of Magdalen College in Oxford, and during his residence there, Anthony à

> Wood says that 'he did solely addict his mind to the study of theology, and to the learning of the Hebrew language.' Being ejected from his fellowship in Queen Mary's reign [because of persecution], he retired to foreign countries and became a preacher at Zurich and Basle, but returned on the accession of Queen Elizabeth. The Book of Psalms passed through the hands of Dr. Cox, Bishop of Ely, and perhaps of some other persons. Possibly this prelate may have been originally appointed by Parker, since Bentham was not nominated by the Archbishop, but by the Queen. Dr. [Edmund] Grindall was educated at Magdalen College in Cambridge, and, as well as Bentham, resided abroad during Queen Mary's reign. On his return he was made Bishop of London, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury.—His literary attainments in every branch of theological learning have never been doubted, and have been so well described by his biographer, Strype, that to enlarge here upon them would be superfluous (Whittaker, pp. 66-67).

We would remind our readers that the Bishops' Bible was the immediate predecessor of the King James. It was the Bishops' Bible that was revised by the KJV translators.

Whittaker also describes the rarified linguistic climate that existed uniquely during the Reformation era.

> Had this gentleman [Bellamy] consulted any historical authority, or in the slightest degree investigated the characters of our translators, he would have found that many of them were celebrated Hebrew scholars, and could not have failed to perceive **that the sacred language was at that time cultivated to a far greater extent in England than it has ever been since.** We have already seen that twelve editions of the Hebrew Bible were printed before the year 1527, four of which were published in one year. Ever since the first dawn of literature in Europe, the study of the Scriptures in the original languages had been an object of the warmest enthusiasm. The turn which religious controversy took at the birth of the Reformation compelled all learned men to take their authorities from the inspired text, and not from a Romish version.—**In the year 1540, King Henry the Eighth appointed regular Hebrew Professors**, and the consequences of this measure were instantaneous. **In Queen Elizabeth's reign no person who pretended to eminence as a learned man was ignorant of this language**, and so very common did it become, that the ladies of noble families frequently made it one of their accomplishments....
>
> **Under Queen Elisabeth and King James**, who were not only the patrons of learning by their institutions, but examples of it in their own persons, **Hebrew literature prospered to a very great extent, and under the last of these monarchs attained its greatest splendour. The Universities, and all public bodies for the promotion of learning, flourished in an extraordinary degree, and AT THIS HAPPY JUNCTURE OUR TRANSLATION WAS MADE**. Every circumstance had been conspiring during the whole of the preceding century to extend the study of Hebrew. **The attempts of the Papists to check the circulation of the translations, the zeal of the Protestants to expose the Vulgate error, the novelty of theological speculations to society at large, and even the disputes of the Reformed Churches, GAVE AN ANIMATED VIGOUR TO THE STUDY OF THE ORIGINAL SCRIPTURES**

WHICH HAS NEVER SINCE BEEN WITNESSED (Whittaker, pp. 99-104).

Many modern version proponents ignore these facts and persist with the myth that the theological scholarship existing at the end of the nineteenth century was well advanced over that of the sixteenth and seventeenth. *To the contrary, the climate of the second half of the nineteenth century, both as to theological and linguistic purity and scholastic achievement, was inferior to the centuries preceding.*

The Quarterly Review

The Quarterly Review, at least as early as 1818, was lifting its voice in opposition to the critical Greek texts and in defense of the Authorized Bible. When John Bellamy published a new translation of the Old Testament in 1818 and criticized the Authorized Version, *The Quarterly Review* rose immediately to the defense of the AV in its April and December issue. The position generally taken by the *Review* through the rest of the nineteenth century is seen in the following excerpts:

> ... **OUR PRESENT AUTHORIZED VERSION WAS MADE WITH EVERY HUMAN PROVISION FOR ACCURACY AND GENERAL EXCELLENCE. THE WORK, WHICH WAS THEN PRODUCED BY JOINT LABOUR OF THE MOST LEARNED MEN IN THE KINGDOM, WITH THE GREATEST CARE AND DELIBERATION, AND WITH THE ADVANTAGE OF ALL THE AIDS THAT COULD BE SUPPLIED BY ANY AUTHORITY, ANCIENT OR MODERN, HAS JUSTLY BEEN DEEMED**, (in the words of Dr. Gray), '**EQUALLY REMARKABLE FOR THE GENERAL FIDELITY OF ITS CONSTRUCTION AND THE MAGNIFICENT SIMPLICITY OF ITS LANGUAGE**.'
>
> But, while it has been thus admired for its general excellencies, it has never been contended that it is a perfect work, or that there are no particular passages susceptible of improvement. ...
>
> Yet, with all the respect which we feel for their labours [those who have attempted revisions of the Authorized Version], **we venture to express a doubt whether any new translation of even a single book of Scripture has appeared since the publication of the authorized version, which, taken as a whole, has come up to its standard, either for the general fidelity and correctness with which it conveys the sense of the original, or the dignity, simplicity, and propriety of the language in which that sense is conveyed**.
>
> The person whose work is now before us, Mr. John Bellamy, some time ago issued proposals for publishing 'a new Translation of the Holy Bible.' We confess that, from the first, we argued no good from them. ... [upon examining specimens of his translation] we began to fear that his work might eventually prove worse than useless; that **IT MIGHT HAVE A VERY MISCHIEVOUS TENDENCY, AS FAR AS ITS INFLUENCE SHOULD REACH, IN SHAKING THE CONFIDENCE OF THE UNLEARNED IN THE**

CERTAINTY OF THOSE INTERPRETATIONS OF THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES, WHICH HAVE HITHERTO, AND WITH THE GREATEST JUSTICE, BEEN UNIVERSALLY RECEIVED. ... **we find him to be a person whose arrogance, presumption, and contempt of others are perfectly intolerable, who proceeds in a rash and wild spirit of innovation**, setting aside, on the authority of his own assertion, the decisions of the learned and the wise, and hazarding statements of the most intrepid kind, on the slenderest foundations. ...

But we have not even yet come to the worst part of Mr. Bellamy's proceedings. In his note on many of those passages which, as he pretends, have been hitherto understood in a sense at variance with the original, he eagerly dwells 'on the absurdity and inconsistency of the received sense,' and retails at full length the objections which have been advanced by the most notorious infidel writers, as Cubb, Morgan, Tindal, Sir William Drummond, &c.; objections which have been refuted over and over, but which, as if with the most determined purpose of mischief, he repeats in the most offensive language. ... **Language like this naturally leads to a suspicion, that the writer is secretly endeavouring to serve the cause of infidelity, and to undermine as much as possible the credit of the Bible**....

Another of Mr. Bellamy's methods of disparaging the authorized version is by general insinuations against the competency of the persons employed on it. 'It was well known,' he says p. ii, 'that there was not a critical Hebrew scholar among them ... in many instances, almost in every page, we find verses consisting in a great part of italics, in some, a third part, and in others, nearly half,—so that the meaning of the sacred writer is by these interpolations always obscured, and in many instances perverted.' ...

We shall have a few words to say respecting the insertions in italics, before we close this Article. In the mean time, **we desire the reader to remember that no insertion of any kind is made in the English Bible, which did not, in the judgment of the translators, appear necessary to express more clearly and fully the sense of the original Hebrew**; yet these are represented by this daring perverter of the truth as interpolations ...

Mr. Bellamy boldly flies in the face of all these authorities, affirms that he understands more of Hebrew than was understood by those concerned in framing former versions, and that he alone can give the true sense where they have all fallen into the grossest errors. ... Mr. Bellamy's translation abounds with inconsistencies, improprieties, and alterations of the words of the authorized version manifestly for the worse. ...

We live in an age, in which, in every department of literature, shallow pretenders are endeavouring to impose upon the world a persuasion that they are deeply and profoundly learned. ...

We never witnessed an instance in which a person has undertaken an important work with loftier claims, but with more slender qualifications. Still we do not think that we should have bestowed so much notice upon Mr. Bellamy, if the subject in which he engaged had been merely literary. ... But, **since he has thought proper to make those Holy Scriptures, which are the groundwork of our faith and hopes, the subject of his fanciful interpretations, and to**

> **pursue a course which obviously tended to impair the reverence, and shake the confidence of the public in the truths derived from them**, **it appeared to us that we should be wanting in our duty if we did not examine his pretensions, and endeavour to prevent his seducing any one into unfounded doubts respecting the certainty of received scriptural interpretations** (*The Quarterly Review*, Vol. XIX, April & December 1818).

These excerpts demonstrate the position held by *The Quarterly Review* throughout the nineteenth century in regard to new versions and proposed revisions of the Authorized Version. The writers whose articles appeared in the *Review* were for the most part united in their opinion that (1) the Authorized Version is accurate and lovely, (2) and while it *could* be improved upon in various minor ways, (3) none of the new versions and revisions appearing in the nineteenth century succeeded in bettering the Authorized. (4) It is necessary that every proposed revision of the Bible be challenged and critiqued to prevent anyone from "being seduced into unfounded doubts respecting the certainty of received scriptural interpretations."

MANY OF THE POINTS MADE IN THE *REVIEW'S* CRITIQUE OF THE BELLAMY VERSION APPLY EQUALLY TO THE VERSIONS THAT HAVE APPEARED IN THIS CENTURY. (1) They have had a "mischievous tendency in shaking the confidence" of people in the accuracy of the Bible, since they propose that the old text and readings were inaccurate. (2) The modern translators have demonstrated arrogance and presumption in tossing aside the faith and work of past generations and in replacing the Received Text with one newly contrived. (3) The modern translators and textual critics have hazarded statements of the most intrepid kind, on the slenderest foundations. (4) The modern translators and textual critics have adopted the arguments of rationalists. (5) We suspicion, as the *Review* did of Bellamy, that many of the modern translators and textual scholars are "secretly endeavouring to serve the cause of infidelity, and to undermine as much as possible the credit of the Bible." (In the book *The Modern Version Hall of Shame* we have demonstrated that this is far more than a "suspicion.") (6) Modern translators, like Bellamy, by their bold criticisms would have us believe that the men of God that produced the former texts and versions were practically ignorant of the original languages and seriously devoid of translation skills. (7) Modern translators, like Bellamy, despise the wisdom that produced the material in italics in the text of the Authorized Version. *The translators did not insert the italics because they felt they had the authority to add to God's Word; they inserted the italics because they felt that the Hebrew and Greek text DEMANDED the italicized words to carry over the full and most precise meaning into English. The italics are an important part of the translation and must be taken seriously*. (8) The age mentioned in the 1818 *Review*, in which shallow pretenders are endeavouring to impose upon the world a persuasion that they are deeply and profoundly learned, is still upon us.

In a follow-up article on Bellamy's version, the *Review* stated:

> As far as relates to ourselves, he may depend on one thing; which is, that, as long as we find him, or any one else, acting on a system which must tend to degrade the Holy Bible in public estimation, so long we shall feel it our duty to use our utmost exertions to maintain inviolate its sacred truths (*The Quarterly Review*, Vol. XIX, No. XXXVII, p. 460). We say, "Amen and Bravo" to this.

An article appearing in *The Quarterly Review* in 1819 critiqued James Burges' *Reasons in Favour of a New Translation of the Scriptures*.

The July 1820 *Review* contained a 37-page article with further considerations on John Bellamy's version. This critique noted that some were being led astray by Bellamy's work. "We are now supplied with positive proof that, even after all which has passed, there is some danger of the public being led into the belief that Mr. Bellamy's translations are truly derived from the Hebrew, and that his charges against the received version are not destitute of foundation." The reviewer addresses James Burges, who had spoken out in support of the Bellamy, as well as addressing some objections which Bellamy himself had made to critiques that had appeared in earlier issues of *The Quarterly Review*. An interesting part of this debate is Bellamy's charge that those who were opposed to his new translation were mere traditionalists and obscurantists. This is precisely the charge made against King James Bible proponents today. Consider what the *Review* had to say about this:

> But the worst part of his [Bellamy's] proceeding (and it is a feature of peculiar blackness) is **his repeated and willful misrepresentation of the intention of those who object to his translation**. He affirms, in the preface of this last publication, (p. iv) that 'the design of a few objectors to a new revision of the authorized translation is to shew that errors are consecrated by time, to put a stop to any amendment of the present version, however contradictory to the sacred original, however it may impeach the moral justice of God, &c.' Was there ever a more impudent statement of a palpable untruth?—**How often must we repeat that the sole design of those who object to his translation is, to maintain the true sense of Scripture, and to prevent its being grossly perverted and misrepresented?** (*The Quarterly Review*, July 1820, pp. 324, 25).

Of course, it was in *The Quarterly Review*, in 1881 and 1882, that John Burgon's powerful critique of the Revised Version first appeared. We deal with this under the section on Burgon in Chapter Three.

In October 1885, the *Review* included articles condemning the Revised Old Testament which came out that year and particularly pointing out the error of the emendation of the Massoretic text and the insertion of so many textual alternatives in the margins.

Richard Laurence

Richard Laurence (1760-1838), Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, in 1820 published *Remarks upon the Critical Principles Adopted by Writers Who Have Recommended a New Translation of the Bible*. He was opposed to the critical principles. He argued "learnedly against the possibility of improving on the Hebrew and Greek texts on which the Authorized Version was based" (H. Wheeler Robinson, *Ancient and English Versions of the Bible*, p. 237).

Henry Walter

Henry Walter (1785-1859), a Hebrew scholar of note, claimed in 1823 that in the previous two centuries knowledge of biblical Hebrew HAD NOT progressed significantly beyond that of 1611. He testified, "On the whole, I see little reason for supposing that the philological apparatus accumulated since King James's time, has carried the knowledge of Hebrew perceptibly farther than it was possessed by his translators" (Letter to the Right Rev. Herbert, p. 140, cited by Edwin Cone Bissell, *The Historic Origin of the Bible*, p. 349). Frederick Nolan and J.W. Whittaker had made this same observation a few years earlier. Alexander McClure would repeat this view in 1855, as would Joseph Philpot in 1857, George Marsh in 1860, and others who followed. This, of course, is contrary to the popular notion held by proponents of modern Bible versions.

John Jebb

John Jebb (1775-1833, Bishop of Limerick, in 1829 verbalized his opposition to proposed revisions of the Authorized Bible which were beginning to circulate in his day.

> I deeply regret that you should, in however modified a sense, and with whatever cautionary feeling of attending dangers, be favorable to a revision of our English Bible. That it has errors and imperfections I most readily admit; what human performance is exempt from them? But I humbly conceive that, **in the present days of unsettlement and appetency after change**, the only safety lies in keeping things as they are. We have not hitherto indeed had any great encouragement from the revisionary labours even of our first scholars and divines. Looking around me in the present day, I see much to fear, and little to hope; **for one trifling error corrected I doubt we should have ten worse introduced; while, in point of style**, **from everything that has appeared of late years, I am obliged to think we should be infinitely losers**. I, then, for one, am content to bear with the few ills I know, rather than encounter thousands that I know not of. But, in truth, with all its errors, **ours is the best version I have seen, or hope to see**. Let individuals give new versions ... but **in days of epidemic quackery, let our authorized version be kept inviolate, and guarded as the apple of our eye** (John Jebb, *Life of John Jebb*, ii, p. 454, cited by Samuel Hemphill, *A History of the Revised Version of the New Testament*, pp. 21, 22).

First, let me say that I don't agree with Jebb's idea that the Authorized Version has errors. Of course, we don't know precisely what he meant by the term "errors." Those who point out errors in the KJV often act as if this version were merely the informal product of a few inconsequential translators. On the contrary; *the Authorized English Version is the product of the most intense, scholarly, sacrificial, wide-reaching Bible translation and revision effort ever to be made in any language in history.* (The revisions since 1870 cannot properly be placed into this stream, as they have taken off on an entirely different textual and methodological direction.) If the KJV has all of the errors that so many speak of, why weren't these errors found and corrected between 1526 and 1638 (the date of the last formal revision of the 1611 KJV, other than the orthographical revision of the 1760s)?

Let me give an example to illustrate what I am trying to say. A pastor wrote to me and said, "'Synagogues' in Psalm 74:8 is wrongly translated. There were no synagogues for six hundred years after this. The Hebrew word is better translated 'meeting places,' certainly not 'synagogues.'" I replied as follows:

> To say that Psalm 74:8 *could also* read 'meeting places' is a reasonable statement and one that I would agree with, but to say categorically that Psalm 74:8 is an error in the King James Bible I find strange. The word 'synagogue' comes from the Greek through French and means 'meeting place.' That is why the Jews adopted the word for their assemblies and assembly halls. That is apparently why the KJV translators kept the word intact from the Bishops Bible they were revising. 'Synagogue' goes back at least as far as the Geneva and probably all the way back to Coverdale, who was the first to print the entire Old Testament in English from the Hebrew. Are you saying that these brilliant scholars, working under the mighty hand of God, did not know enough to figure out that 'there were no synagogues for six hundred years after this'? (Letter of March 29, 1995).

Wouldn't it be wiser to give the KJV translators (and Tyndale and Rogers and Coverdale and the Geneva and the Bishops) the benefit of the doubt, and to admit that they had serious reasons for every translation they gave, though we can't necessarily trace all of their reasoning today, hundreds of years after the fact. Again, it is one thing to say that a certain word or passage could be translated differently; it is quite another to brazenly claim that the KJV is WRONG. The more I learn about the King James Bible and its history, the more reluctant I am to believe there are any errors in it.

Returning to John Jebb's opposition to revision, the chief point is that Jebb *did* see great danger in a revision of the Authorized Version. The man was not a mere traditionalist. He saw the danger of dividing and weakening biblical authority by departing from the standard of the KJV. He was convinced that the theological climate of the nineteenth century could not produce biblical purity. Jebb's warnings have come to pass, yet these wise considerations are given practically no attention in modern treatises on this subject.

Dr. Jebb continued to oppose the revision of the Authorized Bible. He said that it was "*a fatal thing that a version, of which we have been now in possession for more than 250 years, should be subject to the criticism of this very hasty and not very orthodox age*" (John Stoughton, *Our English Bible*, p. 288).

This man had a much wiser understanding of his times than those who were rushing to overthrow the Old Bible.

Noah Webster

Noah Webster (1758-1843), the famous American lexicographer, came out with an updated edition of the King James Bible in 1833. Though he believed it needed updating and he attempted to produce an improved KJV, he also believed that the Authorized Version did not need any sort of general overhaul or textual tinkering. In the Preface Webster said:

> In the present version, the language is, in general, correct and perspicuous; the genuine popular English of Saxon origin; peculiarly adapted to the subjects; and in many passages, uniting sublimity with beautiful simplicity. In my view, the general style of the version ought not to be altered.
>
> But in the lapse of two or three centuries, changes have taken place, which, in particular passages, impair the beauty; in others, obscure the sense, of the original languages. Some words have fallen into disuse; and the signification of others, in current popular use, is not the same now as it was when they were introduced into the version. ...
>
> **At the same time, it is very important that all denominations of Christians should use the same version, that in all public discourses, treatises and controversies, the passages cited as authorities should be uniform**. Alterations in the popular version should not be frequent; but the changes incident to all living languages render it not merely expedient, but necessary at times to introduce such alterations as will express the true sense of the original languages, in the current language of the age. **A VERSION THUS AMENDED MAY REQUIRE NO ALTERATION FOR TWO OR THREE CENTURIES TO COME.** ...
>
> With this estimate of its value, I have attempted to render the English version more useful, by correcting a few obvious errors, and removing some obscurities, with objectionable words and phrases; and my earnest prayer is, that my labors may not be wholly unsuccessful.

Webster had mastered 20 languages in his pursuit of producing the definitive American English dictionary. He traveled the globe in search of the meaning and etymology of words. Note that this linguistic genius, who was one of the most learned men of his day, did not see the need for a major revision of the Authorized Version nor did he propose any textual changes. *Further, he believed that with only minor revision the King James Bible would require no further revision for hundreds of years to come.* This is NOT the view of the typical modern version proponent, who greets every new English version with good cheer,

though it be more radical than, and separated in time by mere months from, its predecessor.

William Brantley and Octavius Winslow

William T. Brantley D.D. (1816-1882), and Octavius Winslow, D.D. (d. 1878), jointly published in 1837 *Objections to a Baptist Version of the New Testament with Additional Reasons for Preferring the English Bible as It Is*. The title leaves little doubt about the position of the authors in regard to the Authorized Bible and any proposed revisions thereof. Brantley was very bold in his position: "*It is our heart's desire and prayer to God that this venerable monument of learning, of truth, of piety, of unequalled purity of style and diction, may be perpetuated to the end of time just as we now have it.* Let no daring genius meditate either change or amendment in its structure or composition; neither let any learned impertinence presume to *disturb the happy confidence of the tens of thousands* who now regard it as, next to the original languages, the purest vehicle through which the mind of the Holy Spirit was ever conveyed to mortals" (emphasis added) (William Brantley, *Objections to a Baptist Version of the New Testament*, New York, 1837, p. 50). No beating around the bush here! Amen, we second that motion.

Alexander McCaul

Alexander McCaul, D.D. (1799-1863) published his defense of the Authorized Bible in 1857 under the title *Reasons for Holding Fast*. McCaul saw the danger of tampering with the underlying Greek and Hebrew text. He saw the danger of dividing the authority of God's Word by the multiplication of versions.

> The changing of these words would establish a principle, that words not intelligible to the general reader must be changed for others more easily understood. And then a great many and important words must be removed. **The possibility of having our theological language and therefore our theology changed** (as might be the case), **makes us rather satisfied to hold fast what we have than to run the risk of emendations of so sweeping a character.** ...
>
> The last reason which may be urged for holding fast the authorized version is, that the advocates for revision propose not only to change our existing translation, but also the adoption of some improved Text of the originals. … Has modern scholarship attained to the highest purity of the Text? If so, where is it to be found? Before a single step be taken towards an authorized version of our English Bible, let us see the New and authorized Text. **All the other perils are as nothing compared with the alteration of the original texts.** Everybody knows that, in the New Testament especially, there are some texts affecting the very foundations of our faith, others affecting the controversies between High Church and Low Church, which are subjects of debate. At present, the English Church leaves the discussion of such passages, and the merits or demerits of the various readings, open to the deliberations of criticism. **But let these passages be changed, and the weight of church authority is at once**

> **thrown into the scale; and a doubtful, mischievous reading may be put forth as the oracle of God**"….
>
> Let us know beforehand, what changes we are going to have, but **let us not give to a Commission, or any other body, the power of altering the Original Text first, then altering our English Bible, then of putting forth their opinions with the weight of Royal and National authority**. …
>
> We can afford to be deliberate and cautious. … The English Bible itself has done and is doing a great work in all parts of the globe, and has exercised an influence, hardly to be estimated, in promoting the welfare of the people of Great Britain and Ireland, and the Colonies. Let us, then, not part with that which we know to be the gift of God, until we are assured that what is offered is better, and marked by the same simplicity, gravity, faith, and fidelity as the version of 1611 (emphasis added) (Alexander McCaul, *Reasons for Holding Fast*, London, 1857, pp. 21, 22, 46-50).

What McCaul warned of is precisely what has happened in countless places in the modern versions, because the translators have not been content to translate, but have determined to place in the text their own private interpretation. In speaking of the alteration of the original texts, McCaul was referring to the attempts by Lachmann and Tischendorf to put forward their critical Greek texts—which were similar to that later adopted by Westcott and Hort and the English Revisers of 1881. Note also that McCaul called for the alleged improved Greek text to be published and examined carefully BEFORE any work of revising the English Bible began. We know, of course, that this did not happen. Those who desired the modern critical text knew that it was very unlikely that a majority would support a revision of the English Bible on the basis of their new Greek text. Therefore, they introduced their work stealthily. The revision committee based their work largely upon a Greek text that had never seen the light of day and was not published until *after* the publication of the English revision. As we will see, what McCaul so fervently warned about is exactly what occurred with the Revision of 1881.

Lord Panmure

Speaking before the Edinburgh Bible Society in January 1857, Lord Panmure delivered a rousing opposition to all proposals to revise the Authorized Bible:

> We have heard in this country, and we have seen it absolutely put into practice in the United States of America, of **a scheme for what is called a new version of the Bible**. Now, feeling very strongly on this subject, I take this opportunity of publicly stating my opinion: **that any such scheme is fraught with the utmost danger to the Protestant liberties of this country. Nay, it is fraught with danger, I believe, to the Protestant religion itself.** ... It is quite true, and every man must admit it, that there are perhaps some slight things, some mistranslations slight in themselves, and not affecting any great principles, which might be corrected in the translation of the Scriptures. But they are so slight in comparison with the danger of letting in those who would make alterations, partly

> from the criticisms of erudition, partly for the purpose of getting in dogmas of their own, that **I think it would be the most dangerous and disastrous thing which could occur to this country, if we were to permit those words to be tampered with which have been household words in many a pious family for upwards of three hundred years, and I hope will be household words to all the families of the world before three hundred years more are passed** (Lord Panmure, *The Witness*, January 10, 1857, as cited by Bissell, p. 351).

Panmure leaves no doubt as to his position in regard to the Old Bible. He wanted no revision. Explain a few things in the margin, if you will, but leave the Old Bible alone. That was the position of the vast majority of English-speaking Christians in that day. Panmure saw Bible revision schemes as "fraught with danger." Oh, that today's so-called Evangelicals had such insight, such spiritual fervor. They write about these the eternal words of the Living God, with a dry, unemotional, ho-hum attitude more befitting a discussion of agricultural techniques than the transmission of the Holy Bible. Panmure's insight into the connection between what he called "Protestant religion" and an authoritative Bible was prophetic. The multiplicity of versions has weakened the authority of the Bible. The sole authority of the Bible-believing Christian is the BIBLE. Leave him with a multiplicity of conflicting Bibles and he has no absolute authority. We believe there *is* an intimate association between the success of Roman Catholic ecumenism and the multiplicity of versions. Today Rome works hand-in-hand with Protestant textual editors and Bible translators throughout the world. It puts its imprimature on the new versions almost as they leave the press. One of the editors of the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament, which is used in most Protestant colleges (and Baptist, too) throughout the world, is a Roman Catholic Cardinal. To fail to see a connection between Rome's ecumenical success and the fact that Protestants have adopted Rome's old corrupt Vaticanus into their Bibles since 1881 is spiritual blindness.

James Lister

James Lister, minister of Lime Street Chapel, Liverpool, England, defended the King James Bible in 1820 in *The Excellence of the Authorized Version of the Sacred Scriptures Defended Against the Socinians* (Liverpool: Printed by J. Lang, 1820). This was an edited version of a sermon that Lister had preached at Gloucester Street Chapel, Liverpool, on Wednesday Evening, October 18, 1820.

The purpose of the sermon was to defend the King James Bible against the Unitarian Book Society' edition of the New Testament founded on William Newcome's version, which was based on the Griesbach critical Greek text. Lister was one of the many Christians that were stirred up by this publication.

When the Unitarian Book Society was formed, a major objective was the translation of a new English version based on the Griesbach critical text. Abandoning this plan, it published in 1808 an "improved" edition of the 1796

translation by William Newcome of Ireland "chiefly because it followed Griesbach's text" (Earl Wilbur, *A History of Unitarianism in Transylvania, England, and America*, 1952, p. 339; see also P. Marion Simms, *The Bible in America*, pp. 255-258). The complete title was "The New Testament, An improved version upon the basis of Archbishop Newcome's new translation with a corrected text and notes critical and explanatory." This publication "drew the fire of the orthodox by omitting as late interpolations several passages traditionally cited as pillars of Trinitarian doctrine," such as "God" in 1 Timothy 3:16 and the Trinitarian statement in 1 John 5:.

After tracing the history of Bible translations in foreign languages (Syriac, Latin, Ethiopic, Coptic, Armenian, Persian, Gothic, French, Italian, Spanish, German, Flemish, Danish, Swedish, Bohemian, Polish, and Sclavonian or Russian), Lister summarized the history of the English Bible, beginning with Bede. He then described two aspects of the KJV translation that illustrate its excellence, the brilliant biblical scholarship of that time and the fierce religious debates that resulted in extreme caution in translation:

> The time when our translation was completed, though two hundred years ago, was remarkable for classical and biblical learning. The classics from the capture of Constantinople, had been revised, and had been studied with enthusiastic ardour in all the countries of Europe. In the century immediately preceding our version, schools and colleges had been multiplied over all the western world. Manuscripts were explored, compared and edited, and correct copies of the ANCIENT AUTHORS, BOTH PROFANE AND SACRED WERE PUBLISHED WITH A ZEAL AND PATIENCE FAR EXCEEDING ANY THING OBSERVABLE IN OUR TIMES. Oriental literature, Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac and Greek was deeply studied; and dictionaries, concordances, polyglots, such as the world had never seen before for depth and variety of erudition remain to this day as monuments of the talents, learning and research of our ancestors. Exalted on these monuments, some of our puny scholars, in THESE LATTER DAYS OF GREAT PRETENSION, have taken their lofty stand, and affected to despise the very men by whom these monuments were reared (Lister, *The Excellence of the Authorized Version,* 1820, p. 14).
>
> The time when our authorized version was completed was a time of awful contention between catholics and protestants; a contest in which whole nations were embarked to a man, arranged under their respective civil authorities. Every nerve was strained on both sides to obtain the ascendency. Learning, talents, piety and zeal rushed forth to the conflict. AND THE MIGHTY FIELD ON WHICH THEY MET WAS, 'THE TRANSLATION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES INTO THE VULGAR TONGUES.' In this fearful combat England stood at the head of the Protestant union; and both sides were fully aware of the incalculable consequences connected with an authorized version of the sacred scriptures into the English tongue. The catholics watched every measure of our government, and put every verse of our translation to the severest scrutiny. The Catholics had already sanctioned the Vulgate, and were prepared to inpugn every sentence wherein our version should differ from their authorized text. The mass of protestant learning was engaged on the one side to make our version as fair a

> copy as possible of the matchless originals; and the mass of popish erudition, on the other side, stood fully prepared to detect every mistake, and to expose without mercy every error of our public version (James Lister, *The Excellence of the Authorized Version*, pp. 14, 15).

The fierce religious debates of the 16th and 17th centuries resulted in a zeal for biblical scholarship and a caution about the details of biblical translation that has absolutely no comparison in our day.

Lister then proceeded to give quotations from 11 authorities as to the excellence of the King James Bible. Following are two of these:

> To Dr. Walton may be added [Matthew] Pool in his *Synopsis Criticorum* 1669: 'In the English version published in 1611, occur many specimens of an edition truly gigantic, of uncommon skill in the original tongues, of extraordinary critical acuteness and discrimination, which have been of great use to me very frequently in the most difficult texts' (Lister, *The Excellence of the Authorized Version*, p. 17).

> Dr. [Joseph] Whit [1745-1814], Laudian professor of Arabic at Oxford, in a sermon recommending the revisal of our present version, says, 'When the authorized version appeared, it contained nothing but what was pure in its representation of scriptural doctrine, nothing but what was animated in its expressions of devout affection. General fidelity to its original is hardly more its characteristic than sublimity in itself. The English language acquired new dignity by it; and has scarcely acquired additional purity since: it is still considered as the standard of our tongue... (Lister, p. 18).

Lister concluded with a review of the Unitarian translation. One of the passages that he examined was 1 Timothy 3:1, where the Unitarians had replaced "God was manifested in the flesh" with "He who was manifested in the flesh." This, of course, is what all of the modern versions following the critical Greek New Testament have done since that day, beginning with the English Revised of 1881 and the American Standard of 1901. Lister rightly mocks the Unitarian rendition of 1 Timothy 3:16 as meaningless.

> This translation rises far above my weak understanding. ... what is this great mystery according to the Socinian Creed? It is 'a man manifested in the flesh.' This is indeed a mystery, compared with which all Calvinistic or Trinitarian mysteries are nonentities; 'a *man* manifested in the flesh.' ... What adds to this mystery is, that this man, this man of clay manifested in the flesh, was *seen*, truly seen by his messengers that is by the apostles. That a man should be seen, seen by others, this is a mystery in the presence of which all Athanasian mysteries must for ever hide their heads. In the last clause they say of this man manifested in the flesh 'he was received in glory.' It is not to be supposed that we Trinitarians can understand such words. No—this is the climax of the Socinian mystery, such as has not entered into the hearts of Trinitarians to conceive (Lister, *The Excellence of the Authorized Version*, pp. 28, 29).

Lister concluded his message with this challenge about holding fast to the KJV: "I entreat my candid readers, to be thankful for a version of God's book so eminently

correct and faithful. To God we owe unfeigned gratitude for the instruments, the holy and learned men, whom he raised up at the era of the reformation; not only to preach, but to translate the sacred volume into the English tongue" (p. 31).

Solomon Malan

Solomon Caesar Malan, D.D. (1812-1894), Vicar of Broadwindsor, published *A Vindication of the Authorized Version, from Charges Brought against It by Recent Writers* (1856), *A Plea for the Received Text and for the Authorized Version of the New Testament* (1869), and *Seven Chapters of the Revision of 1881 Revised* (1881). The first of these was Malan's reply to a call for revision that had come in 1856 through William Selwyn and James Heywood. About that same time, five other Anglican ministers were lobbying for revision. These were Charles Ellicott (later the New Testament Revision Committee chairman), Henry Alford, W.H.G. Humphry, John Barrow, and G. Moberly. This group was brought together in 1856 by Ernest Hawkins, secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and between 1857 and 1863 they published several revised portions of the English Bible. These were issued under the title of *Revision of the Authorized Version, by Five Clergymen.* Malan wrote in opposition to this work, which has been called "the germ of the 1881 revision."

Malan exhibited a learned grasp of the unique and glorious heritage of the Authorized English Version. He well understood the seriousness of any attempt to revise it. Let's go back in time 150 years and listen in as this brilliant man gives a defense of the King James Bible:

> It [the KJV] **stands as yet unrivalled among other modern versions** for the devout spirit in which its authors rendered the original texts; for the simple beauty of its style; and for the dignified and easy flow of a language that was in a great degree formed from it, and that singles it out from among other translations of the Bible, even as a mere literary composition. It is free from the ruggedness and from the archaisms of the older English versions; and at the same time it possesses at least an equal merit with them, for its faithful rendering of the original. But **it has this great advantage over some of them, that whereas they were the work of single individuals, this was made by a goodly company of nearly fifty of the most pious and learned men of that time; who, together, availed themselves of the labours of their predecessors in order to raise their own production to a higher degree of excellence.** ...
>
> **It may, indeed, be taken down; but, if so, never to be rebuilt as it was. It might, it is true, have a more modern appearance; but then, it would lose the solemn look of age. It might also possibly be better adapted to the fastidious taste of the present day; but then, unbroken associations of two centuries and a half, together with much of national individuality, would perish for ever; and those persons who think the Authorized Version antiquate, would be the first to regret the change**. ... And they would lament the day when, for the sake of novelty, they had abandoned those sweet and solemn words of warning blended with their earliest recollections of childhood, by

renouncing their trust of a national treasure, committed to them in the safe keeping of the Authorized English Version of the Bible. ...

So much care, so much earnestness, in the due performance of this important task [the creation of the King James Bible], were not bestowed in vain. **They have stamped the work with a character for excellence to which no modern version, and but one or two of the older ones, can lay claim.** As regards the Old Testament, the Authorized Version is, generally speaking, less paraphrastic, and is therefore a more correct rendering of the Hebrew, than the Septuagint and the versions that follow them wholly or in part; such as the Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Coptic, the Vulgate, the Arabic, and even the Syriac. ... And, as regards the New Testament, the English Bible agrees best with the old versions, which are of the highest value, on account of their faithfulness and accuracy. ...

[I]t stands pre-eminent when side by side with more modern versions,—not only for its devout adherence to the original texts, but also for the beauty of its style. ... So true is this, that whereas neighbouring nations have had, within a short period, a succession of versions of the Bible in their respective languages, to the detriment of union and of uniformity among the readers of the Bible in those countries, the English Version has stood on its own merits, and has shone of its own lustre for nearly two centuries and a half. ...

Thus it is that it has entered into the very substance of the nation. It is interwoven with its sinews, and forms more than any other book ever did—an unseen, by many perhaps, unacknowledged, or even neglected, but still a living, element in the prosperity of the people. ... **THESE LASTING AND WHOLESOME EFFECTS ARE THE RESULT OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE BEING ONE AND THE SAME FOR ALL. IF, INSTEAD OF ONLY ONE BIBLE, ENGLAND HAD, LIKE SOME OTHER COUNTRIES, MANY BIBLES, THAT VARIETY ALONE WOULD BREED AND FOSTER ENDLESS DIVISION**. ...

Their reverence for the Sacred Scriptures induced them [KJV translators to be as literal as they could, to avoid obscurity; and it must be acknowledged that they were extremely happy in the simplicity and dignity of their expressions. Their adherence to the Hebrew idiom is supposed at once to have enriched and adorned our language; and, as they laboured for the general benefit of the learned and the unlearned, they avoided all words of Latin original when they could find words in their own language ...

Thus, then, the English Bible has not only stood for centuries, and **NOW STANDS, ON ITS OWN MERITS AS A TRUE WITNESS OF THE INSPIRED TEXT OF SCRIPTURE**; but it is also strong of its own strength, in being, as the highest authorities tell us, 'the best standard of the English language.' ... **For 'our translators,' says Dr. Adam Clarke, 'not only made a standard translation, but they have made their translation the standard of our language. THE ENGLISH TONGUE, IN THEIR DAY, WAS NOT EQUAL TO SUCH A WORK; BUT GOD ENABLED THEM TO STAND AS UPON MOUNT SINAI, AND CRANE UP THEIR COUNTRY'S LANGUAGE TO THE DIGNITY OF THE ORIGINALS,** so that after the lapse of two hundred [and fifty] years, the English Bible is, with very few exceptions, the standard of the purity and excellence of the English tongue. The original, from which it was taken, is alone

superior to the Bible translated by the authority of King James.'...

Such considerations, however, have no weight whatever with many who are willing to sacrifice much to the love of change; or at all events, who seem to take pleasure in aiming blows at everything that is not of yesterday**. Everything now must keep pace with the age; even the word of God**. ... And yet wisdom neither came with us, nor will die with us. As regards the Authorized Version then, and those who find fault with it, 'let us not too hastily conclude,' says Mr. Whittaker, 'that the translators have fallen on evil days and evil tongues, because **it has occasionally happened that an individual, as inferior to them in erudition as in talents and integrity, is found questioning their motives, or denying their qualifications for the task which they so well performed**. ... **It [the KJV] may be compared with any translation in the world, without fear of inferiority; it has not shrunk from the most rigorous examination; it challenges investigation**; and, in spite of numerous attempts to supersede it, it has hitherto remained unrivalled in the affections of the country.'

And God grant it may long continue so, for the good of the people to which it belongs! ...

I purpose therefore ... to look into the charges thus brought forward against the English Bible, with those who cling to it as they ought, affectionately and devoutly; in order to assist them in expelling from their mind all doubt on the subject. Meanwhile, **they may rest assured that, hitherto, all attempts at improvement upon their Bible, have come far short of it in language, in style, in truthfulness, and above all, in a generally correct and devout rendering of the original texts** (Malan, *A Vindication*, pp. i-xvi, xxii-xxvi).

Malan answered the various arguments that were being put forth in advance of a revision of the Authorized Version. For example:

... we now hear from many, that the English Bible is no longer suited to the exigencies of the present day, but that our advanced state of knowledge loudly calls for a new revision. An evil day that will be when it comes. However, Bishop Middleton holds out no encouragement to them, when he says: '**The style of our present version is incomparably superior to anything which might be expected from the finical and perverted taste of our own age.** It is simple, it is harmonious, it is energetic; and, which is of no small importance, use has made it familiar, and time has rendered it sacred.' ... its words are 'household words,' ... its simple and hallowed language is understood and loved alike, by the poor peasant and by the august Sovereign, whom it binds to Her people. **England has not 'a Bible,' one of many to choose from, like her neighbours; but 'the Bible' is in every English home; and 'my Bible,' in English, means that *one* Book, the very words of which are the same for all** (Malan, *A Vindication*, pp. xviii, xix).

Malan plainly saw the danger of loosing from the ancient moorings of the Received Text and the Authorized Version.

Who will be bold, or I might almost say hardened enough, if not perhaps to pull down, yet even to whitewash the stately edifice of the English Bible? ... It might

> possibly be better adapted to the fastidious taste of the age; but then, unbroken associations of two centuries and a half, together with much of national individuality, would perish for ever; and those persons who think the authorized version antiquate would be the first to regret the change. ... For independently of the words of the Bible being sacred in all languages, the language of the English Bible in particular is consecrated ... the vernacular translation of the Bible has formed and fixed the language of the country (Malan, *A Vindication of the Authorized Version*, 1856, pp. iii, iv, xiv).

Malan pointed out the unsettled, ever-changing character of modern textual criticism, observing: "In other words, the translator chooses his own text, which he renders as he thinks fit; so that, in fact, he has it all his own way. ... Mill is thought by some to be antiquated, Griesbach out of date, and Tischendorf even not exactly to their taste" (Malan, *A Vindication of the Authorized Version,* p. xxi).

Malan "takes exceptions even to the quite prevalent custom of ministers criticising the present translation before their congregations, on the ground that it 'needlessly unsettles the mind of their hearers on a subject in which comparatively few of them can ever be fair judges'" (Bissell, *The Historic Origin of the Bible*, p. 350).

In the second book, Malan directed his remarks to a critique of Henry Alford's sixth edition Greek New Testament (published in 1868) which followed Tischendorf and gave heavy preference to the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts. Malan comments on some of Alford's readings in the Gospels and the book of Titus. The following two examples illustrate the tone of the whole:

> [Matthew 1:25] 'Till she had brought forth her first-born son,' A.V. is changed by Dr. Alford to 'till she had brought forth a son'! His reasons for this change are, that the Vatican MS. and a very few others make it; whereas the reading of the Auth. Version, which is that of the Received Text, is far better supported, and by many more MSS. The English reader may refer to p. 37 for a discussion on this passage; but if he knows no Greek, he may rest assured the Authorized Version is right and far better than the Dean's alteration 'till she brought forth *a son'*... (Malan, *A Plea for the Received Text and for the Authorized Version of the New Testament*, p. 103).

> [Mark 13:14] 'Spoken of by Daniel the prophet,' A.V., 'omit,' Dr. Alford. This clause is not, indeed, in the Vatican MS., but is found in others, as well as in the Syriac, Georgian, Slavonic, and Ethiopic versions. So that we need not obey Dr. Alford's peremptory order to omit it (Ibid., p. 142).

Malan's conclusion offers a window into the sympathies of a great many nineteenth-century preachers toward the attempts to undermine the Greek Received Text:

> **A man who, like him [Henry Alford], sets to a work of this kind, apparently without the slightest hesitation or misgiving in his own powers, thinking it the easiest thing in the world to make wholesale changes in the Greek text and in the joint labours of more than fifty learned men of old, instead of**

dealing with the utmost reverence and caution, not only forms an unworthy estimate of the work he undertakes—but he also recklessly wounds the feeling of deep respect and affection with which men, nowise his inferiors in judgment or scholarship, still continue to look upon the Received Text and the English Bible.

Both these have, indeed, lasted more than two centuries; a long time, in truth, for those who think that wisdom, learning, and scholarship have only just dawned on the land, and that, until now, all was darkness and ignorance. Wise men, however, do not think so but rather take the long life of those two monuments of ancient piety and learning as a proof of their real merit and excellence. ...

[A] better acquaintance with his [Alford's] work only tends to deepen their reverence and to strengthen **their affection for their old friends and companions, the Received Greek Text of the New Testament and the Authorised Version of it—neither of which they ever intend to give up**; not even at the Dean's bidding (Malan, *A Plea for the Received Text and for the Authorized Version of the New Testament*, pp. 210, 11).

When the 1881 English Revision appeared, Malan was not swayed from his earlier position. "The learned writer charged the Revisers with having 'looked upon' their work 'in the light of a Greek exercise,' and with having 'taken pleasure in making as many changes as they could, with little or no regard for cadence, rhythm, style, or even grammar.' He pronounced the result to be 'little short of a great failure'" (Samuel Hemphill, *A History of the Revised Version of the New Testament*, p. 96).

Alexander McClure

Alexander W. McClure, D.D. (1808-1865), wrote a series of biographical sketches of the King James Bible translator called *The Translators Revived*. It was published in 1855 in New York by the Board of Publications of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church. Dr. McClure had a very high regard for the King James Bible and did not believe it could ever be replaced. We can sense the man's mature understanding of history and his depth of feeling toward the King James Bible from the following excerpt:

[T]he translation and printing of the Bible in English forms a most important event in modern history. Far beyond any other translation, it has been, and is, and will be, to multitudes which none can number, the living oracle of God...

Thus it came to pass, that the English Bible received its present form, after a fivefold revision of the translation as it was left in 1537 by Tyndale and Rogers. During this interval of seventy-four years, it had been slowly ripening, till this last, most elaborate, and thorough revision under King James matured the work for coming centuries.

The English language had passed through many and great changes, and had at last reached the very height of its purity and strength. The Bible

has ever since been the grand English classic. It is still the noblest monument of the power of the English speech. It is the pattern and standard of excellence therein.

As to the capability of those men, we may say again, that, by the good providence of God, their work was undertaken in a fortunate time. Not only had the English language, that singular compound, then ripened to its full perfection, but **the study of Greek, and of the oriental tongues, and of rabbinical lore, had then been carried to a greater extent in England than ever before OR SINCE.** ... **ALL THE COLLEGES OF GREAT BRITAIN AND AMERICA, EVEN IN THIS PROUD DAY OF BOASTINGS, COULD NOT BRING TOGETHER THE SAME NUMBER OF DIVINES EQUALLY QUALIFIED BY LEARNING AND PIETY FOR THE GREAT UNDERTAKING.** ... It would be impossible to convene out of any one Christian denomination, or out of all, a body of translators, on whom the whole Christian community would bestow such confidence as is reposed upon that illustrious company, or who would prove themselves as deserving of such confidence.

But this blessed book is so far complete and exact, that the unlearned reader, being of ordinary intelligence, may enjoy the delightful assurance, that, if he study it in faith and prayer, and give himself up to its teachings, he shall not be confounded or misled as to any matter essential to his salvation and his spiritual good. **IT WILL AS SAFELY GUIDE HIM INTO ALL THE THINGS NEEDFUL FOR FAITH AND PRACTICE, AS WOULD THE ORIGINAL SCRIPTURES, IF HE COULD READ THEM, OR IF THEY COULD SPEAK TO HIM AS ERST THEY SPAKE TO THE HEBREW IN JERUSALEM, OR TO THE GREEK IN CORINTH.**

Nor is this any disparagement of the benefits of a critical knowledge of the original tongues. **For while a good translation is the best commentary on the original Scriptures, the originals themselves are the best commentary on the translation.** Passages somewhat obscure in the translation often become very plain when we recur to the original, because we then distinctly see what it was that the translators meant to say. ... **IT IS ONLY MAINTAINED, THAT THE COMMON ENGLISH READER ENJOYS, BY THE GOOD PROVIDENCE OF GOD, THAT WHICH COMES THE NEAREST TO THE PRIVILEGE OF THE CLASSICAL SCHOLAR; AND HAS A TRANSLATION SO EXACT, PLAIN, AND TRUSTWORTHY, THAT HE MAY FOLLOW IT WITH IMPLICIT CONFIDENCE AS 'A LIGHT TO HIS FEET AND A LAMP TO HIS PATHS.'** (emphasis added)

Not that the utmost verbal perfection is claimed for the English Bible as it now stands. Some of its words have, in the lapse of time, gone out of common use; some have suffered a gradual change of meaning; and some which were in unexceptionable use two hundred years ago, are now considered as distasteful and indelicate. **But the number of such words is very small, considering the great size and age of the volume; and the retaining of them causes but little inconvenience, compared with the disadvantages of wholesale projectors of amendment volunteered by incompetent and irresponsible schemers.**

[I]t may help our contentment with the Bible as we have it, to notice what opinions have been expressed as to its merits by the ablest judges of a performance of this nature**. These testimonials might be swelled to the size of a volume**, but a few will be sufficient for the present occasion. ... The famous John Selden, in his *Table-talk*, thus utters his opinion: 'The English translation of the Bible is the best translation in the world, and renders the sense of the original best.' Dr. Brian Walton, the learned editor of a Bible in nine different languages, and six tall-folios, assigns the first rank among European translations to the common English version. Dr. Edward Pococke, that profound Orientalist, in the Preface to his *Commentary on Micah*, speaks of our translation as 'being such, and so agreeable to the original, as that we might well choose among others to follow it, were it not our own, and established by authority among us.' Dr. Middleton, Bishop of Calcutta, and for ever famous for his work on the Greek Article, says, '**The style of our present version is incomparably superior to any thing which might be expected from the finical and perverted taste of our own age**. It is simple, it is harmonious, it is energetic; and, which is of no small importance, use has made it familiar, and time has rendered it sacred.' ...

Dr. White, Professor of Arabic at Oxford, to other strong commendations adds: 'Upon the whole, the national churches of Europe will have abundant reason to be satisfied, when their versions of Scripture shall approach in point of accuracy, purity, and sublimity, to the acknowledged excellence of our English translation.'...

To this testimony let there be added that of Dr. Alexander Geddes, a learned minister of the Church of Rome, who himself also attempted a re-translation of the Bible into English: '... **IF ACCURACY, FIDELITY, AND THE STRICTEST ATTENTION TO THE LETTER OF THE TEXT, BE SUPPOSED TO CONSTITUTE THE QUALITIES OF AN EXCELLENT VERSION, THIS OF ALL VERSIONS, MUST, IN GENERAL, BE ACCOUNTED THE MOST EXCELLENT.** Every sentence, every word, every syllable, every letter and point, seem to have been weighed with the nicest exactitude; and expressed, either in the text, or margin, with the greatest precision.' Pagninus himself is hardly more literal; and it was well remarked by Robertson, above a hundred years ago**,** that **IT MAY SERVE AS A LEXICON OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE, AS WELL AS FOR A TRANSLATION.'**

Dr. Adam Clarke, the Wesleyan, in the General Preface to his Commentary on the Bible, having spoken of the common version as superior in accuracy and fidelity to the other European versions, adds the following declaration—'Nor is this its only praise; **THE TRANSLATORS HAVE SEIZED THE VERY SPIRIT AND SOUL OF THE ORIGINAL, AND EXPRESSED THIS ALMOST EVERYWHERE WITH PATHOS AND ENERGY**. Besides, our translators have not only made a standard translation, but they have made their translation the standard of our language (*The Translators Revived*, pp. 11, 59, 61, 63-66, 235-239).

Note that Dr. McClure claimed that the listing of testimonials to the excellency of the King James Bible could be "swelled to the size of a volume" in his day. That gives us an idea of how the King James Bible was revered in the mid-1800s.

McClure's quotation of Robertson, that the King James Bible may serve as a lexicon of the Hebrew language, is very important. Many fail to understand this. The King James Bible is as much a lexicon on the biblical languages as it is merely a translation. For one to run, say, to Vine or Thayer or Brown or Strong or Barry or Zodiates or Webster, and to accept the interpretation of ONE man as to the meaning of a Greek or Hebrew word, while slighting the deliberated and agreed interpretation of DOZENS of learned men is not wise. The wording of the King James Bible represents the labors of almost one hundred years of brilliant, believing, sacrificial, godly scholarship. Dozens of some of the best biblical linguists who have ever lived applied their minds and their prayers to translating into English PRECISELY what is found in the Hebrew and Greek. That was their goal. When someone says, "The Greek in this passage means such and such," they should not fail to mention that the Greek in that passage also means exactly what the King James translators said it means. It is important to explain and interpret Bible words, but it is never wise to correct or criticize those words and to try to replace them with one's own private translation. Unless one has the capability in the biblical languages to correct the Old Masters, one is wise not to pretend to a level of scholarship that he does not possess. Be careful, friends. Am I saying we should not use lexicons and study aids? Certainly not. Use all the sound tools you can find—lexicons, grammars, dictionaries, encyclopedias, commentaries. They are helpful insofar as they are faithful to the Word of God. Learn Greek and Hebrew and Latin and German, if you please. It can help you. But don't be deceived into thinking that the wording of the King James Version itself is some kind of secondary witness to the meaning of the biblical text, and that some lexicon has an authority superior to that of the King James Bible itself.

D.H. Conrad

D.H. Conrad delivered a message in April 1856, in Richmond, Virginia, which further illustrates the tenor of the defense of the King James Bible in the nineteenth century:

> [Regarding the proposed revision of the Authorized Bible] (1) As to its impolicy. Granting its [the new translation's] general fidelity, what is to be gained? If there be various or double meanings to words, you have the marginal system which has served so well hitherto; and if you adopt the marginal reading in the text, you must in most cases make the text the marginal reading, and what do you gain? (2*)* **You open a crevasse through which you know not how soon the floods of innovation may sweep away the sacred landmarks.** (3) **You risk too much for a small (supposed) accuracy,** for you let in the cavils of those 'who watch for your halting.' You will have, as allies in the undertaking, all the heresies, past, present, and to come, to say nothing of those who now hate the Bible, because it stands a solemn protest against their ideal theories (emphasis added) (D.H. Conrad, Esq., at a Bible Convention*, Bible Society Record*, December 1856, cited by Edward Cone Bissell, *Historic Origin of the Bible*, 1873, pp. 348, 349).

Conrad was displaying a powerful logic and a prophetic foresightedness. We believe the man was absolutely correct, and it is important to note that he represented the position of the majority of godly men in his day.

John Cumming

In a letter published in the *London Times*, August 26, 1856, John Cumming, D.D., gave the following warning about the proposed revision to the Authorized Bible:

> What I contend is, that, all circumstances considered, there is not a reasonable prospect of finding a body of linguists and divines who would be unanimous, when our noble version is assumed or asserted to be at fault, in proposing corrections ... **a fire would probably be kindled at which Dr. Wiseman would delight to warm his hands**. ... I am not unaware of many defects in our version. But these are in nine cases out of ten so trivial, and when the defect is generally thought grave, there is so much learned dispute, that our policy at present is to be very thankful for what we have, very patient under **ill-natured censure of aspiring scholars,** and **truly glad that the authorized version is not intrusted to the manipulation of some improvers, whose zeal, to say the least, outstrips their discretion.** ... I cannot look around on the broad church, and the low church, and the high church parties within the Church of England, or at the keen controversies that rage without her walls—not to speak of other peculiarities incidental to our day—without **an earnest and anxious wish that our country may hold fast that which at present is widely accepted—our glorious common version**.

These sober words of wisdom were eventually drowned out by the clamor of the textual "scholars" and those who yearned for revision and were all for throwing caution to the winds. Not that a majority ever did support a revision. That the majority of that day *did not* support the revision of the Authorized Version is evident by the fact that the Revision soon fizzled into extinction.

Anthony Cooper

As early as 1856 the Christian statesman Anthony Ashley Cooper (1801-85), better known as the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, was speaking out plainly and powerfully against any revision of the Authorized Version. He understood the rationalistic atmosphere of that day. He understood that much of the pressure for the revision of the Authorized Bible was coming from Germany via those English scholars that had imbibed of what he called "the neological spirit of the age." *He saw the issue of Bible revision particularly as it turned upon the matter of authority and the standard of absolute truth.* He understood that to multiply English versions and rob the people of the standard of an "authorized version" would leave them at the mercy of the scholars. Speaking before the British & Foreign Bible Society, May 1856, the Earl gave this rousing opposition to the revision of the Authorized Bible:

Supposing that this new version were given to the world, would it be possible that thenceforward we could have for this country, for our colonies, for the States of North America that speak our own language, an 'Authorized Version,' one that could be received with common consent by every human being that speaks the Anglo-Saxon language. **DESTROY THAT COMMON CONSENT TO RECEIVE AN 'AUTHORIZED VERSION,' AND MY BELIEF IS THAT YOU HAVE INFLICTED A DEADLY WOUND ON THE CAUSE OF THE PROPAGATION OF THE TRUTH AMONG ALL THE NATIONS THAT SPEAK OUR LANGUAGE.** ... At present we have the 'Authorized Version,' and we consent to receive it. **We are, therefore, all on an equality; when we enter into a controversy we are on an equality; THE LAITY CAN EXERCISE THE BEREAN PRIVILEGE OF EXAMINING THE SCRIPTURES 'TO SEE WHETHER THESE THINGS BE SO,' AND CANNOT BE TOLD BY THOSE FROM WHOM THEY DIFFER, 'IT MAY AGREE WITH YOUR VERSION, BUT I HAVE ANOTHER AND A BETTER ONE, AND THEREFORE, I CAN HAVE NO CONTROVERSY WITH YOU.'**

What is proposed would, if carried out, tend to destroy the exercise of private judgment—that grand, sacred, solemn principle which is the right of every man, and which I imagine to be the great security of churches and nations, and the life and soul of individuals. **WHEN YOU ARE CONFUSED OR PERPLEXED BY A VARIETY OF VERSIONS YOU WOULD BE OBLIGED TO GO TO SOME LEARNED PUNDIT IN WHOM YOU REPOSED CONFIDENCE, AND ASK HIM WHICH VERSION HE RECOMMENDED; AND WHEN YOU HAD TAKEN HIS VERSION, YOU MUST BE BOUND BY HIS OPINION. I HOLD THIS TO BE THE GREATEST DANGER THAT NOW THREATENS US. IT IS A DANGER PRESSED UPON US FROM GERMANY, AND PRESSED UPON US BY THE NEOLOGICAL SPIRIT OF THE AGE. I hold it to be far more dangerous than tractarianism or popery, both of which I abhor from the bottom of my heart. This evil is tenfold more dangerous, tenfold more subtle than either of these, because you would be ten times more incapable of dealing with the gigantic mischief that would stand before you.**

Patience and habits of critical comparison are not the characteristics of the working classes. The translators will have introduced, so the people will think, a 'strange' Gospel, and **the multitude, believing that it is 'another,' will lose faith in all.** Could the revision be limited to marginal readings, I should feel much less objection. But is it possible to open the sluice-gates? Your excellent and discriminating rules [those of the textual critic] would avail for nothing. **The cry for further amendment would know no end. It would be difficult to construct an impartial commission. The immense variety of opinion on doctrinal matters, and the immense diffusion of knowledge, both deep and superficial, in these days, would render necessary such a combination of members as would include the extremist forms of Ritualism, Socinianism** [denial of Christ's deity—note that Unitarians did indeed participate in the revision], **and Infidelity**. **Numerically and as scholars, these professors would be very strong,** and experience will not allow us to believe that these learned persons, after years of thought and study in the same groove, fixed and sincere in their peculiar opinions, would not entertain (unknown to themselves no doubt) **a decided bias towards special**

> **renderings of the sacred text** (Lord Shaftesbury, as cited by Bissell, *Historic Origin of the Bible*, p. 355).

The Earl's biographer tells us that he continued his opposition to the new Bibles to the end. "Lord Shaftesbury was a stout opponent of the Revision of the Authorised Version of the Bible." He saw the danger of the multiplicity of versions as "one of the most subtle dangers that beset true religion." He protested the revision "on the ground of the uncertainty which would be created in men's minds as to which was, and which was not, a true and reliable version" (Edwin Hodder, *The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury*, 1892, p. 641).

After the revision was published, the Earl said, "... it is so stiff and stilted, and full of stones that break your shins at every turn, that I do not for a moment think it will ever displace the Authorised Version—that precious, inestimable, and holy gift to England; that wondrous translation of His everlasting and Divine Word."

The Earl of Shaftesbury had great foresight. His testimony on this echoes down the corridors of time and thrills my heart. His words give me courage to resist the modern versions, which have produced precisely the confusion which he forewarned.

Joseph Philpot

Joseph Charles Philpot (1802-1869), Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford, minister of the Gospel, and editor of *The Gospel Standard* 1840-1869 (co-editor with John M'Kenzie from 1840 to 1849) is another example of those who stood boldly for the KJV prior to the publication of the Revised Version. Philpot exhibited a rare combination. He was an Oxford-educated scholar of the highest caliber, having the reputation as one of the greatest Hebrew and Greek masters of his day. He was also a deeply spiritual man "with a sanctified discernment of the evil trend of the apostate church." Note the following lovely testimony which appeared in April 1857:

> **We cannot but admire the great faithfulness of our translators in so scrupulously adhering to the exact words of the Holy Spirit**, and when they were necessarily compelled to supply the ellipses in the original, to point out that they had done so by marking the word in italic characters. By so doing, they engaged themselves, as by bond**, TO GIVE THE WORD OF GOD IN ITS STRICT ORIGINAL PURITY**; and yet, as thorough scholars in the original tongues, and complete masters of their own, **THEY WERE ENABLED TO GIVE US A VERSION ADMIRABLE NOT ONLY FOR ITS STRICT FIDELITY, BUT FOR ITS ELOQUENCE, GRANDEUR, AND BEAUTY**.

Philpot gave six reasons for rejecting a revision of the King James Bible, and his warnings of what would occur if such a revision were popularized have proven to be uncannily accurate. Consider:

1. Who are to undertake it [a revision of the KJV] ... Of course they must be learned men, great critics, scholars, and divines. But these are notoriously either tainted with popery or infidelity. Where are the men, learned, yet sound in Truth, not to say alive unto God, who possess the necessary qualifications for so important a work? And can erroneous men, dead in trespasses and sins, carnal, worldly, ungodly persons, spiritually translate a book written by the blessed Spirit? We have not the slightest ground for hope that they would be godly men, such as we have reason to believe translated the Scriptures into our present version.

2. Again, it would unsettle the minds of thousands, as to which was the Word of God—the old translation or the new. What a door it would open for the workings of infidelity, or the temptations of Satan! What a gloom, too, it would cast over the minds of many of God's saints, to have those passages which had been applied to their souls translated in a different way, and how it would seem to shake all their experience of the power and preciousness of God's Word!

3. But besides all this, there would be two Bibles spread throughout all the land, the old and the new, and what confusion would this create in almost every place! At present, all sects and denominations agree in acknowledging our present version as to the standard of appeal. Nothing settles disputes so soon as when the contending parties have confidence in the same umpire and are willing to abide by his decision. **But this Judge of all dispute, this Umpire of all controversy would cease to be the looser of strife if present acknowledged authority were put an end to by a rival**.

4. If the new translation were once to begin, where would it end? It is good to let well enough alone, as it is easier to mar than to mend. ... The Socinianising Neologian would blot out 'GOD' in 1 Tim. 3.1, and strike out 1 John 5.7, as an interpolation. The Puseyite would mend it to suit his Tractarian views. ... **Once set up a notice, 'The Old Bible to be mended,' and there would be plenty of workmen, who trying to mend the cover, would pull the pages to pieces.** ... All our good Bible terms would be so mutilated that they would cease to convey the Spirit's meaning and **INSTEAD OF THE NOBLE SIMPLICITY, FAITHFULNESS, AND TRUTH OF OUR PRESENT VERSION, WE SHOULD HAVE A BIBLE THAT NOBODY WOULD ACCEPT AS THE WORD OF GOD, TO WHICH NONE COULD SAFELY APPEAL, AND ON WHICH NONE IMPLICITLY RELY**.

5. Instead of our good old Saxon Bible, simple and solid, with few words obsolete, and alike majestic and beautiful, we should have a modern English translation in pert and flippant language of the day. ...

6. The present English Bible (Authorized Version) ... is, we believe, the grand bulwark of Protestantism; the safeguard of the Gospel, and the treasure of the church; and we should be traitors in every sense of the word if we consented to give it up to be rifled by the sacrilegious hands of the Puseyite, concealed Papists, German Neologians, infidel divines, Arminians, Socinians, and the whole tribe of enemies of God and godliness (Philpot, "The Authorized Version of 1611*," The Gospel Standard,* April 1857; reprinted in *The Authorized Version—1611 vs. The New English Bible: a Critical Review*, Trinitarian Bible Society, 1961).

Amen and amen!! Philpot was correct on every point. This is precisely what has happened as a result of the new versions. I'm looking forward to seeing old Philpot in Glory and discussing this matter with him. What a prophet of God! He saw exactly where the revision of the Authorized Version would lead.

In 1861 Philpot wrote about the glories of the literary side of the Authorized Version:

> They [the KJV translators] were deeply penetrated with a reverence for the word of God, and, therefore, they felt themselves bound by a holy constraint to discharge their trust in the most faithful way. **UNDER THIS DIVINE CONSTRAINT THEY WERE LED TO GIVE US A TRANSLATION UNEQUALLED FOR FAITHFULNESS TO THE ORIGINAL, AND YET AT THE SAME TIME CLOTHED IN THE PUREST AND SIMPLEST ENGLISH.** ... No one can read, with an enlightened eye, the discourses of our Lord without seeing what a divine simplicity ran through all His words; and our translators were favoured with heavenly wisdom to translate these words of the Lord into language as simple as that in which they first fell from His lips. What can exceed the simplicity and yet beauty and blessedness of such declarations as these?—'I am the bread of life:' 'I am the door;' 'I am the way, the truth, and the life:' 'I lay down My life for the sheep;' 'I am the vine:' 'God is love;' 'By grace ye are saved.' Even where the words are not strictly monosyllabic they are of the simplest kind, and as such are adapted to the capacity of every child of God, in whatever rank of life he may be. The blessedness of having not only such a Bible, but possessing such a translation of it can never be sufficiently valued. ... it is because the language of our Bible is such pure, simple, unaffected, idiomatic, intelligible English that it has become so thoroughly English a book, and has interwoven itself with our very laws and language (Philpot, *Gospel Standard*, February 1861).

George Marsh

Between 1860 and 1870 George Perkins Marsh (1801-1882) spoke out in defense of the Authorized Bible and in opposition to the proposed revision. (He continued to speak out after the publication of the English Revision.) He saw the importance of maintaining an absolute standard by keeping the ancient English Bible and not giving in to novelties.

> Both the theologian and philologist will admit that a certain degree of permanence in the standards of religious faith and of grammatical propriety is desirable. The authorized version of the Bible satisfies this reasonable conservatism in both points, and it is therefore a matter of much literary, as well as religious, interest, that it should remain intact so long as it continues able to discharge the functions which have been appointed to it as a spiritual and philological instructor (George Marsh, *Lectures on the English Language*, New York: Charles Scribner, 1860, p. 207).

Marsh did not simply desire to keep the Authorized Bible for the sake of maintaining permanence in standards, he understood that theological rationalism had weakened the character of the churches of his day. He believed that the

theological conditions existing at the end of the nineteenth century were less suitable for the production of a Bible translation than at any time in the prior 300 years:

> The acuteness of German criticisms, the speculations of German philosophy, have given rise to a great multitude and diversity of opinions, not on questions of verbal interpretation merely, but of doctrines also, which are but just now beginning to be openly and freely discussed in this country and in England, and **THE MINDS OF MEN ARE NOW PERHAPS MORE UNSETTLED ON THESE TOPICS THAN THEY HAVE BEEN AT ANY TIME BEFORE FOR THREE CENTURIES**. ... the future is more uncertain than the past ... **the irreverent and wanton thoughtlessness of an hour may destroy that which only the slow and painful labor of years or of centuries can rebuild** (emphasis added) (Ibid., p. 630).

> **Shall we for the sake of changes like these [updating obsolete words and such] expose the whole version to a revision which may essentially alter its general coloring***?* Or shall we trust to our mothers, our Bible readers, and our other religious teachers, to bring the intelligence and heart of the young, whom they initiate into the mysteries of Christianity, up to the comprehension of a sacred dialect, not, indeed, so readily intelligible as a newspaper, but less archaic, except in mere grammatical forms which no one thinks of expunging, than that of Bacon? (emphasis added) (George Marsh, *The Nation*, New York, October 13, 1870, cited by Bissell, p. 354).

Thomas Birks

In 1878, Thomas Rawson Birks, Knightbridge Professor, Cambridge, took a stand against modern textual criticism with the publication of *Essay on the Right Estimation of Manuscript Evidence in the Text of the New Testament*. The following sample is from Birks' exposure of the error of the "genealogical method" —

> The method of criticism, then, which is founded on the distribution of MSS. into groups and families, from the close affinity of their readings, seems to me doubly fallacious and unsound. It fails, in the first place, because of the almost entire want of direct historical evidence, by which we would determine the actual process of derivation, and lines of descent, in the hundreds of cursive manuscripts, or even in the very few uncials which still survive. And it fails, in the second place, because, if the materials were a hundred times more abundant, it wholly mistakes the true relation between the witnesses, on which the force of collective evidence must depend. For this is not lateral, but vertical. Each witness or manuscript must have its weight determined by the series of copyings through which it has passed, and not by its agreement or disagreement with other copies of its own age, of which the steps of transmission many have been, and often must have been, wholly different from its own (*Essay*, p. 21).

Robert Lewis Dabney

Robert Lewis Dabney (1820-98) is another example of those who were opposing the theories of modern textual criticism in the United States in those days. Dabney

taught at Union Theological Seminary from 1853 to 1883 and pastored the College Church during most of those years. He contributed to a number of publications, including *the Central Presbyterian*, the *Presbyterian Critic*, and the *Southern Presbyterian*. His last years were spent with the Austin School of Theology in Texas, a university he co-founded. He boldly withstood the apostasy which was creeping in on every side in this day. His biographer called him "a soldier until death, at war with much in his age."

> By any standard Dabney was a remarkable man. At the age of 22 he was offered the editorship of a newspaper—'no man of your age in the Union is superior as a writer'—and when he was 40 Charles Hodge pleaded for his help at Princeton Seminary (A.A. Hodge was to call him 'the best teacher of theology in the United States, if not in the world'). ... In 1862 he answered a call from General T.J. Jackson to serve as Adjutant-General of the 'Stonewall' Brigade, and in this capacity Jackson later referred to him as 'the most efficient officer he knew' (Thomas Cary Johnson, *The Life and Letters of Robert Lewis Dabney,* cover jacket, The Banner of Truth Trust, 1977 edition of the 1903 original).

Though Dabney allowed for a possible minor revision of the Greek Received Text, he gave a very powerful defense, in general, of the Text underlying the KJV and in opposition to the critical views of modern textual criticism. He did not believe the Received Text should be replaced. He opposed the striking textual changes that were being proposed in his day—changes that have appeared in all of the modern English versions since 1881. He understood the theological corruption of the critical text, and he traced these corruptions to second- and third-century heretics. He understood that scholarship is not synonymous with wisdom and spiritual discernment. He knew the fickleness of modern scholarship. He knew that the modern theories of textual criticism are founded upon conjecture and rationalism, not absolute truth and biblical faith. We do not agree with all of Dabney's conclusions on textual matters, but the fact remains that his analysis of modern textual criticism is devastating. We should understand that the modern English versions are translated from a Greek text that is built upon discredited theories. Consider an excerpt from one of his articles on this subject:

> **The minds for which criticism retains its fascination are usually of that peculiar and 'crotchety' type found among antiquarians. The intelligent reader is, therefore, not surprised to find, along with much labor and learning, a 'plentiful lack' of sober and convincing common sense.** ... This method, substantially adopted by Tischendorf and by Alford, no longer retains the received text as a common basis for emendation, or standard of comparison, or even as a mere cord upon which to string the proposed corrections, but proceeds to construct a text just as though it never existed. It is this objectionable and mischievous feature of the later criticism which, as we believe, especially demands the notice of biblical scholars at this time. ... **It is very clear that, practically, the people must either trust the Bibles they have, or believe in none. For there is no practicable substitute. THIS APPEARS FROM THE FACT THAT NO TWO OF THE CRITICS ARE AGREED**; no one of them is willing to adopt the text as settled by any other; their art has not found, and

probably never will find, an authoritative umpire, to end their differences. ...

Let us, as a preliminary task, test the soundness of that boast which the recent critics usually echo from Lachmann; that they discard *conjecture* as a guide to correct readings, and rely in preference upon the *testimony* of competent ancient witnesses. Do they really discard conjecture? ... [It may be that] no particular reading rests upon conjectures; BUT THE GRAND FOUNDATION OF THE WHOLE IS A BUNDLE OF CONJECTURES; that is, upon Lachmann's inferences from internal marks about the writings which he selects as ancient and competent. ... Why does he conclude that the Vatican, the Alexandrine, the Cambridge, the Codex Ephremi, are ancient MSS., while none of the Byzantine are? ... his ground of selection is but conjecture. This charge is eminently true concerning the age which they are pleased to assign to those Greek MSS. which they recommend to us as most venerable: The Vatican, the Alexandrine, and now the Sinai. **It is expressly admitted that neither of these has an extant history.** No documentary external evidence exists as to the names of the copyists who transcribed them, the date, or the place of their writing. **Nobody knows whence the Vatican MS. came to the pope's library, or how long it has been there. ... Tischendorf himself was unable to trace the presence of his favorite codex, in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Horeb, by external witnesses higher than the twelfth century. THEIR EARLY DATE IS CONFESSEDLY ASSIGNED THEM BY CONJECTURE** (*conjectura*: a casting together) of internal marks. It may be rightly assigned, yet by conjecture....

A second critical canon much employed is this: Where any ground exists for suspecting a various reading in any passage which has a parallel in another gospel, that reading shall be condemned as spurious which would harmonize the two parallel places most; and that reading shall be held the original one which most tends to make them contradict each other. The argument for this astonishing canon is that, since the change was made by somebody, in one way or the other, it is presumable it was made by the over-zeal of the copyists, in order to hide the supposed evidence of contradiction between two inspired men. ... **THE CHIEF OBJECTION TO THIS CANON IS THAT, LIKE SOME OTHERS WHICH EVANGELICAL CRITICS HAVE ADOPTED FROM THE MINT OF INFIDEL RATIONALISM, ITS SOLE PROBABILITY IS GROUNDED IN THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE EVANGELISTS AND APOSTLES WERE NOT GUIDED BY INSPIRATION.** Let us adopt the Christian hypothesis, that the scenes of our Saviour's life were enacted, and his words spoken, in a given way, and that the several evangelists were inspired of God to record them infallibly; and the most harmonizing readings will obviously appear to us the most probable readings. ...

The following list [of doctrinal corruptions in the critical Greek text] is not presented as complete, but as containing the most notable of these points. ... the Sinai and the Vatican MSS. concur in omitting, in Matthew vi. 13, the closing doxology of our Lord's prayer. In John viii. 1-11, they and the Alexandrine omit the whole narrative of Christ's interview with the woman taken in adultery and her accusers. The first two omit the whole of Mark xvi., from the ninth verse to the end. Acts viii. 37, in which Philip is represented as propounding to the eunuch faith as the qualification for baptism, is omitted by all three.

... in Acts ix. 5, 6 ... the Sinai, Vatican and Alexandrine MSS. all concur in [omitting 'Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said...' from the passage.]

In 1 Tim. iii. 1 ... the Sinai, Codex Ephremi, and probably the Alexandrine [omit God]...

In 1 John v. 7 ... all the old MSS. concur in omitting the heavenly witnesses...

In Jude 4 ... the MSS. omit God.

In Rev. i. 11 ... all three MSS. under remark concur in omitting the Messiah's eternal titles...

If now the reader will glance back upon this latter list of variations, he will find that in every case, the doctrinal effect of the departure from the received text is to obscure or suppress some testimony for the divinity of the Saviour. ...

Everything in the historical position of those churches, which afterwards formed the patriarchate of Constantinople, marks them as the most likely places in which to look for correct copies of the New Testament. There was the native home of the Greek language, with the truest Grecian culture. **To them nearly all the New Testament was at first addressed.** ... There chiefly labored nearly all the apostles who have wielded the pen of inspiration. ... In a word, the soil of the Greek Church is the native birthplace of the New Testament canon. ... Facts are also much obscured by representing Alexandria as the metropolis of Greek learning after the Christian era ... Antioch was still its equal ... and, beside her acknowledged classic culture, the pretensions of Alexandria were but semi-barbaric. ... until the middle of the fifteenth century, Constantinople still stood, sorely pressed indeed by the Moslems, but yet independent; a Christian Greek kingdom, retaining the ecclesiastical literature, the language ... Then came the final overthrow and dispersion of 1453. The Greek scholars and ecclesiastics, who then filled Europe with the news of their calamity, became the channels for transmitting to all the west the precious remains of early Christianity; and providence prepared the church with the new art of printing to preserve and diffuse them. It was thus that the Constantinopolitan MSS., the representatives of the common text of former ages, became the parents of our received text. ...

The significant fact to which we wish especially to call attention is this: that all the variations proposed on the faith of these manuscripts which have any doctrinal importance, should attack the one doctrine of the Trinity; nay, we may say even more specifically, the one doctrine of Christ's deity. ... **Their admirers [of the favored manuscripts supporting the critical text] claim for them an origin in the fourth or fifth century. The Sabellian and Arian controversies raged in the third and fourth. Is there no coincidence here?** Things do not happen again and again regularly without a cause. ... And when we remember the date of the great Trinitarian contest, and compare it with the supposed date of these exemplars of the sacred text, the ground of suspicion becomes violent. ... **THESE VARIATIONS ARE TOO NUMEROUS, AND TOO SIGNIFICANT IN**

THEIR EFFECT UPON THE ONE DOCTRINE, TO BE ASCRIBED TO CHANCE. ... there are strong probable grounds to conclude, that the text of the Scriptures current in the East received a mischievous modification at the hands of the famous **ORIGEN**, which has not been usually appreciated. ... He is described by Mosheim ... as 'a compound of contraries, wise and unwise, acute and stupid, judicious and injudicious; the enemy of superstition, and its patron; a strenuous defender of Christianity, and its corrupter; energetic and irresolute; one to whom the Bible owes much, and from whom it has suffered much.' ... **HIS REPUTATION AS THE GREAT INTRODUCER OF MYSTICISM, ALLEGORY, AND NEO-PLATONISM INTO THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, IS TOO WELL KNOWN TO NEED RECITAL.** Those who are best acquainted with the history of Christian opinion know best, that Origen was the great corrupter, and the source, or at least earliest channel, of nearly all the speculative errors which plagued the church in after ages. ... **HE WAS STRICTLY A RATIONALIST**. **... HE DISBELIEVED THE FULL INSPIRATION AND INFALLIBILITY OF THE SCRIPTURES**, holding that the inspired men apprehended and stated many things obscurely. ... **THE KEY-NOTE OF ALL ORIGEN'S LABORS WAS THE EFFORT TO RECONCILE CHRISTIANITY AND THIS ECLECTIC PAGAN PHILOSOPHY INTO A SUBSTANTIAL UNITY**....

... **SOMEBODY HAS PLAYED THE KNAVE WITH THE TEXT** ... **We think that [the reader] will conclude with us that the weight of probability is greatly in favour of this theory—that the anti-Trinitarians, finding certain codices in which these doctrinal readings had been already lost through the licentious criticism of Origen and his school, industriously diffused them, while they also did what they dared to add to the omissions of similar readings** (R.L. Dabney, "The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek," *Southern Presbyterian Review*, April 1871; reprinted in *Discussions Evangelical and Theological*, 1890, pp. 350-389).

Terence Brown, summarizing Dabney's view of the transmission of the text, says, "Dabney concluded that these considerations restore the claims of the Received Text to be a faithful one, and invalidate the claims of exclusive accuracy made by recent critics in favour of the so-called oldest codices" (Brown, *The Bible and Textual Criticism*, TB, July 1972).

Robert Breckinridge and James Thornwell

Dabney was not the only man who represented the OLD SCHOOL PRESBYTERIAN in America that fought against the critical Greek texts and the modern versions. Others were Robert Jefferson Breckinridge(1800-1871) and James Thornwell (1812-1862). The Old School Presbyterians were so-called because they stood in the old Protestant doctrinal paths and refused to accept the New School modernism that was flowing from Germany. In 1834, Breckinridge wrote *The Act and Testimony*, "which enumerated the errors of liberal New Haven Theology which had entered the Presbyterian Church under the Plan of Union (with the Congregationalist) of 1801. New Haven Theology denied the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity and advocated the moral

influence theory of atonement rather than the orthodox satisfaction theory. It also denied the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the sinner who believes and therefore saw salvation as mere pardon and not as justification, as a process rather than a sudden, miraculous event" (James H. Sightler, *Tabernacle Essays on Bible Translation*, p. 44). Breckinridge's document became the basis for a division between the Old and New Schools in 1837.

The New School Presbyterian supported the critical texts and the move to revise the English Bible along those lines, while the Old School Presbyterians stood on the opposite side.

In 1856, the American Bible Society produced a revision of the King James Bible that claimed to be a mere update of language but actually proceeded along critical lines. For example, 1 John 5:7 was placed in brackets. "The committee included Richard Storrs, John McClintock, Gardiner Spring, and John Dewitt (Dewitt in 1871 was chosen to serve on the American N.T. Committee by Schaff), but the actual work was done by an obscure New School Presbyterian pastor, James W. McLane, of Williamsburgh, N.Y." (Sightler, p. 45).

Robert Breckinridge published a pamphlet against the ABS revision and "organized the opposition at the Presbyterian General Assembly (Old School) of 1857, and forced the A.B.S. to drop this new translation" (Sightler, p. 45). "Breckinridge was chairman of the Republican Convention in 1864 which renominated Lincoln. ... Breckinridge and his brother John, who was also a Presbyterian minister (Old School), were ardently conservative and were famous for their debates with Catholic antagonists" (Sightler, p. 50). Note the following excerpt:

> It seemed to me that the time had fully come, for the friends of the Bible, as it is, to speak once more. ... Does anyone suppose that a question of conscience touching the integrity of the word of God, can be given up by Christian people even to avoid trouble in the church of God, much less trouble with a secular society? ... The word of God is, next to the Spirit itself, the most precious gift of Christ to his church; and if the church has any clear duty upon earth, one duty is to preserve that Divine Word in purity ... and here is a new standard English Bible, changed ... in somewhere about 24,000 particulars ... we are told they have discovered ... in the text and punctuation alone ... and then they distinctly assert, that of all these 24,000 variations ... there is not one which mars the integrity of the text, or affects any doctrine or precept of the Bible ... THE PRINCIPLE ON WHICH THE PROCEDURE HAS BEEN UNDERTAKEN AND CARRIED THROUGH, ARE PERILOUS IN THE HIGHEST DEGREE ... THE RESULTS REACHED ARE EVIL, AND ONLY EVIL (Robert Breckinridge, *The American Bible Society's Committee on Versions and Its New Bible*, Danville, KY, Robert J. Breckinridge, Oct. 30, 1857, pp. 4-7).

We see that the textual critics of Breckinridge's day made the same claim that they make today, that their criticism does not affect doctrine. We also see that

there were men of God who did not buy this argument and considered the work of textual criticism "evil."

Arthur Cleveland Coxe

Arthur Cleveland Coxe (1818-1896), Episcopalian bishop of the diocese of western New York, also spoke out against the Bible Societies' revision. In 1857, Coxe published *An Apology for the Common English Bible; and a Review of the Extraordinary Changes Made in It by Managers of the American Bible Society* (Baltimore: Joseph Robinson, 1857).

Coxe began by exalting the King James Bible:

> The Holy Scriptures, as translated in the reign of King James the First, are the noblest heritage of the Anglo-Saxon race. Contemporary with the rise of colonial emigration from the great hive of parent life and enterprise, the English Bible, of that epoch, would seem designed, by Providence, to be the parting blessing of the Mother of Nations, to her adventurous progeny. ... It was the work, in some degree, of all, who, in the successive stages of England's growth and development, had contributed to that great principle of the Anglican Reformation, that the Bible, with all its precious promises, is, by covenant with God, the rightful treasure of every Christian man, and of every Christian child. It was the Bible of Adhelm and Bede and AElfric and of Alfred; of Stephen Langton and Rolle of Hampole; of Wiclif and Tindal and Coverdale and Cranmer and Parker, and of all the noble army of Marian Martyr. Finally, it was the Bible which had been winnowed from whatever was unsubstantial in the fruits of all their labours, and which combined the merits of all; IT WAS THE FINEST OF THE WHEAT. ... The English language was in its prime and purity; its wells were undefiled (pp. 5, 6).

Coxe also exalted the skill of the KJV translator, "those giants of Scriptural scholarship" and the "great scholars of the old time, whose reputation and labours have received the homage of men of learning for more than two centuries complete." After describing some of the individual translators, Coxe concluded:

> A biographical history of all who had part in the Translation, is a desideratum, and might be an effectual antidote to the itch for superseding their work, which seems to trouble so many in our days (Coxe, *An Apology for the Common English Bible*, pp, 21, 22). (A "desideratum" is "that which is not possessed, but which is desirable; any perfection or improvement which is wanted," Webster 1828).

Coxe warned that a wholesale revision of the King James Bible would inflict a grave wound, that it is important to have one standard Bible:

> Can it be necessary to argue that no one can inflict a graver wound on the unity of the race, and on all the sacred interests which depend on that unity, under God, than by tampering with the English Bible? By the acclamation of the universe, it is the most faultless version of the Scriptures that ever existed in any tongue. TO COMPLAIN OF ITS TRIFLING BLEMISHES, IS TO COMPLAIN OF THE SUN FOR ITS SPOTS. Whatever may be its faults, they are less evil, in every way, than would be the evils sure to arise from any attempt to eradicate

them; and where there is so much of wheat, the few tares may be allowed to stand till the end of the world. ... It is of the utmost consequence, that the whole Anglo-Saxon people should have one Bible, as one God. It is of vast consequence to Christendom, that there should not be a multiplication of Bibles, every sect setting forth its own (pp. 8, 9).

Coxe understood the obligation to stand for the Words of God. He gave the following as the basis for his zeal in the Bible version issue:

> The care with which the Hebrews guarded every jot and tittle of their Scriptures was never reproved by our Saviour. It is our duty and interest to imitate them in the jealousy with which God's Holy Word is kept in our own language. ... The true believer has instincts that cry out against a compromise that destroys what is dearer to his heart than life, even the truth of God's Word, its spirit as well as its letter (pp. 8, 51).

He even made a case for keeping antiquation in the context of the long history of the Authorized Version:

> Even the antiquated words of the English bible will never become obsolete, while they are preserved in the amber of its purity; and there, they have a precious beauty and propriety which they would lack elsewhere. The language lives there in its strength, as in a citadel, and knows no damage, while it keeps that house like a strong man armed. ... Why is it necessary to modernize the antique spellings which one loves occasionally to meet, amid the leaves of his Bible, and which the humblest reader is willing to see there, though not in his newspaper? ... Why sweep away these bible roughnesses, which are full of strength, if not of the trimness and precision which belong to modern pedantry? (p. 8, 31, 36).

Coxe warned of an intimate association between the apostasy of that day and modern textual criticism:

> The movement, in England, which had made some little stir in Parliament, in behalf of a new translation, SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN SET ON FOOT BY PARTIES CONFESSEDLY AVERSE TO THE GREAT DOCTRINAL TRUTHS OF THE GOSPEL. It is significant, that the *Edinburgh Review*, IN A LATE ARTICLE OF DISTINCTLY LATITUDINARIAN CHARACTER, has pronounced in favour of the experiment. ... WE BELIEVE, THEREFORE, THAT THE TIME HAS GONE BY FOR THE RADICAL IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE, EVEN IN ENGLAND. ... Refined gold must be gilded, and the lily painted; and if possible, the very lights of heaven would be tinkered and repaired, by THE WILD CONCEIT OF THE TIMES. ... I submit it to the judgment of devout and reasonable men, whether, at any time, the intrusion of such novelties into a standard, on mere individual responsibility, is not most dangerous. BUT IF, AT ANY TIME, MORE ESPECIALLY AT THIS TIME, WHEN A GREAT PORTION OF OUR COUNTRY IS WITNESS TO THE MOST ALARMING THEOLOGICAL PROGRESS TOWARDS THE RATIONALISM OF GERMANY. IN NEW ENGLAND, ALL THINGS DENOTE THE ADVANCE OF A THOROUGHLY UNEVANGELICAL SPIRIT, which has possessed itself of the chief seats of learning, and which is successfully contending with the few old-fashioned representatives of a superior orthodoxy, that are left among the descendants of

> the Puritans. IF THE EVIL SPIRIT HAS BEEN EXORCISED FROM ITS GERMAN HAUNTS, IT IS EVIDENT THAT IT IS SEEKING REST IN AMERICA. And what was the history of its growth in Germany? The school of Semler was founded on a religious basis, the precise counterpart of that which already exists in our own country: on the basis of just such innovations in recognized standards, as the American Bible Society are now making. ... In a day when the *New York Tribune* is the Bible of thousands of our countrymen; when Magnetism is the highest spiritualism of thousands more; when gigantic elements of evil, which have no name, are visible in our great West; and when the subtleties of Dr. Bushnell represent the better phase of the rationalism of New England, can it be wise to insert the sharp end of the critical wedge into the Standard Bible? (Coxe, *An Apology for the Common English Bible*, 1857, pp. 10, 13, 46, 47).

Observe that Coxe understood the intimate association between modern textual criticism and theological modernism. This is evident in his reference to Johann Semler, who was not only one of the fathers of German modernism but was also one of the early textual critics and the teacher of Johann Griesbach. Coxe recognized that the same spirit of rationalism combined with textual criticism was at work in the American Bible Society in his day. The reference to Bushnell is to Horace Bushnell, who exalted the power of human reasoning and the "revelation in nature" above the Bible, undermining the Bible's authority by teaching that language can offer "only hints, or images" of truth (Bushnell, *God in Christ*, 1877, pp. 46, 74) and that we should treat the books of the Bible, not as "magazines of propositions," but as "poetic forms of life" (William Johnson, "Nature and the Supernatural in the Theology of Horace Bushnell," *Encounter*, Winter 1965, p. 67). In his influential book *Christian Nurture*, Bushnell redefined biblical conversion to a community issue rather than an individual one. The final question that Coxe proposed is the question that we propose even more vehemently today. In an hour of far-reaching apostasy, can it be wise to insert the sharp end of the critical wedge into the Bible?

Coxe warned that the American Bible Society had become infiltrated with theological modernism and that it had turned away from its charter by publishing (in 1852) a revised edition of the King James Bible.

> For more than thirty years [taking us back to about 1825, only nine years after the ABS was formed], the Society is said to have celebrated its great anniversary festivals, in the presence of hundreds of professed ministers of Christ, without a prayer for His blessing, or an ascription to the glory of the Holy Trinity; and that, confessedly, on the ground of the radical differences among its constituents, as to the very nature of God, and the proper manner of invoking His adorable name. ... Can such an association be a safe 'witness and keeper of Holy Writ?' (Arthur Cleveland Coxe, *An Apology for the Common English Bible,* p. 14).

> It is the tendency of all human institutions to corrupt themselves, especially when they have begun to be rich. The American Bible Society, in its new palace, and surrounded by the excitement of the great moneyed mart of this hemisphere [New York City], waxes fat, like Jeshurun, and like him, begins to kick. Its strength would have been to sit still. If it could have resisted the temptation to do

> something more than was given it to do, no one would have ventured to inquire as to the propriety of its joining house to house, and multiplying its presses and diversifying its operations. ... That such a Body should be content to circulate a Bible conformed to any standard 'in common use,' seems beneath its dignity. A modest experiment is resolved on, which grows less modest as it proceeds (Coxe, pp. 26, 27).

The Bible Society's English revision contained about 20,000 changes, mostly by way of spelling modifications and such, but also involving some doctrinal issues. Following are two examples of the doctrinal changes in the text:

A comma was put after slain in Revelation 13:8, disassociating the Lamb that was slain from the clause "from the foundation of the world." The American Bible Society revision marginal note stated: "... the qualification 'from the foundation of the world' refers not to 'slain,' but to 'written." Arthur Coxe comments: "Will it be believed that the Committee have ventured to tamper with the great beauty and force of Rev. xiii. 8, so as to take away the devotional and doctrinal use of it, forever, and to leave us no such text as 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world'?"

In Revelation 4:5, the American Bible Society edition changed "seven Spirits of God" to "seven spirits of God." Their explanation of this is as follows: "The word *Spirit*, everywhere, is made to begin with a capital when it refers to the Spirit of God as a divine agent; but not when it denotes other spiritual beings, or the spirit of man." This destroys the identity of the seven Spirits of Revelation 4:5 with the Holy Spirit and the intimate association between Revelation 4:5 and Isaiah 11:2.

Doctrinal changes were also introduced through the revised headings. Coxe warned that these "consist not in, here and there, an emendation, but in a vast system of alteration, and of thorough substitution, CHARACTERIZED, FROM FIRST TO LAST, BY A DEBASED ORTHODOXY, RATIONALISTIC TENDENCIES, and a general aversion to the evangelical and primitive modes of thought which characterize the old Bible." An example is the entire exclusion of the words "Christ" and "Church" from the Old and New Testament headings. Coxe observes:

> This is a feature of vast significance. Nothing is more valuable to the ordinary reader, as giving him a clue to the fact that the Old and New Testaments are one Gospel, than the great system which runs through the old headings. In them, Christ is everywhere, from the Psalter to the Apocalypse. In the Society's headings, Christ is nowhere. Even in the New Testament, the old familiar phrases, Christ's passion, Christ's resurrection and the like, running along the top of the page, and clustering over the heads of chapters, are generally stricken out. We have, instead, *Jesus is crucified, The resurrection of Jesus*. I know that to a believer this is all the same, for sense; and to him the name of Jesus is the adorable name at which he bows his knee. But it is not the same, by any means, to all for whose evangelizing the Gospel is sent. The Jews are willing to allow that Jesus was crucified; but *Christ Crucified* is what Paul

> preached unto them as their stumbling-block. ... A similar taste is fashionable among Socinians. They name the name of Jesus, as they speak of Confucius or Plato. May God save our children from being taught, in their very Bibles, the irreverence, which led a Socinian minister, not long ago, to publish a work entitled 'Jesus and His biographers,' meaning thereby our Lord and His Holy Evangelists! ... It is useless to say that *Messiah* and *Christ* are all the same thing. So they are to a believer, and so they are critically. But practically they are very different. *Christ* and *Christian* are words which cannot be separated. Christ means Jesus of Nazareth, for no one else has ever borne the name in its Greek form. But Messiah is indefinite. The Jew has no objection to allow that the 45th psalm means Messiah: in the eyes of some Socinians it means Messiah, that is, Solomon, as the anointed of the Lord. But the old heading, 'the Majesty and Grace of Christ's Kingdom,' is something which they disavow. ... The true believer has instincts that cry out against a compromise that destroys what is dearer to his heart than life, even the truth of God's Word, its spirit as well as its letter (Coxe, pp. 50, 51).

Coxe made some predictions about what would happen if the Authorized English Bible were replaced with a constant stream of revisions and new translations:

> **EVERY GENERATION HAS ITS FASHIONS; AND THE BIBLE, SET AGAIN AND AGAIN, ACCORDING TO PREVAILING WHIMS, WOULD BECOME AS UNTRUSTWORTHY AS AN OLD TOWN-CLOCK, CONTINUALLY CORRECTED BY PRIVATE WATCHES** (pp. 11, 12).

Coxe understood that to set the English Bible on a path of continual revision and re-translation would be to weaken its authority. We believe this is exactly what has happened.

Consider another prophecy by Coxe:

> And if it proceeds no further [than the American Bible Society revision], it degrades Holy Scripture in the popular estimation: it destroys the feeling, so healthful and so prevalent, that the Bible is a book above change, and too holy to be subjected to experiments; and the wholesome habit of confidences in Christ, as the alpha and omega of both Testaments, which the old Bible, with its quaint summaries, generated so naturally in the heart of youth, must entirely disappear, under its widely different spirit. Should it become the Bible of the American people, a cold, modernized, and (to the man of feeling) a vulgarized work will have supplanted the Bible which we have known from childhood, and which has made so many 'wise unto salvation' (p. 15).

Coxe warned that continual revisions degrade the Bible in the eyes of the common people, lowering its position as a holy book, bringing it down to the level of a cold, modernized, vulgarized work. I believe this is exactly what has happened.

Consider another prediction:

> Thirty years more, and another generation may see a new experiment, under the sanction of this, which will be carried further; and a vast body of Neologists may entirely control the work of a new translation. Experience demonstrates

> that I am not a gratuitous alarmist. While I am writing these pages, a respectable newspaper, of the 'Reformed Dutch Communion,' records the deplorable success of such a scheme, in the bosom of the Fatherland of that interesting branch of the Continental Reformation. Here its unexceptionable testimony! It says: 'The National Church of Holland, the descendant of the Old Reformed Church of Dort, has, it is true, still its old orthodox standards; but by additional regulations the Synod has deprived them of their binding power, in consequence of which Rationalism and Unitarianism have, in the course of the last fifty years, seized almost the whole of the clergy. The Synod recently by an official verdict virtually declared, that ministers who hold Unitarian views are legal office-bearers of the Church. OF HER 1500 MINISTERS, NOT MORE THAN A HUNDRED ARE KNOWN AS MAINTAINING EVANGELICAL TRUTH; AND THE SYNOD HAS RESOLVED TO PUBLISH A NEW TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE, which (as the committee and TRANSLATORS CONSIST, ALMOST WITHOUT EXCEPTION, OF UNITARIANS) will doubtless favor their views—and thus the faith of the people, sustained by the old Dutch translation, one of the best in Europe, will be still further undermined' (Coxe, *An Apology for the Common Bible*, p. 18).

Here Coxe becomes even bolder in his predictions, warning that future revisions and re-translations would be taken over by Neologists, meaning those who are committed to religious novelties, such as Unitarians and German modernists. He proved this by what was happening even then in the Netherlands where the Unitarians had taken control and had resolved to publish a new translation of the esteemed Dutch Bible. Coxe's warning was precisely on target. The men that produced the English Revision of 1881 and 1885 and the American Standard Version of 1901 were, for the most part, committed to the new doctrines. At least three of the translators were Unitarians (George Vance Smith, Ezra Abbot, and Henry Thayer). Coxe predicted that future revisions would "be carried further," and nothing could be truer. The revision of 1881 replaced the old Greek Received New Testament with the critical Westcott-Hort text and introduced hundreds of thousands of changes, including many of the most glaring doctrinal character, such as the omission of "God" in 1 Timothy 3:16.

John Dowling

Another man who was standing for the King James Bible and against the modern versions in the nineteenth century prior to the battle against the English Revised Version was John Dowling, who pastored Baptist churches in Rhode Island (Providence) and New York (Broadway Baptist Church, New York City). Dowling was the author of the influential *History of Romanism*.

In 1843 Dowling published a defense of the KJV in *The Burning of the Bibles, Defence of the Protestant Version of the Scriptures Against the Attacks of Popish Apologists for the Champlain Bible Burners* (Philadelphia: Nathan Moore, 1843). This was occasioned by the burning of hundreds of King James Bibles by Jesuit priests in Carbo, New York (near Champlain) in October 1842 and by a

subsequent newspaper article by a Roman Catholic priest named John Corry in which the accuracy and authority of the King James Bible was attacked.

> The Bible which Protestants now use, was translated by order of King James. It was published in A.D. 1611. It is perhaps, the most accurate that has been made, in any language. It is the joint labour of forty-seven of the most learned oriental scholars in Europe; men of pure piety and christian honour. They were divided into six companies: each man had his share assigned to him: each company examined each translation made by individuals: each part of the translated Bible was examined, at least, fourteen times: and, was finally, adopted by the companies in full assembly. ... In this, have the defects, and errors of preceding translations, been carefully corrected (Dowling, pp. 10, 11).

Dowling quotes from seven authorities in praise of the King James Bible, such as John Selden, who said, "The English translation of the Bible is the best translation in the world," and J.W. Whitaker, who said, "It may be compared with any translation in the world without fear of inferiority; it has not shrunk from the most vigorous examination; it challenges investigation, and in spite of numerous attempts to supersede it, it has hitherto remained unrivalled in the affection of the country."

Dowling gave his own opinion that "as a whole, I have never yet seen a version which I would be willing to substitute for that as the commonly received version of the mass of the people" (p. 62).

In 1850, John Dowling published *The Old-Fashioned Bible, or Ten Reasons Against the Proposed Baptist Version of the New Testament* (New York: Edward H. Fletcher, 1850). It was an edited version of a message he had delivered at Hope Chapel, Broadway, March 31, 1850, and at First Baptist Church, Brooklyn, pastored by J. L. Hodge.

Dowling used the strongest terminology to describe his concern over the new version of the English Bible that had been published by the American and Foreign Bible Society. He spoke of "disastrous consequences to the Baptist denomination" and called it "the threatened evil" (p. 7).

In speaking against the Bible Society's new version, Dowling exalted the King James Bible:

> The fact is that the common version which it is proposed to amend, is, taken as a whole, a wonderful translation, and although it may be conceded that it is not perfect—for what human performance is so?—yet it is exceedingly doubtful, whether a translation has ever been made from any ancient book, Greek, Latin, or Oriental—which in point of faithfulness to its original can be compared with this, or which has fewer errors in proportion to the entire amount of its contents. ... to attempt to supplant it by a 'new version,' or to introduce any material alterations, would be like 'gilding refined gold'... It is sufficient to say that the hundred thousand of New York Baptists, and the million of American Baptists, have been made so chiefly by means of the good old English Bible. ... In

conclusion, then, I say, brethren, sisters and fathers, cling to your old-fashioned Bible! (*The Old-Fashioned Bible, or Ten Reasons against the Proposed Baptist Version of the New Testament*, 1850, pp. 11, 12, 13, 27, 36).

Conclusion

Further examples could be given of men who resisted the encroachment of the modern versions and the critical Greek text and who took a stand for the Traditional Text of Scripture and for the KJV prior to 1870 when the Revised Version Committee was formed.

For our part, we believe that those who stood against the critical Greek texts and the proposed revisions of the Authorized Bible in the nineteenth century did so on the grounds of truth and wisdom. We believe their position is as relevant today as it was 150 years ago. The critical Greek texts they were opposing are the same kind of Greek texts that the modern versions are based on. The proposed revisions to the Authorized Bible that they opposed were the same type of revisions we find in today's modern English versions. While I don't agree in every detail with these men and while I don't accept all of their conclusions and applications, I feel a great kinship with what I have seen of their writings on this point. Crackpots notwithstanding, their inheritors are the twentieth-century defenders of the King James Bible.

The point is that there were men throughout the nineteenth century who boldly defended the Traditional Greek and Hebrews texts against its enemies and who defended the King James Bible as an accurate translation of the right texts. In fact, it can safely be said that the vast majority of Bible believers of the 1800s rejected attempted revisions of the King James Bible. It should also be remembered that this was not a major issue for most English-speaking Christians until the call for Revision was made in 1870. Textual criticism was a budding specialty, an elitist field, and its findings were not widely accepted.

Some have tried to say that this was due to the fact that textual criticism had not yet come into full maturity. The fact is that the text adopted by the Anglo-American Revisers between 1870 and 1901 was basically the same text as that proposed by Griesbach and Lachmann and Tischendorf and Alford. While there were distinct differences between these texts, ALL WERE FOUNDED UPON SIMILAR PRINCIPLES, ALL ACCEPTED THE SAME PHILOSOPHY, ALL REJECTED THE RECEIVED TEXT. Practically every point given in opposition to the various critical texts of the first half of the 1800s can be applied directly to the Westcott-Hort text of the last half of the 1800s or to the United Bible Societies text of the 1990s.

Some try to dismiss the witness of nineteenth-century defenders of the King James Bible by claiming they were a bunch of sentimental traditionalists who simply could not accept change. Supposedly, these defenders held a mere

emotional attachment to the old English Bible and were blinded by their devotion to its glorious heritage. That emotion and tradition have played a role in the defense of the King James Bible in the last two hundred years, there can be no doubt, but what is wrong with being emotional about the blessed Scriptures! To say that this was the keynote of that defense, though, is silly and ignores the substance of the position held by the type of men we have sketched in this chapter.

CHAPTER THREE

FROM 1870 TO 1950

The Battle against Westcott-Hort and the English Revised Version

It was the call for a Revision of the Authorized Version that caused the battle of the Bible to reach fierce proportions. We saw in the last chapter that there was a growing sentiment for revision in some quarters during the first half of the nineteenth century. McComb tells us that "during the three years 1856-1858, no less than twenty works appeared dealing with the question [of a new version]" (*The Making of the English Bible*, p. 102). A number of voices were calling for an overhaul of the Old Bible.

The Theological Climate of the Nineteenth Century

It must be noted that the call for revision, and the succeeding creation of the Westcott-Hort Greek text and the English Revised Version, arose in an hour of deep theological confusion and social and philosophical turmoil. The keynote of the hour was not spiritual revival, but spiritual apostasy. We have alluded to this earlier, but here we want to give a fuller description of the theological climate of that time.

RATIONALISM. The Western nations were being overrun with religious Rationalism in the nineteenth century. Man's intellect was being exalted to the place of god. Religious Rationalism originated particularly in Germany, but its damnable influence reached into most theological institutions throughout the world. James Good, who wrote the *History of the Reformed Church of Germany 1620-1890*, testified that Rationalism was a terrible tide which "went over Germany like a flood."

Jean Astruc, beginning in 1753, claimed that Genesis was composed from a variety of sources. This documentary theory was carried over to the entire first five books of the Bible in the early 1800s, and many theologians began to believe that the Pentateuch was written by different men and edited into its present condition only a few hundred years before Christ. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) exalted human reason above biblical authority, philosophy over revelation. Heidelberg professor H.E.G. Paulus (1761-1851) devised naturalistic explanations

for Christ's miracles. Textual critic J.L. Hug (1765-1846) claimed that the Gospels of Mark and Luke were based, at least in part, on Matthew. C.H. Weisse, in 1838, claimed that Matthew and Luke were based on Mark and a second document called *Q*. Georg W.F. Hegel (1770-1831) led the German Idealist movement, turning his back on orthodox Christianity and promoting a type of pantheism. Tuebingen professor F.C. Baur (1792-1860) claimed that the Gospel of John was not written until 170 A.D. Auguste Comte (1798-1857) promoted scientific atheism, claiming there are no spiritual agencies in the universe, only facts discoverable by the senses. David Strauss (1808-1874) argued that the Bible's miracles were merely religious myths. Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) claimed that God was dead. Soren Kierkegaard (1813-1855) popularized existentialism in contrast to biblical absolutes. Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918) published the *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* in 1878, claiming that the Old Testament was not divine revelation, but merely the record of the evolution of Israel's religion. The Graf-Wellhausen theory, in its manifold and ever-changing forms, has permeated most theological education since the early 20th century. Karl Barth (1886-1968) denied the perfect, absolute inspiration of the Scriptures and argued obscurely that the Bible is only the Word of God as it is encountered in an existentialist fashion.

In reviewing the conditions in nineteenth-century Britain, Matthew Arnold said, "Clergymen and ministers of religion are full of lamentations over what they call the spread of scepticism ... '... the speculations of the day are working their way down among the people...'" (*Literature and Dogma*, 1873, p. vi).

Historian S.M. Houghton opens a window into this tumultuous era:

> The fact is that Germany, by the mid-19th century, was flooded by unbelief. Its schools and colleges, as well as its churches, contributed to this. Its Protestant hymn-book was revised in order to deprive it of much of its evangelical content. Philosophy replaced theology, and Scripture was dealt with savagely. Miracles ceased to be accounted miracles; they were explained away. Bible prophecies were discredited. Christ was robbed of his deity. His resurrection, it was said, never took place. Either he did not really die but suffered a fainting fit, or he retreated after his supposed death to some place known only to his disciples. G.F. Strauss startled the world by a *Life of Jesus* (published in 1835-36) which admitted a framework of fact, but claimed that much of the content of the Four Gospels was sheer mythology. Julius Wellhausen [1844-1910] achieved notoriety by attacking the orthodox teaching on the authorship, unity and inspiration of the Scriptures, and unhappily many followed in his steps. He was the chief pioneer of Higher Critical views, and under his influence many theologians throughout Western Europe and America questioned or abandoned the authority even of Christ himself (S.M. Houghton, *Sketches from Church History*, p. 239).

Writing in 1896, L.W. Munhall summarized the devastation that had already been visited upon Europe and Britain by Rationalism:

> **The unspiritual condition of the churches ... and the alarmingly prevalent skepticism, infidelity, and atheism among the masses of the people in Germany, Switzerland, and Holland is, without doubt, almost wholly attributable to the advocacy of these criticisms** by a large majority of the prominent pastors and theological professors in those lands. **The same condition of affairs is measurably true in England, Scotland, New England**, and in every community where this criticism is believed by any very considerable number of people and openly advocated (L.W. Munhall, *The Highest Critics vs. the Higher Critics*, p. 203).

Edward F. Hill, who included an excellent overview of the apostasy of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in his masterly book *The King James Version Defended*, stated the reason why nineteenth-century Protestantism succumbed so readily to modernism:

> Weakened by dead orthodoxy and pietism, conservative Protestants of the late 17th and 18th centuries failed to resist the rising neutral world-view as vigorously as they should have done. Instead of taking their stand upon God's revelation of Himself in holy Scripture and pointing out that the neutral world-view is not really neutral but antichristian and full of contradictions, they began to adopt it themselves, especially in those areas of thought not specifically covered by their Reformation creeds, namely, philosophy and biblical introduction and above all New Testament textual criticism (p. 44).

To fail to see the connection between the rationalism in theology and rationalism in textual criticism is a special kind of blindness, in my estimation. George Samson, President, Columbian University, noted the connection in 1882:

> ... **the adoption of the rule ... that 'individual opinion' as opposed to 'uniform historic testimony,' began the leaning to the authority of the Egyptian uncials which has now culminated**. ... That expression 'rests only on the internal evidence' is calculated to awaken thought ... **this rule, adopted more than a century ago in Germany, like much of German philosophy, has been 'weighed in the balance' of practical judgment and has been 'found wanting.' It is nothing else than the statement that a single modern student, in the seclusion of his study, has better means of judging of the 'character and style' of an ancient writer and of comprehending the 'genius and history of their times' than had all the contemporaries and immediate successors of the writer criticised. DISCOVERIES OF *IMPERFECTIONS* IN THE TEXT, of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures and of the Greek and Latin classic authors, WHICH ESCAPED THE KEN OF THEIR CONTEMPORARIES AND OF GENERATIONS OF NATIVE SCHOLARS FOR AGES SINCE, HAVE SOMEHOW BEEN REVEALED TO A SPECULATIVE CRITIC IN THE 18TH AND 19TH CENTURIES!** ...
>
> The four editors who followed the rule above cited are Griesbach, Knapp, Lachmann, and Scholz. **No two of these agreed**; Griesbach changed his decisions in successive editions; Scholz is inconsistent with himself; and Hahn restored much that his predecessors had discarded. ...
>
> **STUDIED EFFORT TO UNDERMINE THE INTEGRITY OF THE 'TEXTUS**

> **RECEPTUS' BEGAN IN GERMANY, AMONG THE REJECTERS OF THE SUPERNATURAL INTERPOSITION CLEARLY MANIFEST IN THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT RECORDS**; whose verity was maintained by evangelical as distinct from rationalistic interpreters. **IT WAS FOSTERED BY GERMAN SPECULATIVE TENDENCIES OF THOUGHT**; and has unconsciously pervaded the minds not only of a large class in the State Churches of Germany and of England, but has stolen into the Scottish Presbyterian State and Free Churches, and has also influenced a large class of American Biblical students who have over-estimated the comparative value of German philological research.
>
> The **speculative tendency** of German intellect ... has been manifest to the acutest and most comprehensive scholars in every department of research. ... Within the last twenty years Dornes in his exhaustive treatise, and Ritschl by his keen supplementary analysis, have shown, from their native point of view in German theology, how **the 'subjective' tendency to individual speculation has overruled 'objective' devotion to the impartial interpretation** of the teachings of Jesus and His apostles ...
>
> **MEANWHILE THE QUIET WORK OF UNDERMINING THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE WHOLE FABRIC OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH, THE INTEGRITY OF THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, HAS GONE ON; and that through the 'subjective' rule of 'internal evidence' unconsciously accepted as legitimate by editors of the Greek New Testament, like Griesbach and Hahn; and as unconsciously received by American and English as well as German Bible students** (Samson, *The English Revisers' Greek Text*, 1882, pp. 96, 97,126-128).

Dr. Samson understood perfectly the connection between German Rationalism and textual criticism. He understood that this heretical philosophy was being propagated through gullible students in theological institutions.

The growing influence of Modernism and the theological weakness of Christianity in the nineteenth-century was evident from the earliest days of Bible society work. The British & Foreign Bible Society, having been infiltrated with doctrine denying the deity of Jesus Chris *in the first few years of its existence*, was too weak to take a stand for the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The Trinitarian Bible Society had to be formed separately in 1831 by a small minority of BFBS members who refused to accept this apostasy.

COMMUNISM. In the late 1700s, Adam Smith transformed economics into an academic matter with his *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776). Smith's followers became increasingly radical as the years passed, "gravitating more and more toward socialism" and striving for state ownership of the economy. Karl Marx and Friedrick Engels published the *Communist Manifesto* in London in January 1848. A month later the French revolution broke out in all of its socialistic fury. In 1884 the Fabian Society was formed by a group of British socialists. Textual critics Westcott and Hort were both involved with this philosophy. Hort wrote of a "deep hatred of democracy

in all its forms" and had no objection "to a limit being placed by the State upon the amount of property which any one person may possess." He viewed the co-operative principle to be "better and mightier than the competitive principle." Foreshadowing the long history of anti-Americanism on the part of socialists and communists, Hort said, "...the American empire is a standing menace to the whole civilization of Europe ... it cannot be wrong to desire and pray from the bottom of one's heart that the American Union may be shivered to pieces."

EVOLUTION. An evolutionary concept of geology began to be promoted in the 1830s by Charles Lyell. Charles Darwin' (1809-1882) *The Origin of the Specie*, in 1859, applied the theory of evolution to the creatures in the world. In the 1871 sequel, *The Descent of Man*, Darwin was even more openly agnostic to the God of the Bible. Thomas Huxley (1825-1893) joined his voice with Darwin's in mocking biblical creation with *Zoological Evidences as to Man's Place in Nature* (1863) and *The Physical Basis of Life* (1868). Great numbers of Anglicans looked with various degrees of favor upon the new thinking, including Frederic Temple, the Archbishop of Canterbury. Textual critics Westcott and Hort both were sympathetic to evolutionary thought. One of Anglicanism's crown jewel universities, Cambridge, conferred an honorary doctorate upon Darwin.

ROMANISM. In 1870 Pope Pius IX summoned the first Vatican Council, which decreed that the pope was infallible when he spoke *ex cathedra* (literally "from the throne," referring to the blasphemous Roman claim that the pope is a spiritual ruler who has the authority to define doctrine). Romanism was already sweeping through England on the back of the Oxford movement (so called because its early leaders were associated with Oxford University). John Keble, Richard Hurrell Froude, and John Henry Newman began writing *Tracts for These Times* in 1833 to promote a Roman Catholicized Anglicanism. Thus the movement was also named *Tractarianism*. Edward Pusey joined them in 1841 and was so influential in the movement that its followers were called Puseyites. Though the movement was resisted by many within the Anglican communion, its influence was vast. By 1845 several hundred Anglican clergy had joined the Roman Catholic Church. H.G. Guinness gave the following witness to the success of the Oxford Movement:

> Fifty years ago [1837] there were not five hundred Roman priests in Great Britain; now there are two thousand six hundred. Fifty years ago there were not five hundred chapels; now there are fifteen hundred seventy-five. Fifty years ago there were no monasteries at all in Britain; now there are two hundred and twenty-five. There were even then sixteen convents, but now there are over four hundred of these barred and bolted and impenetrable prisons, in which fifteen thousand English women are kept prisoners at the mercy of a celibate clergy, who have power, unless their behests are obeyed, to inflict on these hapless and helpless victims torture under the name of penance. Fifty years ago there were but two colleges in our land for the training of Roman Catholic priests—i.e. of men bound by oath to act in England as agents of a foreign power, the one

> great object of which is avowed to be the dismemberment of our empire and the ruin of our influence in the world; now there are twenty-nine such schools (H.G. Guinness, *Romanism and the Reformation*, 1891, pp. 2, 3, as quoted by Co, pp. 20, 21).

Historian J.A. Froude wrote in great detail of the wretched spiritual climate in Britain in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Froude's father was an Anglican parish minister, and an older brother, Richard Hurrell Froude, as we have seen, joined the Oxford Movement and wrote one of the *Tracts* that popularized the movement in 1833. Thus, he was in a position to have first-hand information about the religious situation in England at that hour. The twin evils of Rationalism and Romanism had devastated Anglicanism.

> 'Mysteries' which had been dismissed as superstitions at the Reformation, and had never been heard of, were now preached again by half the clergy, and had revolutionized the ritual in our churches. Every county had its Anglican monasteries and convents. Romanism had lifted up its head again. It had its hierarchy and cardinals; it was a power in Parliament and in the London salons. The father confessors were busy in our families, dictating conditions of marriages, dividing wives from husbands, and children from parents.
>
> By the side of the revival of Catholicism there was a corresponding phenomenon of opposite and no less startling kind. Half a century ago any one who openly questioned the truth of Christianity was treated as a public offender and was excommunicated by society. **Now, while one set of men were bringing back medievalism, science and criticism were assailing with impunity the authority of the Bible; miracles were declared impossible; even Theism itself was treated as an open question, and subjects which in our fathers' time were approached only with the deepest reverence and solemnity were discussed among the present generation with as much freedom as the common problems of natural philosophy or politics.**
>
> **Both these movements [Romanism and Rationalism] began within a short distance of one another, and were evidently connected**. ...
>
> ... at present there is scarcely a clergyman in the country who does not carry upon him in one form or other the marks of the Tractarian movement. ... The Church of England has not only admitted Catholic doctrine but has rushed into it with extraordinary enthusiasm (Froude, *Short Studies about Great Subjects*, 1883, pp. 163, 164, 218).

In the context of the Romanizing influences that were spreading throughout Britain in the nineteenth century, we do not believe it is unimportant to note that many of the readings preferred by Westcott and Hort and the revisers of 1881 were those that had appeared in Catholic Bibles for centuries and had previously been condemned as corrupt by Protestants. After a careful examination of all of the various readings introduced by the Westcott-Hort text, Andrew Edgar (who worked on the revision committee) testified:

> It is certainly a remarkable circumstance that so many of the **Catholic readings in the New Testament, which in reformation and early post-reformation**

> **times were denounced by Protestants as corruptions** of the pure text of God's word, should now, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, be adopted by the revisers of our time-honoured English Bibles. ... We have seen that **in a large number of cases in which the revisers have departed from the text believed to underlie the authorised version of the New Testament they have adopted readings that Catholics have all along maintained to be the true letter of Scripture**. ... The most remarkable thing however, about some of the revised readings is that they have no apparent point of either resemblance or contrast to those they have superseded (Edgar, *The Bibles of England*, 1889, pp. 347, 70, 76).

Edgar, while finding this fact interesting enough to note in his book, didn't see a serious problem with it. We do.

James H. Sightler gave a summary contrasting the seventeenth century with the nineteenth in a message before the Dean Burgon Society in 1990:

> The AV 1611 was born in an age of belief. There was no Unitarianism, no Higher Criticism, no Socialism, and no Darwinism. The English language had entered a golden period. There were classical scholars writing whose books would be used of the Lord 120 years later to help bring about the conversion of Wesley and Whitefield. By 1881 the Anglican church had been seriously damaged by Arianism, Socianism, apathy, unbelief, Socialism, Darwinism, and worst of all, had had to accommodate itself to the Oxford movement with its Catholicized ritual. By 1881 the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Oxford Press had felt it expedient to publish a 39-volume *Oxford Library of the Fathers* which was a paean to the founders of the Catholic church and which was edited by none other than Philip Schaff. True piety was unacceptable; spiritual deadness was the order of the day. **THE MID-19TH CENTURY WAS THE WORST POSSIBLE TIME FOR TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE. THE RESULT—THAT IS THE ENGLISH REVISED VERSION OF 1881 AND ITS DESCENDANTS, THE AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION**, **THE NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION**, **THE NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION—was entirely predictable**.

It is a well-known fact that Charles Haddon Spurgeon spent the last years of his life fighting against the "downgrade" in theology that had undermined his Baptist denomination. In 1887, he wrote the following haunting words:

> **A chasm is opening between the men who believe their Bibles and the men who are prepared for an advance upon Scripture.** ... Those who hold evangelical doctrine are in open alliance with those who call the fall a fable, who deny the personality of the Holy Ghost, who call justification by faith immoral, and hold that there is another probation after death. ... Attendance at places of worship is declining and reverence for holy things is vanishing. We solemnly believe this to be largely attributable to **the scepticism which has flashed from the pulpit and spread among the people.**

Spurgeon thus describes for us the wretched spiritual condition that existed in Britain in his day. End-time apostasy was coming into blossom.

The Bible League, which was formed in Britain in 1892, describes the spread of

apostasy from that day until now in these words:

> Spurgeon's days saw apostasy as a trickle; by the time of the Bible League's foundation [1892] it had become a stream; shortly it expanded to a river, and today it has become a veritable ocean of unbelief. For the most of men the ancient landmarks have disappeared from sight. Life upon earth has become a voyage on an uncharted ocean in a cockle-shell boat 'tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine.' Never before in human history has the 'sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive' (Eph. 4:14) been so greatly in evidence. 'Evil men and seducers wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived' (2 Tim. 3:13) (S.M. Houghton, "The Bible League: Its Origin and Its Aims" 1971, *Truth Unchanged, Unchanging*, Abingdon: The Bible League, 1984).

It was in this pot of end-time theological confusion that the stew of the critical Greek text and the modern translations was cooked up.

Proposals for Revision

The first official proposal for revision of the Authorized Bible came in March 1856, when William Selwyn petitioned the Lower House of Convocation. There being little support for the proposal, it was withdrawn. In July of the same year, Mr. James Heywood, M.P. for North Lancashire, attempted to have the House of Commons address the Crown on the subject of a revision, but his motion was withdrawn because of severe opposition.

That same year (1856) Ernest Hawkins, secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, brought together a group of five Anglican ministers with the goal of producing a private revision of the Authorized Version. These were Charles Ellicott (later the New Testament Revision Committee Chairman), Henry Alford, W.H.G. Humphry, John Barrow, and G. Moberly. Between 1857 and 1863 they published several revised portions of the English Bible under the title of *Revision of the Authorized Version, by Five Clergymen.* This work has been called "the germ of the 1881 revision."

On February 10, 1870, a resolution was passed unanimously by the Upper House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury (Southern Province of the Church of England) appointing a committee with the following commission:

> To report upon the desirableness of a revision of the Authorized Version of the Old and New Testament, whether by marginal notes or otherwise, in all those passages where plain and clear errors, whether in the Hebrew or Greek text originally adopted by the translators, or in the translations made from the same, shall, on due investigation, be found to exist.

Note that this was not a resolution authorizing the replacement of the Greek Received Text with a new one, nor was it a resolution authorizing a general overhaul of the King James Bible. It was a resolution merely authorizing an exploration of the desirableness of a *revision*.

The proposal for revision stirred up a great debate and focused the attention of Christians on the issue of texts and versions. A great many men of God stood publicly against the Revised Version and in so doing used the occasion to affirm their conviction that the KJV was an accurate translation of the preserved Greek and Hebrew texts. Of course there were many sides to the Bible version debate of that day. Some wanted NO revision. Of these, some wanted no revision *ever*, while others only wanted no revision *at that time.* Others wanted SLIGHT revision. Of these, there were differences pertaining to exactly *how* slight and exactly *which* slight changes to make. Others wanted CONSIDERABLE revision. Again, there was a variety within this grouping as to the precise nature of the revision. Still others wanted a TOTAL revision along the lines of the most radical critical Greek texts. Very few supported these last two positions.

Within three months, in May 1870, the committee reported on their findings in these words:

> (1) That it is desirable that a revision of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken. (2) That the revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings and such emendations as it may be found necessary to insert in the text of the Authorized Version. (3) That in the above resolutions WE DO NOT CONTEMPLATE ANY NEW TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE, or any alteration of the language, except where, in the judgment of the most competent scholars, such change is necessary. (4) That in such necessary changes the style of the language in the existing version be closely followed. (5) That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong (*Comparative New Testament: Old and New Versions Arranged in Parallel Columns,* Preface, Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1881, p. 9).

This proposal was couched in language that could be interpreted to support widely varying positions. The majority of Bible believers who wanted no overhaul of the Authorized Bible and who only wanted to see some antiquities and obscurities cleared up, would have been somewhat comforted, unless they knew the radical position of some of the men who would participate in the revision, inasmuch as the proposal itself DID NOT CONTEMPLATE ANY NEW TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE. Nothing was said about the fact that the Greek Received Text was going to be rejected as the basis for the translation, to be replaced by a critical text that was even then in the hands of Westcott and Hort.

On the other hand, those who favored the most radical "revision" of the Authorized Version could find support for their objective in the proposal. Did it not allow for alteration where "IN THE JUDGMENT OF THE MOST COMPETENT SCHOLARS, SUCH CHANGE IS NECESSARY"? Those who considered themselves the most competent scholars, regardless of how radical their judgment, could have felt they had been given license by the wording of

this proposal.

The Duplicity of the Revision: How a Minor Revision Became Radical

There can be no doubt that the average Christian of the late nineteenth century who read the proposal would have believed it was calling only for a slight revision—updating of language and perhaps minor textual changes. We are convinced that was precisely the effect intended by some who were rushing forward with a radical agenda to replace the Received Text under the guise of gentle revision. If the proposal had boldly and honestly called for the replacement of the Received Text with the Westcott-Hort text and for a radical overhaul of the Authorized Version, it would never have seen the light of day.

George Samson testified in 1882 of the general impression of the Christian populace as to the original intent of the revision committee:

> When the revision of the received version of the English Scriptures was proposed in England by the Canterbury Convocation ... *few, if any, outside of the original and controlling majority had the conception that anything more than a revision of the translation of the text generally received in all branches of the Christian Church, Greek and Oriental, Catholic and Protestant, was proposed.* The fact is now made public that some, in the company of revisers selected from the English Church itself, were, from the first, as much surprised as the Christian world at large have been; for the Bishop of St. Andrews, in his late charge to his synod, states, as to his own impressions of the revisers' work during its progress: *'The more I saw of the work, the more it appeared to me that we were going beyond the purpose for which, as I understood it, we have been appointed'* (Samson, *The English Revisers' Greek Text*, pp. 9, 10).

The fact is that the project was approved *only because those who staunchly supported it made every attempt to quiet the fears of the majority and to deny that they were setting about to produce a radical revision of the Old Bible*. Samuel Hemphill, who wrote a detailed history of the English Revised Version, states this:

> In such cautious and judicious manner was the project of New Testament revision discussed during the dozen years from 1858-1870; nor can it be too distinctly or too emphatically affirmed that **THE RELUCTANCE OF THE PEOPLE COULD NEVER HAVE BEEN OVERCOME BUT FOR THE STUDIOUS MODERATION AND APPARENTLY RIGID CONSERVATION WHICH THE ADVOCATES OF REVISION WERE CAREFUL TO ADOPT**. ... even the most ardent reformers **were obliged by the force of public opinion to confine their proposals to the mere removal of sporadic errors**, thus leaving the old English Bible to all intents and purposes in its integrity, or at least with its rhythmical and sonorous diction not appreciably altered....
>
> And, as to **THE GREAT BULK OF CHRISTIAN ENGLISHMEN, THEY WOULD MUCH RATHER HAVE APPOINTED A COMMITTEE TO REWRITE THEIR**

SHAKESPEARE THAN THEIR VENERATED AND BELOVED BIBLE. It was therefore no easy task to persuade people in general to extend even ordinary toleration to any attempt, however conservative, to improve on the great work of 1611; and it may truthfully be said that literary men, other than theologians, almost without exception frowned on the enterprise (Hemphill*, A History of the Revised Version of the New Testament*, 1906, pp. 25,26).

Consider these comments made in the year 1870 by Bishop Charles Ellicott, who was appointed to head up the New Testament section of the revision committee:

> We may be satisfied with the attempt to correct plain and clear errors**, but there it is our duty to stop** (emphasis added) (Ellicott, *Speech in Convocation*, Feb. 1870, p. 83).
>
> Nothing is more satisfactory at the present time than the evident feelings of veneration for our Authorized Version, **and the very generally-felt desire for as little change as possible** (emphasis added) (Ellicott, *Considerations on Revision*, May 23, 1870, p. 99).
>
> What course would Revisers have us to follow? ... **Would it be well for them to agree on a Critical Greek Text? To this question we venture to answer very unhesitatingly in the negative**. ... we have certainly not yet acquired sufficient critical judgment for any body of Revisers hopefully to undertake such a work as this (emphasis added) (Ibid., p. 44).
>
> We have now, at all events, **no fear of an over-corrected Version** (Ibid., p. 205).
>
> We should hardly be far wrong **in estimating the amount of changes** that would be introduced in any English revised Version of the whole 6944 verses of the New Testament, **as not exceeding one for every five verses, or under fourteen hundred in all**, very many of these being of wholly unimportant character (Ibid., p. 52). [The actual changes made by Ellicott and the revisers numbered 36,000, or four and one-half changes per verse. Eleven years after the previous remarks Ellicott admitted that he had vastly underestimated the amount of change which would be made.]
>
> **No reasonable Englishman would tolerate a Version designed for popular use, and to be read publicly, that departed from the ground-principles and truly noble diction of the last revision** (Ibid., p. 53).
>
> The question will really turn on the amount of and nature of the changes. **If few and good, they will be accepted**, if not, they will not meet with acceptance either at home or abroad (Ibid., p. 199).
>
> The really monumental character of our Version is the best protection against progressive change, and this protection, we cannot help feeling persuaded, as long as England is England, will be always found available and sufficient (Ibid., p. 200).

Hemphill summarizes Ellicott's 1870 call for revision in these words: "He emphasized 'the wise and leading principle of minimized alteration and guarded change.' ... He warned the future revisers against 'over-correction,' 'over-

pressing,' 'mechanical uniformity,' 'innovation,' and efforts to 'improve'" (Hemphill, pp. 27, 28).

It is important to note also that Ellicott had participated in the effort mentioned earlier to produce a preliminary revision of the English Bible in 1857. Pay careful attention as he looks back on this in 1903:

> There was thus a real danger, unless some forward step was quickly and prudently taken that the excitement might gradually evaporate and the movement for revision might die out. ... Ernest Hawkins ... came forward and persuaded a few of us ... to combine and publish a version of one of the books of the New Testament which might practically demonstrate to friends and to opponents what sort of a revision seemed desirable under existing circumstances...
>
> The effect produced by this *tentamen* [preliminary edition] was indisputably great. ... The work in fact became a kind of object lesson. It showed plainly that there were errors in the Authorised Version that needed correction [Editor: plainly, that is, only to certain 'scholars'!]. It further showed that their removal and the introduction of improvements in regard of accuracy **did not involve**, either in quantity or quality, **the changes that were generally apprehended**. And lastly, it showed in its results that **scholars of different habits of thought could combine in the execution of such a work without friction or difficulty**.
>
> **In regard of the Greek text but little change was introduced**. The basis of our translation was the third edition of Stephens ... As we ourselves state in the preface, '**our object was to revise a version, not to frame a text**.' (Ellicott, *Addresses on the Revised Version of Holy Scripture*, 1903, pp. 11-14).

That Ellicott would, with straight face, write this in 1903, after he had overseen a translation project that went miles beyond the 1857 revision, is amazing. Note: (1) Those involved in the project understood that there was not a mood among Christians in general for a revision of the King James Bible and that many were afraid that any official revision would go beyond the desired bounds of making minor improvements to the KJV. Their project was therefore an attempt to mollify and manipulate the people in this regard. (2) The 1857-63 revision was only a minor revision of the old English Bible and was not an effort to replace the Greek Received Text, yet it was put forth as an example of the type of revision that would be made officially. (3) Ellicott claimed that the 1857 revision showed "that scholars of different habits of thought could work without friction or difficulty." Why didn't he admit that the 1857-63 revision was a misrepresentation in this matter as well and that it absolutely was NOT an example of what actually occurred in the formal Revision Committee, which was characterized by bitter infighting and wrangling and contention from beginning to end? The textual readings chosen to replace the TR did not enjoy unanimity of scholarship, or anything even close to unanimity.

Yet only weeks after making these statements to comfort those who feared a

radical revision of the KJV, Ellicott allowed Westcott and Hort to introduce their unpublished critical Greek text *clandestinely to his committee*! Does anyone really believe Ellicott had not previously known about the Westcott-Hort text? I can't swallow that. Though we do not know the full details of all of this, and will not this side of eternity, there can be no doubt that there was a lot of duplicity on the part of many of these men. Consider this fact: On May 23 Ellicott said, "What course would Revisers have us to follow? ... *Would it be well for them to agree on a Critical Greek Text? To this question we venture to answer very unhesitatingly in the negative*. ... *we have certainly not yet acquired sufficient critical judgment for any body of Revisers hopefully to undertake such a work as this*." Less than one month later, on June 22, the New Testament revision committee began doing precisely what Ellicott had said they were incapable of doing: they began to agree on a critical Greek text!

Whether Ellicott was setting out to deceive or whether he was only later caught up by Westcott and Hort's enthusiasm for radical change, only the Lord knows. More than one of the revisers wrote about "the itch of change" that overtook the project. Others testified of the persuasive powers of Dr. Hort, who made every attempt to sway the committee to his own radical position. The more I have read of Ellicott's writings and work, the less respect I have had for the man. He was weak and vacillating and lacking in spiritual discernment—precisely the type of chairman desired by those on the committee who were attempting to use the revision as an occasion to overthrow the Received Text. Burgon points out that Ellicott had, previous to his participation in the Revision committee, spoken against the various critical Greek texts (which found their culmination in the Westcott-Hort text adopted by the Revisers). The following interesting testimony appeared in Burgon's *Letter to the Right Rev. Charles John Ellicott in Reply to His Pamphlet in Defence of the Revisers and Their Greek Text of the New Testament*:

> A word in your private ear, (by your leave) in passing. You seem to have forgotten that, **at the time when you entered on the work of Revision, *your own* estimate of the Texts put forth by these editors was the reverse of favourable; i.e. was scarcely distinguishable from that of your present correspondent** [Burgon is referring to himself]. Lachmann's you described as 'a text composed on *the narrowest and most exclusive* principles,'—'really based on *little more than four manuscripts*.'—'The case of Tischendorf' (you said) 'is still more easily disposed of. Which of this most inconstant Critic's texts are we to select? Surely not the last, in which an exaggerated preference for a single manuscript has betrayed him into an *almost childlike infirmity of judgment*. Surely also not the seventh edition, which exhibits all the instability which a comparatively recent recognition of the authority of cursive manuscripts might be supposed likely to introduce.'—as for poor Tregelles, you said:—'His critical principles ... are now, perhaps justly, called in question.' His text 'is rigid and mechanical, and sometimes fails to disclose *that critical instinct and peculiar scholarly sagacity which'* have since evidently disclosed themselves in perfection in those Members of the Revising body who, with Bp. Ellicott at their

> head, systematically outvoted Prebendary Scrivener in the Jerusalem Chamber. **But with what consistency, my lord Bishop, do you to-day vaunt 'the principles' of the very men whom yesterday you vilipended precisely because *their 'principles'* then seemed to yourself so utterly unsatisfactory**? (Burgon*, Revision Revised*, pp. 378, 379).

Regardless of what he said at the start of the Revision, it was not long before Ellicott was sold out to the Westcott-Hort methodology. Immediately after the completion of the Revision, Ellicott co-authored a defense of the Westcott-Hort critical theories. Only years later did he turn back somewhat from supporting these views of textual criticism. Hemphill describes these events:

> At all events, the Company, having once for all been set going on its course, travelled faster and farther than the public or even the Chairman had expected. The ball having been set rolling could not be stopped by any power in that Jerusalem Chamber; and a **strong and united group of Progressives quickly manifested the determination to impress their principles, their ideals, and, it may be added, their personalities, fully upon the work** (Hemphill, p. 46).

We must repeat that had it not been for influential voices such as Ellicott's, *which were encouraging the public that only a minor revision was planned*, there would not have been sufficient support even for the partial authorization they eventually received. For a minor revision to have been proposed and defended by key men, then for those same men to allow, instead, the replacement of the Greek Received Text with a new one was treasonous.

The Secretive Greek Text of Westcott and Hort

The deception of the Revision is further evident in the fact that the revisers agreed to Westcott and Hort's requirements that their Greek text be circulated among themselves alone under strict pledge of secrecy.

> Westcott and Hort had been working together on their text since 1853; in 1870 they printed a tentative edition for private distribution only. This they **circulated under pledge of secrecy** within the company of New Testament revisers, of which they were members. It soon became evident that the New Testament committee was not going to be content merely to revise the Authorized Version, but was determined to revise the underlying Greek text radically (Alfred Marti*, A Critical Examination of the Westcott-Hort Textual Theory*, 1951, p. 60).

Samuel Hemphill traces the decision to exceed the bounds of the instructions which had been given to the revisers directly to Westcott and Hort and their friend, Lightfoot.

> For many years he [Hort] had been toiling at a critical edition of the Greek Testament in collaboration with Professor Westcott, and both these able scholars were the intimate friends and colleagues of Professor Lightfoot. ... **These three men—'the Cambridge Trio, as they were called—proved the strongest group amongst the Revisers, and indelibly stamped the**

Revision with their own individuality from the very outset. ... In fact it can hardly be doubted that Hort's was the strongest will of the whole Company, and his adroitness in debate was only equalled by his pertinacity....

... it may easily be imagined what a powerful effect their fighting qualities of fearless confidence and incessant tenacity would have upon 'the great majority' who, in the words of one of them, 'had never made' textual criticism 'a subject of special study.' ... these two Revisers were in the habit of entrusting privately the proof sheets of their forthcoming text to the other members of the Company, and were punctually present at the meetings, where they could expound and enforce the principles on which that text rested, as well as contend for the particular readings of the text itself; **A TEXT, BE IT ALWAYS REMEMBERED, WHICH HAD NEVER BEEN EVEN SEEN BY THE PUBLIC, NOR SUBJECTED TO THE ORDEAL OF INDEPENDENT CRITICISM**, inasmuch as it was not published till the very day on which the Revised Version came out. ...

It is true that Ellicott tries to minimise the amount of influence which Westcott and Hort exercised on their colleagues ... But, whatever individual members of the Company may have said on one side or the other, the stubborn fact remains that **Ellicott himself mentions sixty-four passages of the Greek Testament in which the Revisers made changes in the textus receptus which were not supported by any one of the great critical editors, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, but were in conformity with the results arrived at by Westcott and Hort**, **in whose hands the 'pruning-knife cut deeper' than in those of any of the aforesaid editors**. ... here we find on the Chairman's own admission, that in no fewer than sixty-four instances the Revisers outdistanced Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles in their revolt from the traditional text ... Indeed several Revisers have in plain English confessed that in textual matters they did follow the guidance of Westcott and Hort. ...

Probably nine-tenths of the textual struggles and 'countless divisions' at the table in that old Jerusalem Chamber were about that very question as to the proper amount of weight to be accorded to the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS., Hort and Westcott claiming pre-eminence for the consensus, while Scrivener pleaded for caution. ...

The textual work of the Revisers was done in a tremendous hurry under the inexorable pressure exerted by the personal influence and eager advocacy of the two Cambridge theorists, and was to that extent in the nature of a leap in the dark....

Such was the result of some of Hort's 'stiff battles,' and 'incessant voting and speaking'; of Westcott's 'hard fighting' and 'battles royal'; and of the 'ceaseless differences of opinion and countless divisions' mentioned by Ellicott afterwards in his speech in Convocation. Plastic minds were molded by Hort and Westcott ...

THE DOMINANT FACTION OF TEXTUAL CRITICS, HAVING AT THEIR BECK AND CALL A WORKING MAJORITY OF AMATEURS READY FOR THE SOUND OF THE DIVISION-BELL, PUSH THEIR UNPROVED, UNPUBLISHED, AND UNCRITICISED THEORIES TO THE UTMOST LIMITS,

SHOWING NEITHER REVERENCE FOR THE TRADITIONAL TEXT NOR CONSIDERATION FOR ITS DEFENDERS, BUT USING THEIR TYRANT MAJORITY TO PRACTICALLY CLOSURE THEM (Hemphill, *A History of the Revised Version,* pp. 48-62).

George Salmon (1819-1904) was a contemporary with Westcott and Hort and published books on textual criticism (*A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament*, 1889, and *Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 1897). He warned about Hort's lawyer-like ability to prove any point. "That which gained Hort so many adherents had some adverse influence with myself—I mean his extreme cleverness as an advocate; for I have felt as if there were no reading so improbable that he could not give good reasons for thinking it to be the only genuine" (Salmon, *Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 1897, pp. 33-34).

Many of the Revisers Were Unhappy with Their Own Work

The English revisers so blatantly overran their authority and so grossly introduced unnecessary changes that MANY OF THEM LATER CRITICIZED AND REPUDIATED THEIR OWN WORK!

Charles Wordsworth, Bishop of St. Andrews refused to sign his name to a testimonial of thanks to the Chairman because he was so discouraged by the "number of minute and unnecessary changes made in direct violation of the instructions under which the work was undertaken." Looking back on the revision, Wordsworth called it "a deplorable failure." Lee regretted "the number of changes which altered the rhythm of the Authorized Version." Stanley was constantly opposed to the Westcott-Hort innovations. Trench, Moberly, and Wordsworth were so disgusted with the revision that each man had been "anxious at different times to resign." Merivale said, "We are altogether playing havoc with the old text, in spite of my strong conservative inclination—not influence, I am sorry to say." Scott said, "We are impoverishing the English language." Humphrey said, "Each of us, times without number, has been outvoted by a 'tyrant majority.'" Moberly said, "The Version as it stands does not exhibit the real judgment of any of the Revisers. Each one was, many times, outvoted in points which he greatly valued." Kennedy said that he "would fain hope [that the Revision] is not unalterably permanent." Even the Unitarian G. Vance Smith said the revision contains "no small amount of elaborate over-correction."

After diligent examination of the record, Hemphill testified, "Comparatively few of the Revisers gave it their calm approval when they were able to look back and review it in the light of its results."

The Southern Convocation, which had authorized the revision, was "extremely frigid" in its reception of the finished product. The Convocation assembled on the

day of the Revision's publication and heard Ellicott's "distinctly apologetic" speech that accompanied the formal presentation of the Revision. The lack of enthusiasm for the new version was evident in the fact that the assembly concluded, not with a testimony to the glories of the Revision, but to that of the Old Version the Revision was supposed to replace, and with the statement that the Revision "did not supersede that version of the Scriptures which all English-speaking Christians had learnt to esteem and love"! Hemphill says that this statement brought forth agreeing cheers of 'Hear, hear" from the assembled Bishops!

One of the revisers described the activity of the revision company in these words:

> In saying this, however, I more or less condemn myself. For when **THE ITCH OF CHANGE** (if I may so speak) took possession of the Company, I was infected by it. But as the work went on, I was one of those who saw that the changes which were being made were not only far too many, but, out of a desire to squeeze out the last shred of the sense, were destroying the purity of the English, and all hope of our version being accepted by the public (James Brown, *Memoir of David Brown*, p. 222).

The "itch for change" is a good description of Bible translation activity in the English language from 1870 to present.

The Revision Project Itself Was Secretive

It was not only the new Greek text that was kept hidden from the public; THE ENTIRE REVISION PROJECT WAS SECRETIVE.

> The English New Testament Revision Company labored for ten long years behind closed doors, all was silent, the general public knew very little about what was going on behind those closed doors. The same rule of secrecy prevailed in the American Company (George Coy*, The Inside Story of the Anglo American Revised New Testament*, p. 41).

On December 7, 1871, a resolution was presented to the American revision committee from England saying: "... that, upon the assurance of Dr. Schaff that the work, so far as it is at present advanced, will be considered as *strictly confidential*, the company will send a sufficient number of copies for Dr. Schaff and his brother revisers, *for their own private use*, *the copies to be in no way made public beyond themselves*" (John Stoughton, *Our English Bible*, p. 299).

Expanding on this secretive aspect of the work, Unitarian reviser G. Vance Smith related, "It was a rule acted upon throughout that the work done in the Jerusalem Chamber, as well as the opinions expressed by the members, with the results arrived at, and the grounds on which changes were either made or left unmade, *should all be considered 'private and confidential*.'"

Matthew Brown Riddle, a member of the American revision committee, gives more information on the American committee's participation in the secrecy: "The

New Testament Company received copies of the Synoptical Gospels, all marked 'private and confidential,' with a written statement from Bishop Ellicott upon each, designating the person for whom the copy was intended, and the confidential use to be made of it" (Riddle, *The Story of the Revised New Testament,* 1908, p. 15).

The behind-the-scenes plotting that produced the Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament and the English Revised Version began many years before the project actually got underway. In the official *Historical Account of the Work of the American Committee of Revision*, which appeared in 1885, the year the Revised Old Testament was published, we find the following interesting information:

> As year by year went onward, **EVERY CHANGE IN PUBLIC OPINION WAS CLOSELY WATCHED by those who had taken part in the revision just mentioned** [the private revision of 1857-63 made by five Anglican clergymen], and especially by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol and Dean Alford. ... The Bishop and Dean frequently conferred on the subject, consulted all those who were in any degree likely to forward the undertaking, and at length obtained the hearty aid and support of Bishop Wilberforce (*Historical Account of the Work of the American Committee of Revision,* p. 4).

Is this the way that good men labor? By watching public opinion and plotting secretly to take advantage of it? It should be noted in passing, that Bishop Wilberforce, though he did help get the project approved, later backed away from the revision. He attended only one meeting, that being the preliminary meeting on July 14, 1870. Why did he stop attending? There have been various surmises, but Samuel Hemphill, who looked into the history of the Anglo-American Revision very carefully not long after it was published, said:

> But, two days after this his only appearance, he wrote to his intimate friend Henry Parry Liddon as follows: 'What can be done in **THIS MOST MISERABLE BUSINESS**? My own conviction is nothing, and that I should only increase the evil by my own distinct and, as I find on every side thoroughly apprehended disclaimer of all fellowship with **THE MISCHIEF**."
>
> But we have a still plainer letter, though not in his own biography, which contains these significant words: 'I have done all that I could—**I NEVER ATTEND THE COMPANY BECAUSE OF THE SOCINIAN'S [UNITARIAN'S] PRESENCE**.'
>
> Such, then, was the real reason of the absence of Samuel Wilberforce from the Jerusalem Chamber (Hemphill, *A History of the Revised Version of the New Testament,* pp. 36-37, 39).

As we have seen, the American revision committee was likewise sworn to secrecy regarding the proceedings of the work. Schaff and company agreed to this. Schaff, in the official report on the Anglo-American Bible Revision, testified:

> The Revision has been wisely carried on **without publicity**, and **the actual results of their labors are not yet made known**. Any public statement, therefore, of particular changes are wholly unauthorized and premature (*Anglo-*

American Bible Revision: by Members of the American Revision Committee, p. 19).

All of this is in great contrast to the Authorized Version of 1611. That translation project was open and honest. The public was kept informed of the progress and details of the translation, and scholars and pastors throughout the land were invited to share their thoughts and concerns with the translators. "On all hard passages they called to their aid the appropriate departments of both universities. All scholars everywhere were asked to send in any contributions, to correct or criticize as they would. Public announcement of the work was made, and all possible help was besought and gladly accepted" (McAfee, *The Greatest English Classic*, p. 62).

Rule XII, which guided the work of the King James Bible translation committee, stated:

> Letters to be sent from every bishop to the rest of his clergy, admonishing them of this translation in hand, and to move and charge as many as, being skilful in tongues, and having taken pains in that kind, to send his particular observations to the company, either at Westminster, Cambridge, or Oxford, according as it was directed before in the King's letter to the Archbishop.

Truth loves light.

The duplicity of the English Revisers is also evident in the fact that they entirely ignored rule number 4 of the guiding principles under which they were instructed to carry out the project. "... when the Text so adopted differs from that from which the Authorised Version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin."

The revisers incorporated at least 5,337 changes in the Greek Received Text. That was the actual count made by Dr. Scrivener, a member of the revision committee. How many of these five thousand plus changes were noted in the margin? Only a few.

The "revisers," who were appointed merely to improve the Authorized Bible, ignored and disobeyed their carefully-annotated instructions and became a law unto themselves.

Upon What Authority Was the Revision Made?

It is also important to state that whereas the King James Bible was authorized by the British Crown, the nineteenth-century revision was not so approved. In fact, the Crown, being approached for its blessing, had twice refused to participate. It had been first approached in 1856 by James Heywood, whose motion in favor of appointing a Royal Commission was "withdrawn after the briefest discussion, in which it became evident that the Government as represented by Sir George Grey *would have nothing to do with it*" (Samuel Hemphill, *A History of the Revised Version of the New Testament*, p. 23).

The second approach was attempted a few years later and again repulsed:

> ...it was deemed desirable that **an address to the Crown** should be moved for in the House of Lords, and in the following terms: 'That a humble address be presented to Her Majesty praying Her Majesty to appoint a Royal Commission to revise the Authorised Version...' Before, however, so responsible a step was taken, careful inquiry was made how far such a resolution would obtain the support of those in authority**. It was found that support could not be promised**. **... the plan of a Royal Commission was at once given up** (Hemphill, p. 6).

This is more than interesting in light of the fact, not only that the King James Bible was produced *under the direct authority of the British Crown*, but also that the copyright for the King James Bible *resides with the Crown*. In a legal and historic sense, within the British context, the Crown has the sole authority to authorize a revision of this Bible.

> **The solemn revision of the English Bible, for England at least, should be carried on in the same spirit and with the same devout feeling with which the translation was originally made in King James's time; that is, BY ROYAL COMMAND**, to the archbishops and bishops of the realm, who in their official capacity, as heads spiritual of the Church, should choose and appoint a number of fit persons to meet together for the purpose (S.C. Malan, *A Vindication of the Authorized Version of the English Bible*, 1856, p. v).

The King James Version was produced under royal command. Its revision should have had royal approval, but it did not. It only had the "authority" of one branch of the Church of England, the other branch as well as the Crown REFUSING TO COOPERATE.

The Revision Was Widely Opposed

The overall resistance to the Revision, even couched in clever language and even with its more radical aspects shrouded in secrecy, was so great that only the Southern Province of the Anglican communion was willing to support the Revised Version. The Northern Province, the Convocation of the Province of York, declined on February 23, 1870, saying that while they favored the correction of certain blemishes, they would "deplore any recasting of the text." Moulton, in his *History of the English Bible*, said that the northern convocation urged (1) that the time was not favourable for revision and (2) that the risk was greater than the probable gain. George P. Marsh voiced the concerns of many when he said of the revision effort, "*It is a purely sectarian, not to say schismatic movement*, and as such calculated to widen rather than to narrow the divisions which exist between the different Protestant churches of the English speech" (Edwin Cone Bissell, *The Historic Origin of the Bible*, p. 392).

On May 25, 1870, the Southern Province determined to proceed with the Revision and adopted eight rules that would control the project. Number one was "to

INTRODUCE AS FEW ALTERATIONS AS POSSIBLE into the Text of the Authorized Version consistently with faithfulness*" (Comparative New Testament: Old and New Versions Arranged in Parallel Columns,* Preface, 1881, p. 9).

The revisors' definition of "few alterations" was marvelous to behold. Note, too, that they said they were not contemplating a new translation, yet their Revision used an entirely different Greek text than that underlying the Authorized Version, differing in 5,788 places. The revisors made 36,191 changes in the English (Miller, *General Introduction to the Bible,* p. 372)!

There was a small minority on the Revision committee that resisted the wholesale revision that was carried on and did not support the replacement of the Greek Received Text, but their voices were ignored. A glimpse into these struggles is seen in the following quote:

> It is therefore no surprise to us to be told by another Reviser that Dr. Eadie, who was, withstanding his great erudition, generally a silent member of the Company, belonging to the Conservative school of Revisers. So also did Dr. Roberts, Bishop [Charles] Wordsworth, and Principal Brown. They sent in a joint protest, says Roberts, and—
>
> '**Expressed themselves in writing against the unduly wide scope**, as they imagined, which the Revision has assumed in the hands of the majority of the Company. Dr. Brown was especially emphatic on this point. He often stated to the writer his dissent from the manifold, and as it seemed both to him and me, **unnecessary latitude of changes** which had been accepted by the Revisers' (Samuel Hemphill, A *History of the Revised Version of the New Testament*).

The point we are making is that there was widespread resistance to the revision of the Authorized Version, and a great many of those who resisted the Revision did so on the grounds that the Traditional Greek Text underlying the KJV was the preserved Word of God.

A summary of the outcry against the English Revised Version is given by Bishop D.A. Thompson: "Devout Christians were stunned, bewildered and irrevocably opposed to the many ejections, and other alterations made in the text or given in the footnotes of the Revised New Testament (1881)" (Thompson*, The Controversy Concerning the Last Twelve Verse of the Gospel According to Mark*, p. 5).

Dr. Frederick Field (who is cited by Burgon as a scholar of the highest caliber) detested the critical Greek text and noted that the Revisers had drawn down upon their heads "a hail of criticism."

T. Harwood Pattison gave the following interesting overview of the criticism that arose when the Revised Version appeared:

> The great majority of the people to whom the Bible was dear, hailed the Revised Version with pleasure; bought it when it appeared with eagerness; glanced over its pages with interest; and **THEN RETURNED TO THE AUTHORIZED**

> **VERSION**. ... The men who had inherited the Puritan love for the very letter of the Scriptures **were many of them indignant at proposed changes which would rob them of texts familiar** in their mouths as household words. '**We did not need**,' **Mr. Spurgeon wrote**, in noticing the Revised Old Testament, **'a blunder Bible to complete the series of eccentric Scriptures. HOWEVER, GOOD HAS COME OUT OF EVIL; THE OLD AUTHORIZED VERSION SITS SECURE UPON ITS THRONE. THERE IS NONE LIKE IT; NOR IS THERE LIKELY TO BE**.' Dean Burgon warned the Canadian Episcopal Synod against sanctioning 'the grossest blunder of the age.' Mr. Gladstone wrote to the fiery dean in terms more politic, certainly, but still adverse to the English of the new version; and the devout Lord Iddersleight, himself as competent a scholar as Mr. Gladstone, was of opinion that 'the travesty of the whole text of the Scripture destroys far more than it can possibly give in return' (Pattison, *The History of the English Bible*, 1894, pp. 163, 64).

Let me emphasize that much of the opposition to the Revision was voiced by men who, though believing the King James Bible *could be improved*, were convinced it *should not undergo revision*. Following are three of the reasons they had for this position: (1) *The revision would not be wise*, inasmuch as the Authorized Bible is an ancient Standard for the English-speaking world and as no revision could take its place, the division of authority that would accompany any such revision would result in far greater evil than any possible advantage. (2) *The revision would not be godly*, inasmuch as the spiritual and theological climate of the late 1800s was too decadent to produce a godly revision of the KJV. (3) *The revision would not be honest*, inasmuch as many of those who would be involved in producing the revision were not to be trusted.

I have already stated these facts, but I want to emphasize them again. I know, as surely as I am writing this book, that some will charge me with rewriting history to make every man who opposed the Revised Version into the image of the most radical of today's so-called King James Only crowd. The charge is bogus. I have not wrestled any man's words out of context. What I am doing is letting the arguments of these men speak for themselves. I am not claiming that all of these witnesses believed exactly like I do or exactly like some other King James defender today believes. Some of these men believed almost precisely like I do, and some did not. But the fact remains that all *did* defend the King James Bible and its underlying text; all *did* oppose the revision; and most understood the rationalistic foundation and nature of the modern Greek texts.

Key Voices Raised in Opposition to the Revision

Now we will take a closer look at some of the key voices that were lifted against the Revision. Andrew Edgar, in describing the clamor for revision which steadily rose from some quarters in the nineteenth century, also made the following admission (with somewhat more candor than some of his fellow historians): "It must be admitted however, that *men of equal or almost equal eminence,* both in the first and second half of the present century, set themselves *sternly* against the

project of revising the King's version" (emphasis added) (Edgar, *The Bibles in England*, 1889, p. 331).

We will now consider some of these eminent men that spoke out in behalf of the KJV, or at least in opposition to the texts and principles underlying the modern versions:

JOHN WILLIAM BURGON (1813-1888)

John Burgon held degrees from Oxford University and was one of the foremost biblical scholars of his day. He was Gresham Professor of Divinity at Oxford, Fellow of Oriel College, vicar of St. Mary's (the university church); and during the last 12 years of his life, he was Dean of Chichester. His biographer said:

> "Burgon was in this country [England] the leading religious teacher of his time, who brought all the resources of genius and profound theological learning to rebut the encroachments of Rationalism by maintaining inviolate the integrity of the written Word of God as the Church has received it" (Edward M. Goulburn, *John William Burgon: Late Dean of Chichester*, 1892, Preface, p. vii).

F.H.A. Scrivener called Burgon "that grand scholar" (cited by Edward Miller, Preface to *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, p. viii), and called his work defending the ending of Mark 1 "brilliant." He was a first-rate textual scholar, the equal to any man alive at the time. He made several tours of European libraries, examining and collating New Testament manuscripts wherever he went. He visited the Vatican Library in 1860 to examine the Vaticanus. In 1862 he traveled to Mt. Sinai to inspect manuscripts at St. Catherine's. Edward Hill notes the purpose of these travels:

> "Being driven by the desire to get to the bottom of the false statements being made by the reigning Critics of his day, Burgon devoted the last 30 years of his life to disprove them. Believing firmly that God had providentially preserved the true text of the New Testament, he set out to discover how the depraved and corrupt readings developed. This required him to travel widely" (E.F. Hills, "A Biographical Sketch of the Life of Burgon," *Unholy Hands on the Bible:* Vol. 1, Jay Green, ed., p. xix).

"His biographer lists over fifty published works, on a considerable variety of subjects, besides numerous articles contributed to periodicals. He contributed considerably to Scrivener's *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* in its various editions. Edward Miller, who became posthumous editor both to Scrivener and Burgon, said of this contribution, 'He has added particulars of three hundred and seventy-four manuscripts previously unknown to the world of letters.' Of the considerable volume of unpublished material that Dean Burgon left when he died, of special note is his index of New Testament citations by the Church Fathers of antiquity. It consists of sixteen thick manuscript volumes, to be found in the British Museum, and contains 86,489 quotations. It may be said that Burgon's scholarship in this facet of the total field

has never been equaled" (Wilbur Pickering, "Contribution of John William Burgon to New Testament Criticism," *True or False?* p. 217).

Some modern writers have claimed that Burgon has been answered and thus is no longer of relevance. This is not true, as stated more correctly by Hugh Pope in *English Versions of the Bible*.

> "Burgon, it should be remembered, had spent five and a half years collating the great uncial manuscripts of the Gospels only, and eight years in all in such work of collating. No one has attempted to refute his *Last Twelve Verse of the Gospels according to St. Mark*, nor has his third article in that review ever been answered, while the answer to his first two articles by 'Two Members of the New Testament Company' (Dr. Ellicott and E. Palmer) can hardly be called an answer at all. Burgon answered Dr. Ellicott in *The Revision Revised*, pp. 369-520" (Pope, pp. 565, n.1, 567).

Burgon's stand against Darwinism, Modernism, Romanism

We have seen that three false movements were undermining Britain's spiritual foundation in the nineteenth century: Darwinism, Theological Modernism, and Romanism. John William Burgon understood the nature of these assaults and stood decidedly against all three. One of the hallmarks of Burgon's ministry, as noted previously by Goulburn, was his exalted view of Holy Scripture. It was his love for the Bible that produced his fierce opposition toward every form of humanistic rationalism. Burgon gave Modernism absolutely no quarter. He refused to be quiet about it. He refused to treat it kindly. He refused to be patient with it.

When articles began to be published at Oxford in 1860 casting doubt upon the inerrancy of Scripture, Burgon, who had been appointed the same year as Select Preacher of the University, presented a series of messages in defense of the verbal, plenary inspiration of the Bible. The sermon titles were as follows:

- Sermon 1: The study of the Bible recommended; and a method of studying it described
- Sermon 2: Natural science and theological science
- Sermon 3: Inspiration of Scripture—Gospel difficulties—the Word of God infallible—other sciences subordinate to theological science
- Sermon 4: The plenary inspiration of every part of the Bible, vindicated and explained—nature of inspiration—the text of Scripture
- Sermon 5: Interpretation of Holy Scripture—inspired interpretation—the Bible is not to be interpreted like any other book—God (not man) the real author of the Bible
- Sermon 6: The doctrine of arbitrary scriptural accommodation considered
- Sermon 7: The marvels of Holy Scripture—moral and physical—Jael's deed defended—miracles vindicated

These sermons were published the following year, with a number of other materials touching on the same subjects, under the title *Inspiration and Interpretation*. Attached as appendixes were the following treatises: "The simplest view of inspiration the truest and the best," "The volume of the Old Testament

Scripture indivisible," "How the inspired authors of the New Testament handle the writings of the inspired authors of the Old," and "Remarks on theories of inspiration—the human element."

The occasion of Burgon's sermons on the inspiration of Scripture was the publication of *Essays and Reviews*, a series of modernistic articles by seven men (six of whom were Anglican clergymen). In reading Burgon's *Inspiration and Interpretation* in the context of researching this book, I have been tremendously edified and encouraged. I have read the writings of many modernistic theologians, and, while they have been answered repeatedly and aptly by Bible-believing preachers, in my estimation no one has done a better job than John Burgon in exposing the modernist's clever errors. I certainly am not sympathetic with much that Anglicanism stands for, and Burgon was a staunch Anglican, but there is no doubt in my mind that this man loved Jesus Christ and the Bible and he hated the enemies of Christ with great passion. I disagree with Burgon on some of his *interpretations* of Scripture, but I agree heartily with him on the *nature* of Scripture.

Let's look into this battle for a moment, and we will get a glimpse into the heart of this warrior as well as a good feel for the theological war that raged in his day. (It is interesting also to see that modernists have not changed one *iota*; they are just as deceitful today as then.) The first few paragraphs following are from Burgon's Preface to *Inspiration and Interpretation*, written June 24, 1861, in which he gives the background of his Oxford messages. Note particularly Burgon's retort to the charge that his writings display an overzealous vehemence. The rest of the paragraphs are lifted from the actual sermons. Please understand that Burgon's volume on *Inspiration* is very large, comprising 545 pages of text. I am going to lift lengthy portions from this wonderful book, particularly from the Preface and the second sermon, because I want our readers to see this record. It gives a fuller picture of a man who has been wrongly ignored and misrepresented by modern version proponents.

> Astonished, (not by any means for the first time in my life,) at the apathy which seemed to prevail on questions of such vital moment, I determined at all events not to be a party to a craven silence; and denounced from the University pulpit with hearty indignation **that whole system of unbelief**, (if system it can be called,) **which has been growing up for years among us; and which, I was and am convinced, must be openly met,—not silently ignored until the mischief becomes unmanageable**: met, too, by building up men in THE TRUTH (Preface, pp. ix,x).
>
> The Jesuitical notice prefixed to the book, (deprecating the idea that its authors should be held responsible, except severally for their several articles,) completed the scandal. As if seven men, each armed with his own appropriate weapon of violence, breaking into a house, and spreading ruin around them, could 'readily be understood,' (to quote their own language,) to incur each a limited responsibility! (p. xiii).

AT THE ROOT OF THE WHOLE MISCHIEF OF THESE LAST DAYS LIES DISBELIEF IN THE BIBLE AS THE WORD OF GOD. THIS IS THE FUNDAMENTAL ERROR (Preface, p. xvii).

The plain truth is, (**and it is really better to speak plainly**,)—the plain truth is, that the ... offensive *Essays and Reviews* which have lately occasioned so much public scandal,—are the work of men who discuss that which they do not understand; profess that which they were never, at any time of their life, taught. Their method of handling a text is altogether unique and extraordinary. **Their remarks concerning Divine things are even puerile**. Their very citations of Scripture are incorrect. Their cool affectation of superiority of knowledge, their claim to intellectual power, would be laughable, were the subject less solemn and important. Speculations so feeble that they sound like the cries of an infant in the dark, are insinuated to be the sublime views of a bold and original thinker ... Doubts so badly expressed that they read like the confused utterance of one in his sleep, claim to be regarded as the legacy of one who is about to 'depart hence before the natural term, worn out with intellectual toil.' ... In a word,—Men who have never been taught and trained, but have grown up in a miserable self-evolved system of their own,—(with a little of Hegel, and a little of Schleiermacher, and a little of Strauss,)—cannot but trouble the peace of the Church (Preface, pp. xx,xxi).

To cope systematically with all this from the University pulpit, as already remarked, is plainly impossible. **The preacher must take up the question at some definite stage, and arrest the false teacher there**. ... **in these Sermons the threshold of the Bible has been chosen as the place for the conflict. My life for his life. I will slay or be slain on the very portal of Holy Scripture** (Preface, p. xxii).

When **a few words have been added concerning the manner in which I have executed my task**, this Preface shall be brought to a close. ... A man feels strongly and warmly; writes fast and freely; is determined to be clearly understood: **IS WEARY OF THE DIGNIFIED CONVENTIONALITIES UNDER WHICH SCEPTICISM LOVES TO CONCEAL ITSELF WHEN IT COMES ABROAD**. ... Some respectable persons, I doubt not, will think my treatment of them harsh and uncharitable. I invite them to consider that we do not expect blasphemy from Ministers of the Gospel,—irreligion from the teachers of youth, —infidelity from the Professor's chair: nor **are we called upon to tolerate it either**. ... **Let those who feel little jealousy for God's honour measure out in grains their censure of a volume, the confessed tendency of which is to sap the foundation of Faith, and to introduce irreligion with a flood-tide**. Private regard, if it is to weigh largely with him who stands up for God's Truth, should first have weighed a little with those by whom it has been most grievously outraged**. It may suit these Authors to wrap up their shameful meaning in a cloud of words**; but their Reviewer avails himself of that Christian liberty to which they themselves so systematically lay claim, **mercilessly to uncover their baseness, and uncompromisingly to denounce it**. If I may declare my mind freely, **PUNCTILIOUS COURTESY IN DEALING WITH SUCH OPINIONS, BECOMES A SPECIES OF TREASON AGAINST HIM AFTER WHOSE NAME WE ARE CALLED**, and whom we profess to serve. Seven men may combine to handle the things of God, it

seems, in the most outrageous manner; while themselves are to be the objects of consideration, tenderness, respect! I cannot see their title to any consideration at all (pp. xxiii, xxiv).

Charity herself after weighing these Essays carefully has no alternative but to assume that the Authors either have not the courage, or that they lack the ability, to descend to a free discussion, and risk all on a stand-up fight. A kind of guerrilla warfare: half a dozen arrows, and a hasty retreat: such is their mode of attack! (Preface, p. xxv).

Gentlemen who come abroad in the fashion above described, have no right to complain if they encounter rough usage on the road. When Critics are clamorous for the 'free handling' of Divine Truth, they must not be surprised to find themselves freely handled too. **IF FREE DISCUSSION IS TO BE THE ORDER OF THE DAY, THEN LET THERE BE FREE DISCUSSION OF 'ESSAYS AND REVIEWS,' AS WELL AS OF THE BIBLE**. Six Clergymen of the Church of England who enter upon a crusade against the Faith of the Church of England must not be astonished if they are looked upon in the light of immoral characters, and treated as such. Accordingly, **I HAVE HANDLED THEM JUST AS FREELY AS THEY HAVE HANDLED THE PROPHETS, APOSTLES, AND EVANGELISTS OF CHRIST**. ... This is no literary misunderstanding, or I could have been amicable enough ... No other than an attempt to destroy Man's dearest hopes, is this infamous book: no other than an insult, the grossest imaginable, offered to the Majesty of Heaven; an attack, the more foul because it is so insidious, against the Everlasting Gospel of Jesus Christ. **IN SUCH A CAUSE I WILL NOT SO FAR GIVE IN TO THE SMOOTH FASHION OF A SUPPLE AND INDIFFERENT AGE**, **AS TO PAY THESE SEVEN WRITERS A SINGLE COMPLIMENT WHICH THEY WILL CARE TO ACCEPT** (Preface, pp. xxvi, xxvii).

Not one of them has had the manliness to *speak out*, and to say *plainly* what he means. They *seem* to deny the Divinity of Christ, and the Personality of the Holy Ghost: but how reluctant is a reader to believe that they really *mean* it! (Preface, p. xxvii).

He has a marvellous aptitude ... of connecting together in the same sentence two or three clauses; one or two of which shall be true as Heaven, while the other is false as Hell. ... It is not till the sentence is well advanced, or till it is examined by the fatal light of its context, that one is shown what the ambiguous writer really was intending**. A CLOVEN FOOT APPEARS AT LAST; BUT IT IS INSTANTLY WITHDRAWN, WITH A SHUFFLE; AND YOU EXPERIENCE A SCOWL OR A SNEER, AS THE CASE MAY BE, FOR YOUR EXTREME UNKINDNESS IN INQUIRING WHETHER IT WAS NOT A CLOVEN FOOT YOU SAW?** ... Meanwhile, the learned Professor has gone off *in alia omnia*, with a look of earnestness which challenges respect, and **A VAGUENESS OF DICTION** which at once discourages pursuit and defeats inquiry. **The fish invariably ends by disappearing in a cloud of his own ink** (Preface, pp. xxviii, xxx).

The great master of **this cloudy shuffling art** is Mr. Jowett. Even where he and his associates in 'free handling,' are express and definite in their statements, yet, as their rule is prudently to abstain from adducing a single

example of their meaning, it is only by their disingenuous reticence that they escape punishment or exposure (Preliminary Remarks, p. xix).

There was a time, then,—and it was certainly less than 6,000 years ago,—when 'the Earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep.' ... My faith however is not troubled,—nor even perplexed,—by the strangeness of these things. ... Behold, 'He measureth the waters in the hollow of His Hand, and weigheth the mountains in scales.' What if the Creator of the earth and the sea shall bid them of a sudden change places? Think you that they would hesitate to obey Him? Or what if He 'calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the Earth?'—Then further, if I believe, (as I *do* believe,) that when the Jews crucified the Lord of Glory 'there was darkness over all the land' from the sixth hour unto the ninth;—nay, that when 'Moses stretched forth his hand toward Heaven, there was a thick darkness in all the land of Egypt,' even darkness which might be felt, for three whole days:—more than that; if I believe, (as I *do* believe,) the solemn prediction of my Lord that at the consummation of all things, 'The Sun shall be darkened, and the Moon shall not give her light, and the Stars shall fall from Heaven'—shall it move me to incredulity, if God tells me, that six thousand years ago it was His Divine pleasure that the same phenomenon should prevail for a season? (Sermon II, pp. 26-28).

I profess myself at a loss to see what special note of impracticability it presents that I should hesitate to embrace it [first chapters of Genesis], in the plain natural sense of the words, with both the arms of my heart. ... **Apart from Revelation, we could really have known nothing at all about the works of the Days of the first Great Week. Ejaculations therefore concerning the strangeness of the record, and cavils at the phraseology in which it is propounded, are simply irrelevant.**

There exists however a vague suspicion after all that the beginning of Genesis is a vision, or an allegory, or a parable,—or anything you please, except true History. It is hard to imagine *why*. If there be a book in the whole Bible which purports to be a plain historical narrative of actual events, *that* book is the book of Genesis. ... Why the first page of it is to be torn out, treated as a myth or an allegory, and in short explained away,—I am utterly at a loss to discover. There is no difference in the style. ... It is a pure Revelation, I admit: but I have yet to learn why the revelation of things intelligible, where the method of speech is not such as to challenge a figurative interpretation, is not to be taken literally: unless indeed it has been discovered that a narrative must of necessity be fabulous if the transactions referred to are unusually remote and extraordinary. The events recorded are unique in their character,—true. But this happens from the very necessity of the case. The creation of a world, to the inhabitants of that world is an unique event (Sermon II, pp. 32-34).

Whether or no South overestimated Adam's knowledge, I will not pretend to decide: but I am convinced the truth lies more with him than with certain modern wits, when he says concerning our first Father:—'He came into the world a philosopher; which sufficiently appeared by his writing the nature of things upon their names ... His understanding could almost pierce into future contingents; his conjectures improving even to prophecy, or the certainties of prediction. Till

his Fall, he was ignorant of nothing but sin ... There was then no struggling with memory, no straining for invention. His faculties were ready upon the first summons ... We may collect the excellency of the understanding *then*, by the glorious remainders of it now: and guess at the stateliness of the building by the magnificence of its ruins ... And certainly that *must* needs have been very glorious, the decays of which are so admirable. He that is comely when old and decrepit, surely was *very* beautiful when he was young! An Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam; and Athens but the rudiments of Paradise' (Sermon II, pp. 36, 37).

I take leave to add that even the respectful attempt to make Genesis accommodate itself to the supposed requirements of Geology, by boldly assuming that the days of Creation were each a thousand years long,—seems inadmissible. ... The very notion seems absurd—But what is more to the purpose, such an interpretation seems to stultify the whole narrative**. A *week* is described. *Days* are spoken of,—each made up of *an evening and a morning*.** God's cessation from the work of Creation on the Seventh Day is emphatically adduced as the reason of the Fourth Commandment ... **You may not play tricks with language plain as this, and elongate a week, until it shall more than embrace the span of all recorded Time.**

Neither am I able to see what would be gained by proposing to prolong the Days of Creation indefinitely, so as to consider them as representing vast and unequal periods....

NATURAL SCIENCE has lately woke up from her long slumber of well nigh sixty ages; and with that immodesty for which youth and inexperience have ever been proverbial, she IS IMPATIENT TO MEASURE HER CRUDE THEORIES AGAINST THE SURE REVELATION OF GOD'S WORD. WHERE THE TWO DIFFER, SHE ASSUMES THAT OF COURSE THE INSPIRED ORACLES ARE WRONG, AND HER OWN WILD GUESSES RIGHT. She is even indecent in her eagerness to invalidate the testimony of that Book which has been the confidence and stay of God's Servants in all ages. On any evidence, or on none, she is prepared to hurl to the winds the august record of Creation. Inconveniently enough for the enemies of God's Word, every advance in Geological Science does but serve to corroborate the record that the Creation of Man is not to be referred to a remoter period than some six thousand years ago. But of this important fact we hear but little. On the other hand, no trumpet is thought loud enough to bruit about a suspicion that Man *may be* a creature of yet remoter date (Sermon II, pp. 38-40).

That the Mosaic record of Creation has been thought at variance with certain deductions of modern observation, is not surprising: seeing that the deductions of each fresh period have been at variance with the deductions of that which went before; and seeing that the theory of one existing school is inconsistent with the theory of another.—That the Bible is not, in any sense, a scientific treatise again, is simply a truism (who ever supposed that it was?). ... But such remarks are a gross fallacy, and a mere deceit, if it be meant that the statements in the Bible partake of the imperfection of knowledge incident to a rude and primitive state of society. To revive an old illustration,—Is a philosopher therefore a child, because, in addressing children, he uses language adopted to their age and capacity? God speaks in the First

Chapter of Genesis,—hath spoken for three and thirty hundred years,—as unto children: but there is no risk therefore that in what He saith, He either hath deceived, or will deceive mankind.

YOU ARE NEVER TO FORGET THE GREAT FUNDAMENTAL POSITION, THAT THE BIBLE CLAIMS TO BE THE WORD OF GOD; AND THAT *GOD'S WORD CAN NEVER CONTRADICT OR BE CONTRADICTED BY GOD'S WORKS.* We therefore reject, *in limine*, all insinuations about the 'unscientific' character of the Bible. A scientific man does not cease to be scientific because he does not choose always to express himself scientifically (Sermon II, pp. 41, 42).

Above all, the limits of the knowledge of unassisted Man must infallibly be those of the age in which he lives. But, with the Ancient of Days, it is not so. He at least *cannot* err. Nothing that man has ever discovered by laborious induction was not known to Him from the beginning: nothing that He hath ever commissioned His servants to deliver, will be found inconsistent with the anterior facts of History. 'He that made the eye, shall He not see?' The records of Creation then *cannot* be incorrect (Sermon II, p. 43).

DESTROY MY CONFIDENCE IN THE BIBLE AS AN HISTORICAL RECORD, AND YOU DESTROY MY CONFIDENCE IN IT ALTOGETHER; FOR BY FAR THE LARGEST PART OF THE BIBLE IS AN HISTORICAL RECORD. If the Creation of Man,—the longevity of the Patriarchs,—the account of the Deluge;—if these be not true histories, what is to be said of the lives of Abraham, of Jacob, of Joseph, of Moses, of Joshua, of David,—of our Saviour Christ Himself? ... Will you then reject one miracle and retain another? Impossible! You can make no reservation, even in favour of the Incarnation of our Lord,—the most adorable of all miracles, as it is the very keystone of our Christian hope. **EITHER, WITH THE BEST AND WISEST OF ALL AGES, YOU MUST BELIEVE THE WHOLE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE; OR, WITH THE NARROW-MINDED INFIDEL, YOU MUST DISBELIEVE THE WHOLE. THERE IS NO MIDDLE COURSE OPEN TO YOU** (Sermon II, p. 46).

The very phraseology with which men have presumed to approach this entire question, is insolent and unphilosophical. ... **We constantly find SCIENCE and THEOLOGY opposed to one another: just as if Theology were not a Science!** History forsooth, with all her inaccuracy of observation, is a Science: and Geology, with all her weak guesses, is a Science: and comparative Anatomy, with nothing but her laborious indictions to boast of, is a Science: but Theology,—which is based on the express revelation of the Eternal,—is some other thing! What do you mean to tell us that Theology is, but the very queen of Sciences? ... **What have other sciences to boast of which Theology has not?** Antiquity,—such as no other can, in any sense, lay claim to: a Literature,—which is absolutely without a rival: a Terminology,—which reflects the very image of all the ages: Professors,—of loftier wit, from the days of Athanasius and Augustine, down to the days of our own Hooker and Butler,—men of higher mark, intellectually and morally,—than adorn the annals of any other Science since the World began: above all things, a subject-matter, which is the grandest imagination can conceive; and a foundation, which has all the breadth, and length, and depth and height, which the Hands of God Himself could give it.

For subject-matter, what Science will you compare with this? All the others in the world will not bring a man to the knowledge of God and of Christ! They will not inform him of the will of God ...

And, for that whereon they are built, what Science again will you compare with this? Let the pretender to Geological skill,—(I say not the true Geologist, for he never offends!)—let the conceited sciolistt, I say, go dream a little longer over those implements of chipped flint which have called him into such noisy activity, —and discover, as he will discover, that the assumed inference from the gravel and the bones is fallacious after all.—Let the Historian go spell a little longer over that moth-eaten record of dynasties which never were, by means of which he proposes to set right the clock of Time. Let the Naturalist walk round the stuffed or bleached wonders of his museum, and guess again. Theological Science not so! Her evidence is sure, for her Rule is God's Word. No laborious Induction here,—fallacious because imperfect; imperfect because human: but a direct message from the presence-chamber of the Lord of Heaven and Earth,—decisive because inspired; infallible because Divine. **The express Revelation of the Eternal is that whereon Theological Science builds her fabric of imperishable Truth**: that fabric which, while other modes change, shift, and at last become superseded, shines out,—yea, and to the very end of Time will shine out,—unconscious of decay, incapable of improvement, far, far beyond the reach of fashion: a thing unchanged, because in its very nature unchangeable!

O sirs ... it must suffice to have warned you against the men who resort to the armoury of Natural Science for weapons wherewith to assail God's Truth. Regard them as the enemies of your peace; and learn to reject their specious, yet most inconsequential reasonings, with the scorn which is properly their due. ... **HE WHO SURRENDERS THE FIRST PAGE OF HIS BIBLE, SURRENDERS ALL**. He knows not where to stop. Nay, you and I cannot in any way afford to surrender the beginning of Genesis; simply because upon the truth of what is there recorded depends the whole scheme of Man's salvation, —the need of that 'second Man' which is 'the Lord from Heaven' (Sermon II, pp. 47-51).

Much has it been the fashion of these last days, (I cannot imagine why,) to vaunt the character and the Gospel of St. John, 'the disciple of Love,' as he is called; as if it were secretly thought that there is a latitudinarianism in Love which would wink at Doctrinal obliquity; whereas *St. John is the Evangelist of Dogma*; and **if there be anything in the world which is *jealous*, that thing is *Love***. Indifference to Truth, and laxity of Belief, are the growing characteristics of the age. But **you will find that St. John has about four or five times as much about Truth as all the other three Evangelists**...(Sermon II, p. 51).

This whole visible frame of things wherein we play our part, is hastening to decay. ... O my soul, (learn to ask yourselves,)—O my soul, when the Heavens shall depart, and the Earth reel before the Second Advent of its Maker;—when the Sun puts on mourning, and the very powers of Heaven are shaken;—what shall be our confidence,—our hope,—in that tremendous day? Whither shall we betake ourselves, amid the overthrow of universal Nature, but to the sure mercies of Him who 'in the beginning created the Heaven and the Earth'? ... And we only know Him in, and through, and by His Word (Sermon II, p. 52).

> I am asked whether I believe the words of the Bible to be inspired,—I answer, To be sure I do,—every one of them: and every syllable likewise. Do not you?—Where,—(if it be a fair question,)—Where do you, in your wisdom, stop? The book, you allow, is inspired. How about the chapters? How about the verses? Do you stop at the verses, and not go on to the words? ... **No, Sirs! THE BIBLE (BE PERSUADED) IS THE VERY UTTERANCE OF THE ETERNAL;—AS MUCH GOD'S WORD, AS IF HIGH HEAVEN WERE OPEN, AND WE HEARD GOD SPEAKING TO US WITH HUMAN VOICE**. Every book of it, is inspired alike; and **is inspired entirely**. ... **THE BIBLE IS NONE OTHER THAN THE VOICE OF HIM THAT SITTETH UPON THE THRONE! EVERY BOOK OF IT, —EVERY CHAPTER OF IT,—EVERY VERSE OF IT,—EVERY WORD OF IT, —EVERY SYLLABLE OF IT,—(WHERE ARE WE TO STOP?)—EVERY LETTER OF IT—IS THE DIRECT UTTERANCE OF THE MOST HIGH**! ... 'Well spake the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of' the many blessed Men who wrote it.—**The Bible is none other than the Word of God: not some part of it, more, some part of it, less; but all alike, the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the Throne;—absolute,—faultless,—unerring,—supreme!** (Sermon III, pp. 75, 76, 89).

> Already, ... already the Judge standeth at the door; and assuredly, thou and I, (to whom God hath entrusted so much!) shall have to render a very strict account of the use we have made of the Bible,—when we shall stand face to face with its undoubted Author (Sermon IV, p. 125).

Those who truly love God's Word cannot but thrill at such a glorious defense of it. Burgon was a great preacher.

These excerpts were lengthy, but I wanted to give our readers a fuller portrait of the man who so boldly opposed the Westcott-Hort principles and Greek New Testament, which is the same basic text underlying all modern English versions. Oxford University is the most exalted institution of higher learning in all of Britain. What we see in the previous excerpts is one of the most brilliant scholars of the nineteenth century boldly testifying of his faith in a perfect Bible before the student body of this university. We can be sure that such a testimony has not been heard at that university in many a decade, probably not in this century. Burgon's views did not prevail. His earnest pleas were ignored. The soul-destroying gloom of rationalism has long settled over Oxford.

It is not difficult to see why Burgon has been so despised by men who are sympathetic to a rationalistic approach to the Bible. He rang the rationalist's bell! Think of how he describes rationalists and their work: He speaks of their "cloudy shuffling art." He says they "wrap up their shameful meaning in a cloud of words." He reveals how they carry on "a kind of guerrilla warfare: half a dozen arrows, and a hasty retreat." He exposes the "dignified conventionalities under which Scepticism loves to conceal itself." He observes that while they *seem* to deny biblical doctrines, at the same time it is somehow hard to "believe that they really *mean* it." He notes that they have a "marvellous aptitude of connecting together in the same sentence two or three clauses; one or two of which shall be true as Heaven, while the other is false as Hell." He describes the difficulty of

discerning the false teacher's "cloven foot." "A cloven foot appears at last; but it is instantly withdrawn, with a shuffle; and you experience a scowl or a sneer, as the case may be, for your extreme unkindness in inquiring whether it was not a cloven foot you saw." He describes the false teacher's "vagueness of diction which at once discourages pursuit and defeats inquiry." He warns us that the false teacher is like the type of fish that disappears "in a cloud of his own ink."

Burgon was a scholar, but he refused to dance to the scholar's tunes. We will see that today's Rationalists—Metzger, Bruce, Kenyon, Aland, and that gang—treat Burgon as if he were some kind of tradition-bound crank. In fact, a great many who profess to be evangelical today hold rationalistic views on the Bible, denying the literalness of the first three chapters of Genesis, rejecting the absolute perfection of the inspired text, claiming that the Bible is inaccurate when it deals with "scientific matters." Burgon's defense of the verbal-plenary inspiration of Holy Scripture steps on the toes of the vast majority of today's Christian scholars and theologians.

We mentioned three evils that were flooding into nineteenth-century Britain and that Burgon opposed. Two of these, Darwinism and theological Modernism, have been dealt with in the citations from *Inspiration and Interpretation*. The third, Romanism, will not receive as much attention here, but there can be no doubt that Burgon lifted his voice against the Romanizing influences that were creeping through the land.

For example, consider a book he published in 1869 entitled *England and Rome: Three Letters to a Pervert*. A title like that leaves little doubt as to Burgon's position on Roman Catholicism! He was addressing the tendency in his day for Anglicans to convert to Romanism. The "pervert" in question was a man who had done this very thing and who, as a staunch Roman Catholic, a "designing Papist," had written to Burgon to exhort him to likewise convert to Rome. Burgon replied with three lengthy letters of his own, exposing all of the blasphemous dogmas of Catholicism. His purpose in publishing the letters, with a number of appendixes, was pastoral. In the Preface, Burgon said, "A hundred fold rewarded for my pains shall I account myself if it shall please the God of Truth to bless what follows to the quieting of *one* unsettled spirit, the satisfying of *one* doubting mind..."

In his second letter, Burgon listed the following eleven charges against Roman Catholicism:

1. Idolatry
2. Purgatory and indulgences
3. Mariolatry
4. Communion under one kind
5. Superstition
6. Legends of fabulous saints
7. The entire system of public worship
8. Neglect of Scripture, and exalting tradition to the level of Scripture
9. Papal infallibility

10. Adding fresh articles to the Faith
11. Popery's political power

On December 12, 1869, only four days after the 800 Roman Catholic bishops first met to open the First Vatican Council, John Burgon preached a message at St. Mary the Virgin's Church in Oxford, of which he was Dean, on "The Roman Council." Burgon stated his conviction that the Roman Catholic Church is the religious harlot of Revelation 17. He said, "... if Rome is found in the Book of Revelation ... she must needs be the 'great City' which is symbolized by the Woman sitting on seven hills. (Rev. 17:3, 9, 18.) This, I say, is certain." Burgon warned that the First Vatican Council marked a turning point of end-time events:

> What is to be thought of this imposing gathering at Rome, this long array of Ecclesiastical pomp and circumstance? I am concerned to return myself no other answer but this:—It may be, IT MUST BE, ONE OF THE STEPS PRELIMINARY TO THE GREAT AND TERRIBLE ISSUE. ... it is impossible not to be aware that FITFUL SHADOWS OF ANTICHRIST ARE ALREADY DARKENING OUR PATHWAY; and watchfulness and wakefulness may well be the abiding attitude of all our spirits (Burgon, *The Roman Council*. A Sermon preached at S. Mary the Virgin's, Oxford, on the third Sunday in Advent, Dec. 12, 1869; being the Sunday after the death of John Parsons. James Parker and Co., Oxford and London, 1869, p. 10).

On October 12 and 19, 1873, he preached on "Romanizing within the Church of England." He said, "I eagerly throw in my lot with those faithful laymen who have endured till they can endure no longer,—and are resolved, if they lawfully can, at last to resist the endeavour which is being made in certain quarters to assimilate our English method to that of the Church of Rome." He warned that Romanism produces "a general indifference to Truthfulness" and "paves the way for Unbelief, and fosters nothing so much as Irreligion." Burgon warned about "the Romish dresses,—and the Romish lights,—and the Romish incense,—and the Romish gestures" which were coming into the Anglican Church. He warned about Rome's exaltation of Mary, wisely observing, "There has resulted from this unscriptural theory of Tradition, no grosser perversion of the truth than the entire system of Saintworship, and especially the cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary. ... She can only be fitly described as the tutelary Deity of modern Rome." He warned of "the abominable casuistry and indecency of the Confessional" and of the blasphemy of the papacy, "for it sets up on behalf of the Roman Pontiff, the awful prerogative which our Saviour claims expressly for Himself:—'I have the keys of Hell and of Death.'" He labeled Rome's doctrine of Transubstantiation "Idolatry" and "a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit." He spoke of the "treacherous course" of those who would bring in Romanism with subtilty and under the guise of spirituality. He spoke of "the dishonesty of the method of this little handful of disloyal men." He warned against keeping silent in the face of heresy, because to do so "is to connive at the scandal to witness it without remonstrance." He considered it his duty as a preacher to lift his voice against error. "I regard my own as a position of solemn trust; and consider you have a right, as a

congregation, to know my sentiments on what is becoming a very conspicuous matter ... I further hold it to be my plain duty,—a very painful one, but one I dare not any longer neglect,—solemnly to warn you all..." He described the folly of those who were saying that it would be wise to yoke together with Romanism to resist the onslaught of Skepticism. "I answer,—That one ugly pit yawns on my left hand, is no reason whatever why I should overlook another ghastly pit which yawns on my right. ... I take leave to point out moreover, that there is no surer way to promote Infidelity than to bring in upon us this plausible counterfeit of Romanism proper." He concluded: "These histrionic extravagancies may appeal successfully to the young and impulsive,—may for awhile gratify the taste and captivate the imagination; but they will be found sorry things to fall back upon in times of extremity, and amid the decays of age; in the hour of fainting nature and on the bed of death. There is wondrous little of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in this miserable resuscitation of effete Mediaevalism. It is of the earth,—earthy: an unspiritual, an unwholesome, a mawkish, a wholly un-English thing."

There has not been this type of preaching at St. Mary the Virgin's Church, Oxford, since the days of Burgon.

In light of Burgon's battle against Modernism and Romanism, it is not surprising to us that he lifted his voice against the critical Greek text and the English Revised Version. These were products of the very movements he was resisting, and he understood this to be the case. In 1871 his defense of the inspiration of Mark 16:9-20 appeared. It was titled *The Last Twelve Verse of the Gospel According to S. Mark*. Jay Green describes it as "the only full-scale book ever written to prove that the last twelve verses of Mark were genuine Scripture, taking up all the evidence (and showing that those rejecting these verses were falsifying the record)—that book was not even allowed to be listed as a source of reading for seminary students who supposedly were studying textual criticism. This duplicity continues to this day." Burgon's work on Mark 16:9-20 has been reprinted in its entirely at least three times in this century. It appears in condensed format in David Otis Fuller' *Counterfeit or Genuine?* It also has been summarized in a great many articles and books.

An excellent review of this important book was given by Samuel Zwemer (1867-1952) in his 1943 book on missions, *Into All the World*. Zwemer was Professor Emeritus of the History of Religion and Christian Missions, Princeton Theological Seminary. Chapter five of Zwemer's book, entitled "The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel of Mark," deals with the ending of Mark's Gospel because of its relation to the Great Commission. After noting the "cavalier dismissal of these verses" on the part of such textual critics as Westcott and Hort, Alexander Bruce, F.C. Conybeare, and James Moffatt, Zwemer turns to Burgon and other defenders of this passage to represent his conviction that this is inspired Scripture.

There is no reference whatever [by the aforementioned critics] to the elaborate vindication of the twelve verses of the Gospel according to Mark by Dean John W. Burgon of Oriel College, Oxford. This devastating reply to all the critical objectors was published in 1871 and takes up in the greatest detail every argument advanced against the authenticity and genuineness of the passage....

Now all this [the statements by various critics as to the 'certainty' with which they can dismiss this passage] would be very interesting if it were true. But both external and internal evidence can be and has been brought together to show '**THAT NOT A PARTICLE OF DOUBT, THAT NOT AN ATOM OF SUSPICION, ATTACHES TO THE LAST TWELVE VERSES OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK**.' Those are the closing words of Dean Burgon's masterly monograph to which we will refer in some detail. ...

We desire to give a summary of the arguments of Dean John William Burgon, (in a book that proved as interesting to us as a detective story) ... **THE QUESTION IS OF COMPARATIVELY RECENT DATE, FOR GRIESBACH WAS THE FIRST (1796-1806) TO INSIST THAT THE CONCLUDING VERSES WERE SPURIOUS.**

I. **The early Fathers, to the number of nineteen, including Papias, Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, witness to these verses in their writings**. Some of these are quotations, it is true, fragmentary, but others are complete. Ambrose cites verses 16-18 three times. Jerome gives all the twelve verses their place in the Vulgate. And these nineteen witnesses represent every part of the ancient Church, from Antioch to Rome and Carthage. Seven of them are of more ancient date than the oldest codex we possess.

II. **The early versions are also examined and found to yield unfaltering testimony to the genuineness of these verses**. The Peshito, the Vetus Itala, the Vulgate, and the Gothic and the Egyptian Versions *all* contain the passage in question. ...

In Chapter V, Burgon deals with the alleged hostile witness of certain early Fathers, such as, Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa and Jerome. These are examined one by one in the most painstaking manner and we cannot escape the conclusion of Burgon: 'Six Fathers of the Church have been examined who are commonly represented as bearing hostile testimony to the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel; and they have been easily reduced to *one*. ... Only by a critic seeking to mislead his reader will any one of these five Fathers be in future cited as witnessing against the genuineness of St. Mark 16:9-20. Eusebius is the solitary witness who survives the ordeal of exact inquiry. But Eusebius (as we have seen), instead of proclaiming his distrust of this portion of the Gospel, enters upon an elaborate proof that its contents are not inconsistent with what is found in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John. His testimony is reducible to two innocuous and wholly unconnected propositions: the first—that there existed in his day a vast number of copies in which the last chapter of St. Mark's Gospel ended abruptly at verse 8; (the correlative of which, of course, would be that there also existed a vast number which *were* furnished with the present ending); the second—that by putting a comma after the word *Anastas*, St. Mark 16:9, is capable of being reconciled with St. Matthew 28:1' (pp. 65-66).

III. In Chapter VI of Burgon **the manuscript testimony is shown to be overwhelmingly in favor of these verses**. **They are contained in every important manuscript in the world except two.** However, neither Codex B [Vaticanus] nor Codex Aleph [Sinaiticus] is infallible but both contain omissions and interpolations. **Eighteen uncials and six hundred cursive manuscripts of this Gospel contain the verses in question. The superstitious reverence for Codex B is unwarranted.** ...

Burgon gives several examples (pp. 73-75) and then he concludes: 'To say that in the Vatican Codex (B), which is unquestionably the oldest we possess, St. Mark's Gospel ends abruptly at the eighth verse of the sixteenth chapter, and that the customary subscription (*Kata Mapkon*) follows, is true; but it is far from being *the whole* truth. It requires to be stated in addition that the scribe, whose plan is found to have been to begin every fresh book of the Bible at the top of the next ensuing column to what which contained the concluding words of the preceding book, has at the close of St. Mark's Gospel deviated from his else invariable practice. He **has left in this place one column entirely vacant. It is *the only vacant column* in the whole manuscript—a blank space *abundantly sufficient to contain the twelve verses which he nevertheless withheld*.** *Why* did he leave that column vacant? *What* can have induced the scribe on this solitary occasion to depart from his established rule? The phenomenon (I believe I was the first to call distinct attention to it) is in the highest degree significant, and admits of only one interpretation. ***The older* manuscript from which Codex B was copied must have infallibly *contained* the twelve verses in dispute.** The copyist was instructed to leave them out—and he obeyed; but he prudently left a blank space *in memoriam rei*. Never was blank more intelligible! **Never was silence more eloquent! By this simple expedient, strange to relate, the Vatican Codex is made to refute itself even while it seems to be bearing testimony against the concluding verses of St. Mark's Gospel**, by withholding them; for it forbids the inference which, under ordinary circumstances, must have been drawn from that omission. It does more. ***By leaving room* for the verses it omits, *it brings into prominent notice* at the end of fifteen centuries and a half, *a more ancient witness than itself*'** (pp. 86, 87).

IV. The style and phraseology of Mark are absent from the closing paragraphs, so we are told by the critics, and therefore they are not genuine. Here Burgon is at his best and the scores of pages devoted to a devastating reply simply fascinate the reader who has any knowledge whatever of Greek. **He turns the tables completely against the critics; and with fairness, but marvelous skill, demonstrates that all of the instances given of style and language prove exactly the opposite of what is intended**. ...

Scrivener ... refused to pay any attention whatever 'to the argument against these twelve verses, arising from their alleged difference in style' (Intro., pp. 431 -32). **Professor John A. Broadus of the Southern Baptist Seminary also wrote an able and convincing paper refuting the assertion that the style and language of the passage in question argued for its spuriousness** (*The Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1869).

The argument of Burgon is as follows: There are twenty-seven alleged words and phrases listed by the critics as peculiar. These twenty-seven alleged

difficulties of style and vocabulary he discusses one by one. They include a variation of the word for Sabbath (vs. 9) and the mention of Mary Magdalene (as one from whom demons were cast [vs. 9]) whereas in the same chapter she is twice referred to without this statement! The preposition used after 'casting out demons' is peculiar. The word for 'go' used three times (vss. 10,12,15) is not used elsewhere by Mark. But the fact is that compounds of this Greek word are used by him frequently (twenty-four times), that is, oftener than in all the other Gospels! The expression 'those with him' is peculiar (vs. 10). However, Mark here refers not to the eleven but to the larger company of believers as in Acts 20:18 and Luke 24:9. This expression therefore is rather a proof of an eyewitness and of Mark's peculiarity of giving detail. ...

Finally, after fifty pages of painstaking patience with this hypercriticism of style, and after showing that in fact there are twenty-seven notes of genuineness, based on style and vocabulary, in this very short passage, Burgon concludes: 'Something more is certain than that the charges which have been so industriously brought against this portion of the Gospel are without foundation. **It has been proved that, scattered up and down these twelve verses, there actually exist twenty-seven other words and phrases which attest with more or less certainty that those verses are nothing else but the work of the Evangelist'** (p. 173).

Professor Broadus tells how it occurred to him to use the preceding twelve verses (Mark 15:44-16:8) for critical study, and he discovered here seventeen peculiar words not found elsewhere in Mark! A *reductio ad adsurdum* (*Baptist Quarterly*, July 1869). So the whole argument from style is rendered weak and the test breaks down hopelessly under severe analysis. This section of Dean Burgon's book has special value because he was known as one of the greatest Greek scholars of his day....

Finally, Dean Burgon assails the authority of B and Aleph on the ground of their sceptical character. ... There seems to be an alliance between them and the school of Origen. ...

In addition to all this, Edward Miller, editor of the posthumous work of Burgon, points out that **even as in B, so in Aleph, we have proof in the very manuscript itself that the writer was conscious of having made an important omission at the end of Mark**. 'The scribe manages to conclude Mark not with a blank column such as in B tells its own story, but with a column such as in this manuscript is usual at the end of a book, exhibiting the closing words, followed by an arabesque pattern executed with the pen and the subscription. But by the very pains he has taken to conform this final column to the ordinary usage of the manuscript his purpose of omission is betrayed even more conclusively, though less obviously, than by the blank column of B' (Appendix VII, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 299, 300). ...

In **Scrivener's Introduction** (Vol. II, pp. 237-238) he refers to the work of Burgon and argues for the genuineness of the passage. Here are his words:

'**Dean Burgon's brilliant monograph, *The Last Twelve Verse of the Gospel according to St. Mark Vindicated against Recent Objectors and Established* (Oxford and London, 1871), has thrown a stream of light upon**

> **the controversy**, nor does the joyous tone of his book misbecome one who is conscious of having triumphantly maintained a cause which is very precious to him. **We may fairly say that his conclusions have in no essential point been shaken by the elaborate and very able counter-plea of Dr. Hort** (Notes, pp. 28-51).' ...
>
> **After all this we are content to turn to the text of the Authorized English Version, to scores of translations made by the Bible Societies into hundreds of languages and rejoice to find in them no break and no mutilation of the Mark text** (Samuel Zwemer, *Into All the World*, pp. 69-85).

In 1881, when the English Revised Version New Testament was completed, Burgon immediately opposed it in a series of articles that appeared in the *Quarterly Review*. These were later incorporated into his classic work, *The Revision Revised*, which appeared in 1883. After Burgon's death, two more of his works were published under the editorship of Edward Miller*: The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels* (1896) and *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established* (1896).

Though Burgon did not believe the KJV is perfect, he did exalt the King James Bible above all other English versions, and he maintained that the Greek Received Text was, apart from minor improvements he felt could be made, the preserved Word of God. He defended the Traditional Text over the critical text introduced by Westcott and Hort. His attitude toward the KJV is evident from his description of the 1881 revision:

> As Translators, full two-thirds of the Revisionists have shown themselves singularly deficient,—alike in their critical acquaintance with the language out of which they had to translate, and in their familiarity with the idiomatic requirements of their own tongue**. THEY HAD A NOBLE VERSION BEFORE THEM, WHICH THEY HAVE CONTRIVED TO SPOIL IN EVERY PART**. Its dignified simplicity and essential faithfulness, its manly grace and its delightful rhythm, they have shown themselves alike unable to imitate and unwilling to retain. Their queer uncouth phraseology and their jerky sentences:—their pedantic obscurity and their stiff, constrained manner:—their fidgety affection of accuracy,—and their habitual achievement of English which fails to exhibit the spirit of the original Greek—are sorry substitutes for **the living freshness, and elastic freedom, and HABITUAL FIDELITY OF THE GRAND OLD VERSION which we inherited from our Fathers, and which has sustained the spiritual life of the Church of England, and of all English-speaking Christians, for 350 years**. Linked with all our holiest, happiest memories, and bound up with all our purest aspirations: part and parcel of whatever there is of good about us: fraught with men's hopes of a blessed Eternity and many a bright vision of the never-ending Life;—the Authorized Version, wherever it was possible, *should have been jealously retained*. But on the contrary. Every familiar cadence has been dislocated: the congenial flow of almost every verse of Scripture has been hopelessly marred: so many of those little connecting words, which give life and continuity to a narrative, have been vexatiously displaced, that a perpetual sense of annoyance is created. The countless minute alterations which have been needlessly introduced into every familiar

> page prove at last as tormenting as a swarm of flies to the weary traveller on a summer's day. To speak plainly, the book has been made unreadable (Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, pp. 225, 26).
>
> Its effect [the Revised Version] will be to open men's eyes, as nothing else could possibly have done, to the dangers which beset the Revision of Scripture. **IT WILL TEACH FAITHFUL HEARTS TO CLING THE CLOSER TO THE PRICELESS TREASURE WHICH WAS BEQUEATHED TO THEM BY THE PIETY AND WISDOM OF THEIR FATHERS**. It will dispel for ever the dream of those who have secretly imagined that a more exact Version, undertaken with the boasted helps of this nineteenth century of ours, would bring to light something which has been hitherto unfairly kept concealed or else misrepresented. Not the least service which the Revisionists have rendered has been the proof their work affords, how very seldom our Authorized Version is materially wrong: how faithful and trustworthy, on the contrary, it is throughout (*Revision Revised*, p. 232).

I have gone through *Revision Revised* carefully and annotated it and have read large parts of it dozens of times, and I never cease to thrill at Burgon's zeal for the Word of God, his defense of the Traditional Text, and his exposure of the error of Westcott-Hortism. He was a scholar of the highest caliber and spent much of his life in dimly lit, musty libraries, poring over obscure marks on the pages of old manuscripts, but he also had the heart and faith of a child. He was not merely a Bible scholar; he was a Bible defender. He had enthusiasm for the Word of God. He had passion for it. He LOVED it! His detractors, then and now, have misunderstood his passion. Burgon has been lightly dismissed as if his arguments were the rantings of a hysterical traditionalist. I have read dozens of books that have purported to give the history of the Revised Version, and I never cease to be amazed at the manner in which Burgon is caricatured.

The Textual Critics' Caricatures of Burgon

An illustration of this attitude is found in **Frederic Kenyon's** (1863-1952) remarks about Burgon in *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*:

> On the first appearance of the Revised New Testament it was received with much unfavourable criticism. Dean Burgon of Chichester, occupying towards it much the same position as Dr. Hugh Broughton in relation to the Authorised Version, assailed it vehemently in the *Quarterly Review* with a series of articles, the unquestionable learning of which was largely neutralised by the extravagance and intemperance of their tone (p. 242).

Burgon, with all of his weighty defense of the Traditional Text and with all his scholarly opposition to Westcott-Hortism and the English Revision, is dismissed with those few words. To compare Burgon with Broughton (1549-1612) is ridiculous, but the comparison began to be made by Westcott, Lightfoot, and Ellicott, as a reprisal against Burgon's bold attacks of their work, and continues to be repeated by modern version proponents. Burgon opposed the RV chiefly on the basis of its Greek text and its use of rationalistim textual principles; this is not

what Broughton did in regard to the AV. Broughton admitted that he was working along the same lines as the KJV translator, but he was piqued because he was not invited to participate in the project. He was shunned because "he was not cut out for collaboration with others, and would have proved an impossible colleague" (Bruce, *History of the Bible in English*, p. 107), because of his "violent and impractical temper" (H.S. Miller, *General Biblical Introduction*, p. 364), because "he was a man of ungovernable temper and utterly unfitted to work with others" (McAfee, *The Greatest English Classic*, p. 55), because he "was a man of overweening spirit, whose conceit made him intolerable and impracticable; no translation of the Bible pleased him, and his own translations pleased nobody but himself" (Andrew Edgar, *The Bibles of England*, p. 327). A contemporary said of Broughton, "a more conceited and arrogant man hardly existed" (S.C. Malan, *A Vindication of the Authorized Version*, 1856, p. xviii). Broughton was opposed to the KJV, it is true, but his protest was the product of his own private opinions; he did not protest the text or the principles used by the KJV translators. Broughton was an irascible iconoclast; Burgon was a Christian gentleman who moved among, ministered to, and got along well with his fellow man. His biography contains countless testimonies to this fact. Consider one example:

> I think I have never known a character so simple, so childlike, so pure. His fondness for children was remarkable; and to women he was uniformly most courteous, and evidently took much pleasure in their society (Edward Goulburn, *Life of Dean Burgon*, Vol. 2, p. 231).

Burgon and Broughton had almost nothing in common apart from the fact that their names both begin with "B" and both opposed new versions, but to compare the two beyond that is to darken the truth.

Kenyon also claimed that Burgon's "extravagant tone" neutralized his "unquestionable learning." Apparently if one is "extravagant," meaning one has true passion for his subject, it matters not how weighty and sound his arguments, he does not deserve a hearing. While it is true that an ungodly attitude can detract from the truth one speaks, Burgon did not display an ungodly attitude. He was not mean-spirited. He was forthright, but not unkind; he was bold but ever a gentleman. My friends, all of this is a smokescreen. Truth is never neutralized by genuine godly enthusiasm. The biblical prophets were exceedingly enthusiastic!

In another of his books, Kenyon gives this slant to Burgon's opposition to Westcott-Hortism:

> A period of lively controversy followed, the new version being bitterly attacked by a few scholars (headed by Dean Burgon) who refused to abandon the 'received' text, maintaining that the authority of the Church outweighed the evidence of ancient manuscripts and the ordinary canons of textual scholarship (Kenyon, *The Story of the Bible*, pp. 87, 88).

Kenyon would have his readers believe that the essence of Burgon's opposition to the Westcott-Hort text was the authority of the church vs. the evidence of ancient

manuscripts. In reality, Burgon's argument was this: He believed Westcott-Hort's "ancient manuscripts" were corrupt. It was not a debate of ancient manuscripts vs. recent ones, or ancient manuscripts vs. church authority. Even Hort admitted that the Received Text can be traced to the fourth century. Consider what Herman Hoskier, a respected textual scholar, says about this:

> It is well to bear in mind at all times that **the questions at issue are not those of the 15th century [the supposed date of the manuscripts used by Erasmus] versus those of the 4th**. ... **The textual questions involved are all back of the 4th cent**. In other words it is not a question of Turner's 'later MSS in favour of the earlier Greek MSS,' but as to who was right A.D. 125-400, when these questions arose. Turner is misstating the case. **HORT** did not do this. He **RECOGNISED THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS AS BEING QUITE AS OLD AS 350 A.D. OR OLDER** (Herman C. Hoskier*, Codex B and Its Allies: A Study and an Indictment*, p. viii).

This is such an oft-repeated falsehood, I can't let it rest. Let's call on a witness on this matter that even the modern version defenders should accept: Charles Ellicott, the head of the New Testament Revision Committee:

> The manuscripts which Erasmus used differ, for the most part, only in small and insignificant details from the bulk of the cursive manuscripts. The general character of their text is the same. **By this observation the pedigree of the Received Text is carried up beyond the individual manuscripts used by Erasmus**. ... **That pedigree stretches back to a remote antiquity. The first ancestor of the Received Text was at least contemporary with the oldest of our extant manuscripts, if not older than any one of them** (Charles John Ellicott, *The Revisers and the Greek Text of the New Testament, by Two Members of the New Testament Company*, 1882, pp. 11, 12).

I repeat, Kenyon was putting forth a myth: It was not a debate of ancient manuscripts vs. recent ones, or ancient manuscripts vs. church authority. It was (and is) a debate as to *which* ancient manuscripts represent the preserved Scripture. As for Burgon's rejection of "the ordinary canons of textual scholarship," why not describe, or at least acknowledge, the weighty arguments upon which he based this rejection? Burgon, and many others of that day, did not believe that the canons of modern textual scholarship were biblically sound. They did not believe they were scientific. If you only have Kenyon's testimony about Burgon, you have a faulty picture of the man and of the debate of that day.

F.F. Bruce (1910-1990) is another example of the way that Burgon is dismissed and libeled by today's textual scholars. In his popular and widely used *History of the Bible in English,* Bruce presents a typical caricature of Burgon to illustrate the opposition to the English Revised Version and the Westcott-Hort Greek text:

> Since most of the leading textual scholars in the United Kingdom had some part in the revision, and most of those in the United States were similarly involved in the American Standard Version, reviews, if they were to be the work of uncommitted reviewers, must for the most part be entrusted to men less

> competent in the relevant fields of study than the revisers themselves. But this could not be said of the most distinguished and remorseless reviewer of the R.V. —Dr. John William Burgon, Dean of Chichester from 1876 till his death in 1888. Burgon was an able textual scholar in his own right, and was actually ahead of his time in his appreciation of the importance for textual criticism of biblical citations in early Christian writers and of early Christian lectionaries. In both these areas of study he did much valuable pioneer work. Temperamentally, however, he was so conservative as to be the ideal Oxonian defender of lost causes, and his old-fashioned high-church outlook disposed him to pay much more deference to the 'voice of catholic antiquity' with regard to the biblical text than the canons of textual criticism could countenance. He was completely out of sympathy with the prevalent trends of nineteenth-century textual study of the New Testament, as shown in the work of Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort. ... In reading Burgon, at times one might be forgiven for supposing that in his judgment the older a manuscript, the worse it was (F.F. Bruce, *History of the Bible in English,* pp. 148, 49).

We make three observations on Bruce's description of Burgon and his work. First, note Bruce's scholarly pride. Since, supposedly, the *true* scholars participated in the Revision, the opposition was, he would have us believe, left for "men less competent." Bruce's *folly* is that he apparently believes that only the most highly skilled textual scholar can judge the accuracy of a Bible translation. David Otis Fuller described this attitude as "scholarolatry." Bruce's *disingenuousness* is that he gives an entirely false picture of the scene. A more accurate portrayal is given by two historians, Dr. Samuel Hemphill and Dr. Andrew Edgar:

> It must be admitted however, that **MEN OF EQUAL OR ALMOST EQUAL EMINENCE**, both in the first and second half of the present century, set themselves *sternly* against the project of revising the King's version (emphasis added) (Edgar, *The Bibles in England*, p. 331).

> ... **CRITICS OF EQUAL EMINENCE AND SOBRIETY WITH ITS AUTHORS**, such as [F.C.] Cook, Field, Evans, Beet, Sanday, and Christopher Wordsworth (not to mention the fiercer class of pamphleteer) **had pointed out a very large number of serious defects and errors**; and **even some of the most learned of the Revisers themselves**, such as Trench, Charles Wordsworth, Moberly, Roberts, and even Bickersteth and Kennedy, had written of it in such a way as to indicate to even the least careful reader their conviction of its unfitness to supersede the older version (Hemphill, *A History of the Revised Version*, p. 129).

A number of scholars who were invited to be on the revision committee, declined because they did not agree with its principles. The very fact that they were invited is evidence that their scholarship was considered equal to that of those who did participate. At least one committee member resigned later as a public protest. Burgon tells us that Dr. Merivale "withdrew in disgust from them entirely. He disapproved the method of his colleagues, and was determined to incur no share of responsibility for the probable result of their deliberations" (*Revision Revised*, p. 230). Indeed, as noted earlier in this chapter, several members of the "esteemed" revision company themselves afterwards criticized the revision and rejected the

Westcott-Hort principles! Scrivener, who was at least the equal of Westcott and Hort in textual scholarship, largely supported the Received Text during the project and later rejected Westcott-Hortism altogether and largely concurred with Burgon's position. Thus Bruce's position that true scholars overwhelmingly supported the Westcott-Hort text and the ERV is seen to be fraudulent.

Second, Bruce, while admitting Burgon's capabilities, lightly dismisses him as a "defender of lost causes." Bruce ignores Burgon's arguments. He does not even review them for his readers. He merely lifts a few quotations from Burgon that fortify his own deficient view of the man.

Three, Bruce would "almost" have his readers believe that Burgon's position on textual criticism is that "the older a manuscript, the worse it was." What an amazingly inaccurate statement. Someone might protest that Bruce didn't mean his statement to be taken literally. Why, then, did he say it? I believe he meant his readers to believe that this, or something like it, was what John Burgon taught. A more dishonest statement could not have been made. The position of Burgon was simply that the age of a manuscript is no evidence of its purity because an old manuscript can be a corrupted one and a newer manuscript can be a copy of a pure one. Why didn't Bruce allow Burgon to state his own position? Burgon summarized his own position succinctly many times in his writings. Consider this example:

> Strange as it may appear, it is undeniably true, that the whole of the controversy may be reduced to the following narrow issue: Does the truth of the Text of Scripture dwell with the vast multitude of copies, uncial and cursive, concerning which nothing is more remarkable than the marvellous agreement which subsists between them? Or is it rather to be supposed that the truth abides exclusively with a very little handful of manuscripts, which at once differ from the great bulk of the witnesses, and—strange to say—also amongst themselves? (John Burgon, *The Traditional Text*, p. 16).

Burgon demonstrated that Westcott and Hort had exalted a handful of manuscripts far beyond proper bounds.

> And to come to the point, we refuse to throw in our lot with those who, disregarding the witness of every other known Codex, every other Version, every other available Ecclesiastical Writer, insist on following the dictates of a little group of authorities, of which nothing whatever is known with so much certainty as that often, when they concur exclusively, it is to mislead (John Burgon, *Revision Revised*).

Burgon's position was not "the older a manuscript the worse it is." His position was that *all* evidence needs to be taken into consideration.

Bruce Metzger (1914-2007) also gave the typically shallow view of Burgon's work:

> During the closing decades of the nineteenth century the traditional text found a doughty defender in the person of John W. Burgon ... He has been described

> as ‘a High-churchman of the old school’ who became notorious as ‘a leading champion of lost causes and impossible beliefs; but the vehemence of his advocacy somewhat impaired its effect.’ His conservatism can be gauged from a sermon he preached at Oxford in 1884 in which he denounced the higher education of ‘young women as young men’ as ‘a thing inexpedient and immodest’; the occasion was the admission of women to university examinations! ... Burgon used every rhetorical device at his disposal to attack both the English Revision and the Greek Testament of Westcott and Hort. Burgon’s argument was basically theological and speculative (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, p. 135).

Metzger sets the stage for his review of Burgon by labeling him a champion of lost causes. We could put the same label on the Old Testament prophets. They championed causes that certainly appeared to have been lost in their own day. Israel did not respond to their pleas and did not return from apostasy. Most defenders of the truth throughout history, in fact, have been champions of what appear to have been lost causes, including the Lord Jesus Christ. It is essential that we acknowledge, though, that the end has not yet come, and there are many causes that appear to be lost but that will be victorious in the end.

And what of the supposed “impossible beliefs” of Burgon? One of the hallmarks of his ministry was his defense of the infallible divine inspiration of Holy Scripture against the theological Modernism that was sweeping into the Church of England. Was that an impossible belief? (Of course, it was impossible to Metzger, as we saw in Chapter One.)

Metzger overlooked the great things in Burgon, did not even mention his hallmark work on Inspiration, and selected an irrelevant incident to describe Burgon’s life and work. Burgon opposed the opening of the university of Oxford to co-education that did not distinguish between the sexes. Metzger approvingly quotes the *Dictionary of National Biography* which refers to the title of a sermon Burgon preached on Oxford on June 8, 1884, but this *Dictionary* (and Metzger does not set the record straight) leaves out an important part of the sermon title, which was, “To educate Young Women like Young Men *AND WITH YOUNG MEN*—a thing inexpedient and immodest.” The omission of the words “and with Young Men” changes the thrust of Burgon’s position. Burgon was not opposed to women being trained in institutions of higher education. He was supportive of the situation that existed prior to 1884, in which women lived in private dwelling houses while pursuing their education. “He is careful to explain that his censure does not touch the Halls already established for young Ladies in Oxford (‘Lady Margaret Hall’ and ‘Somerville Hall’)” (Edward Goulburn, *Life of Dean Burgon*, p. 235). What Burgon was opposing was the close, constant, unsupervised intermingling of unmarried men and women, and he was opposed to the changes of this nature that were overtaking his times. We believe Burgon was right. There can be no doubt that the contemporary practice of coeducation has resulted in a tremendous increase in immorality in the institutions of

"higher" education. Consider an excerpt from Burgon's sermon:

> You are the prime ornament of God's creation; and we men are, to speak plainly, just what you make us. ... If you set about becoming Man's rival, or rather if you try to be, what you never can become, Man's equal ... you have in a manner unsexed yourselves, and must needs put up with the bitter consequence (Goulburn, pp. 236,37).

We are convinced that Burgon's sermon would be *very* appropriate for the latter half of the twentieth century. We would like to hear it preached in pulpits across the land! Of course, we could not expect Bruce Metzger, who headed up a committee that applied feministic "inclusive language" concepts to the Scripture in the New Revised Standard Version, to appreciate Burgon's biblical view of womanhood. Metzger also failed to remind his readers that a great many of Burgon's contemporaries, probably the majority, in fact, held the same view as Burgon. What about Metzger's hero F.J.A. Hort? Since he would have us think that this type of thing is important, why does he fail to tell his readers that *Hort* opposed women's suffrage in 1850? Or that *Hort* was a racist for writing in 1862 of the black man, "As yet everywhere (not in slavery only) they have surely shown themselves only as an immeasurably inferior race, just human and no more, their religion frothy and sensuous, their highest virtues those of a good Newfoundland dog" (Arthur Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, Vol. 1, p. 458)? Why does Metzger not label *Hort* a champion of lost causes?

Why does Metzger pick out an example like Burgon's position on coeducation while failing to describe his amazing and in some ways unexcelled credentials in textual scholarship and failing to cite Burgon's wonderful defense of the perfect inspiration of Scripture against the rationalism of his day? The answer lies, we believe, in the fact that Metzger himself was a Rationalist, as we have seen in Chapter One.

Metzger summarized the 1,500 or so pages of John Burgon's incredibly well researched, carefully-reasoned, biblically-based defense of the Traditional Text as "theological and speculative." This is amazing. To say that Burgon's defense of the Bible text was *speculative* is simply a lie. To use any other term would be inaccurate. And as for "theological," what in the world is wrong with a *theological* defense of the Bible! Theology is merely the teaching of the Word of God. There is no other proper way for the text of Scripture to be examined than theologically.

A final example of this from the dozens we could give is **H. Wheeler Robinson's** (1872-1945) *Ancient and English Versions of the Bible*. In his review of the opposition to the Revised Version, Robinson gives his readers the following introduction to John Burgon:

> But the doughtiest and most ruthless of all foes of the Revision now drew nigh. Dr. John William Burgon, Dean of Chichester, published three long and slashing articles in *The Quarterly Review* for October 1881 and January and April 1882

> (Nos. 304-6). ... The judgments they expressed, particularly those directed against the textual theory of Westcott and Hort, were very wrong-headed; and the violence of their tone was unparalleled. Nothing the Revisers had done was right (p. 261).

As is usual with this type of "history," Robinson does not tell us anything of substance about Burgon's opposition to the Revised Version. He merely pontificates that Burgon's judgments were "wrong headed." He also brings up Burgon's enthusiasm, claiming that his writings were unparalleled in "the violence of their tone." Violence? Unparalleled? Has Mr. Robinson not read the fiery writings of Martin Luther or of John Knox? Compared even to Charles Spurgeon's writings during the "Downgrade Controversy," Burgon was not very "violent." I am convinced that a common problem among Burgon's critics is that they simply do not understand, and certainly do not appreciate, genuine zeal for the truth.

Robinson's attitude toward Burgon is typical of that of the vast majority of men that have written on textual criticism since 1881. This is why most twentieth-century Christians know almost nothing accurate about Burgon and his writings. In fact, many, if not most, of the widely-used books on textual research don't say even this much. Every student of biblical Greek should be introduced to the writings of Burgon and Miller and Scrivener and Hoskier. It is criminal that they are not. Let the students read Burgon for themselves instead of some silly caricature of him by someone who is an enemy of what the man stood for.

We need to note in passing that all four of the men we have cited in reference to their caricatures of Burgon were modernistic in their theology. Some protest the labeling of these men as modernists. As far as I am concerned, you can call them what you want, but they deny the infallible divine inspiration of Holy Scripture, and they are therefore apostate men.

Robinson, who died in 1945, claimed that Jesus Christ was not accurate in everything He said, because, supposedly, Christ was subject to the ignorance of the time in which He lived. Robinson said that those who "seek to extend His authority to realms in which He claimed no right or desire to speak, and disregard the historical conditions of His utterances" abuse the Word of God. Robinson said "the language and the thought of a particular generation [are] stamped upon His sayings" (*Ancient and English Versions of the Bible*, p. 287). This is not only a lie; it is blasphemy.

We have already considered Bruce Metzger's unbelief in Chapter One. With his rationalistic biases, it is no surprise that he would quickly pass over Burgon's defense of the Traditional Text. Burgon's powerful writings are devastating to Metzger's own position on biblical inspiration as well as to his position on the Bible text.

F.F. Bruce, who died in 1990, denied the eternal fire of the biblical Hell and promoted the damnable annihilation theory of judgment. Bruce claimed that

Paul's writings restricting women from the leadership positions in the churches was "merely a statement of practice for a particular time." A popular commentary series edited by F.F. Bruce and William Barclay (Abingdon Press) is full of modernistic thought and historical-critical mumbo-jumbo. In the volume dealing with Daniel and Revelation, the book of Daniel is said to have been written AFTER the fulfillment of the events prophesied therein. In the same volume we are told that we cannot know who authored the book of Daniel (even though the Lord Jesus Christ said Daniel wrote it). The volume on 1 and 2 Timothy claims that an unknown author wrote these letters in Paul's name. The volume on Isaiah claims that there were three authors of Isaiah, even though the Lord Jesus Christ quoted from both major portions of Isaiah and attributed the book to the ONE historical prophet.

Frederic Kenyon was the Director and Principal Librarian of the British Museum. He described the history of the Bible in a very naturalistic manner. He did not see the hand of God, for example, in Tyndale's masterly translation; he saw only the genius of man. Kenyon did not mention the Holy Spirit, Who is the Author and Preserver of the Scriptures. In *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, Kenyon, spewing forth the same tired modernistic slop that is commonly served up by textual critics, claimed that the Pentateuch was written by unknown authors and was not put together in its present form until the time of Ezra or even later (*Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, p. 32). He claimed that the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings were "put together after the fall of the monarchy" (Ibid.). He claimed that "we are free to examine the materials and structure of the historical books in the light of the *ordinary principles* of historical and literary criticism" (Ibid., p. 30). In other words, the Bible can be treated like any other book. Jesus Christ said Moses wrote the Law. Kenyon did not believe this, claiming that Moses did not necessarily write the Pentateuch. Kenyon believed the "Jewish religion" evolved in a naturalistic sense. He did not believe what the Bible claims: that the Old Testament was given by inspiration of Almighty God through holy men of God.

Modern textual editors do not understand Burgon's defense of the Traditional Text, but that should not come as a great surprise since most of them do not understand even the ABCs of biblical truth. This is true even for a great many of those who claim to be "evangelical."

In spite of what some revisionist historians would have us believe, Burgon's influence was very wide in his own day. Before me is a clipping from a British newspaper containing a review of Burgon's *Revision Revised*. Consider these interesting remarks which pull back the curtain and allow us to gaze into the situation existing two years after the publication of the Westcott-Hort text:

> The *Revision Revised*, by John William Burgon, B.D. ... containing 549 pages, of the three famous articles in the *Quarterly Review* upon the Revised Version of the New Testament, and also of the long pamphlet in rejoinder to Bishop Ellicott's

> apology for the Revisers. ... **is the most formidable of the many indictments which have been framed against the Revised Version** during the last two years and more. ... **we are satisfied that he has made out the two chief factors of his thesis—that the text of the Vatican Codex, which has been almost superstitiously followed by the Revisers, is largely untrustworthy ... and that the new version of even this text is constantly unscholarly, as respects both the English and the Greek.** ...
>
> For the longer the Revised New Testament has been before the public, the more stringent become the censures of the learned few; the deeper the murmurs of the Bible-reading many. ... **THE DEAN OF CHICHESTER [JOHN BURGON] MUST IN ALL FAIRNESS BE CREDITED WITH HAVING DONE MORE SINGLY THAN ANY OTHER CRITIC TO DISCREDIT IT. INDEED, THE APPEARANCE OF HIS ARTICLES WAS THE SIGNAL FOR A SUDDEN CESSATION OF THE DEMAND FOR THE NEW VERSION IN THE UNITED STATES, WHERE IT HAD PREVIOUSLY A GREAT COMMERCIAL SUCCESS; BUT THE SALE CEASED AT ONCE, AND HAVE NEVER SINCE, SO FAR AS WE LEARN, RECOVERED ACTIVITY.** This attests that he has succeeded, despite the necessary technical character of the inquiry, and the length to which his strictures extend, in getting the ear of the public, and in keeping it too, despite the replies which have been made to him from various quarters ... And, after all deductions are made, and all questionable or strained arguments disallowed, the bulk of his plea remains unaffected, and **HE MUST BE ACCOUNTED AS HAVING DONE A GREAT PUBLIC SERVICE, FOR WHICH HE DESERVES GRATITUDE**. (This newspaper clipping was found folded up in a copy of Sir Robert Anderson's *The Bible and Modern Criticism*.)

This nineteenth-century British reviewer credits John Burgon with the rapid demise of the English Revised Version.

Let me say here that I disagree with Burgon's position that the Greek Received Text underlying the KJV needs revision. He felt it could be revised, but he also held that it could not be revised unless 14 requirements were met—requirements that made it impossible for such a revision to have been done in his day and that would have made it impossible, in fact, for it ever to have been done. (For these requirements see two books by D.A. Waite: *Ten Reasons Why the Dean Burgon Society Deserves Its Name*; also *How and When Would Dean Burgon Revise?* The Bible for Today, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ 08108).

In regard to the nature of the Received Text I have the benefit of looking back over 100 years of history since Burgon's day. I can see the confusion that has come from the multiplicity of Greek texts and English versions. The One Standard was divided into two, then into three, then into four, and there has been no end of further division. Today there are hundreds of texts and versions, each with its own peculiar witness as to what God supposedly said. The "Thus saith the Lord" of the nineteenth century has become "the Better Manuscripts Omit This Verse" of the twentieth. The Received Text was blessed and exalted by God in a way that no text of Scripture has ever been. I believe that if the Received Text—which was refined in the sixteenth-century fires of persecution, which was enshrined in the

most powerful and influential translations the world has ever seen, which was carried to the ends of the earth during the greatest era of missionary activity since the first century—I say, that if this was not the preserved Word of God we will never know what is. That is what I believe, and I believe it because of God's solemn promises to preserve His Word. So I disagree with John Burgon or with Edward Hill or with Zane Hodges or with anyone else who proposes that the Received Text needs revision at this late date in history. What edition of the Received Text, you say? The very edition underlying the King James Bible. (See the section on Edward F. Hills for an explanation of this.)

This aside, my heart cries out "Amen" to the vast majority of what Burgon had to say. He was a warrior; he was a watchman; he was mightily zealous for the Word of God.

Burgon's Position on Bible Texts and Versions

Consider what Burgon believed about preservation and the Traditional Text underlying the KJV:

> What standard more reasonable and more convenient than the Text which, by the good Providence of God, was universally employed throughout Europe for the first 300 years after the invention of printing? Being practically *identical* with the Text which ... was in popular use at the end of three centuries from the date of the sacred autographs themselves: in other words, being more than 1500 years old (emphasis in the original) (*Revision Revised*, 386).

Consider what Burgon believed about the danger of dividing biblical authority:

> In the meantime, the country has been flooded with two editions of the New Greek Text; and **thus the door has been set wide open for universal mistrust of the Truth of Scripture to enter** (*Revision Revised*, Preface, p. xxx).
>
> Our Authorized Version is the one religious link which at present binds together ninety millions of English-speaking men scattered over the earth's surface. Is it reasonable that so unutterably precious, **so sacred a bond should be endangered**, for the sake of representing certain words more accurately,—here and there translating a tense with greater precision,—getting rid of a few archaisms? ... For ourselves, we deprecate it entirely (*Revision Revised*, pp. 113, 114).

Consider what Burgon believed about the King James Bible:

> ... the plain fact being that the men of 1611—above all, that William Tyndale 77 years before them—produced a work of real genius; seizing with generous warmth the meaning and intention of the sacred Writers, and perpetually varying the phrase, as they felt or fancied that Evangelists and Apostles would have varied it, had they had to express themselves in English (*Revision Revised*, p. 167).
>
> It may be confidently assumed that no revision of our Authorized Version however judiciously executed, will ever occupy the place in public esteem which

is actually enjoyed by the work of the translators of 1611,—THE NOBLEST LITERARY WORK IN THE ANGLO-SAXON LANGUAGE. **We shall in fact never have another 'Authorized Version.' ... only as a handmaid is [a revision] to be desired. AS SOMETHING INTENDED TO SUPERSEDE OUR PRESENT ENGLISH BIBLE, WE ARE THOROUGHLY CONVINCED THAT THE PROJECT OF A RIVAL TRANSLATION IS NOT TO BE ENTERTAINED FOR A MOMENT. FOR OURSELVES, WE DEPRECATE IT ENTIRELY** (*Revision Revised*, pp. 113,114).

Burgon understood the unspeakably serious nature of tampering with the Bible. It was this that so keenly set him apart from the textual scholars who flippantly toss aside a thousand biblical words here and a thousand there as if they were nothing more than old nails from a roofing job.

But what makes this so very serious a matter is that, because Holy Scripture is the Book experimented upon, the loftiest interests that can be named become imperiled; and it will constantly happen that what is not perhaps in itself a very serious mistake may yet inflict irreparable injury (*Revision Revised*, p. 197).

To feel Burgon's heartbeat, consider an excerpt from his critique of the English Revised Version of 1881. Everything he said about the ERV is applicable to the popular versions of our day:

In the end, when partisanship had cooled down, and passion had evaporated, and prejudice had ceased to find an auditory, the 'Revision' of 1881 must come to be universally regarded as what it most certainly is, the most astonishing, as well as the most calamitous literary blunder of the Age....

In thus demonstrating the worthlessness of the 'New Greek Text' of the Revisionists, I considered that I had destroyed the key of their position. And so perforce I had. For if the underlying Greek Text be mistaken, what else but incorrect must the English Translation be? ...

A yet stranger phenomenon is, that those who have once committed themselves to an erroneous theory [Westcott and Hortism], seem to be incapable of opening their eyes to the untrustworthiness of the fabric they have erected, even when it comes down in their sight like a child's house built with playing cards, and presents to every eye but their own the appearance of a shapeless ruin. ...

For we resolutely maintain, that external evidence must after all be our best, our only safe guide. And to come to the point, we refuse to throw in our lot with those who, disregarding the witness of every other known Codex, every other Version, every other available Ecclesiastical Writer, insist on following the dictates of a little group of authorities, of which nothing whatever is known with so much certainty as that often, when they concur exclusively, it is to mislead. ...

Shame—yes, shame on the learning which comes abroad only to perplex the weak, and to unsettle the doubting, and to mislead the blind! Shame on that two-thirds majority of well-intentioned but most incompetent men who, finding themselves (in an evil hour) appointed to correct 'plain and

> **clear errors' in the English Authorized Version, occupied themselves instead with falsifying the inspired Greek Text in countless places, and branding with suspicion some of the most precious utterances of the Spirit! Shame, yes, shame upon them!** ...
>
> Changes of any sort are unwelcome in such a book as the Bible; but the discovery that changes have been made for the worse, offends greatly. ...
>
> What offends us is the discovery that, for every obscurity which has been removed, at least half a dozen others have been introduced: in other words, the result of this Revision has been the planting of a fresh crop of difficulties, before undreamed of, so that a perpetual wrestling with these is what hereafter awaits the diligent student of the New Testament. ...
>
> **CALL THIS TEXT ERASMIAN OR COMPLUTENSIAN—THE TEXT OF STEPHENS, OR OF BEZA, OR OF THE ELZEVIRS—CALL IT THE 'RECEIVED,' OR THE TRADITIONAL GREEK TEXT, OR WHATEVER OTHER NAME YOU PLEASE—THE FACT REMAINS, THAT A TEXT HAS COME DOWN TO US WHICH IS ATTESTED BY A GENERAL CONSENSUS OF ANCIENT COPIES, ANCIENT VERSIONS, ANCIENT FATHERS** (John Burgon, *Revision Revised*).

The modern textual critics hate Burgon because he had their number! Though as scholarly as any man of his age, he was not content to discuss these life-or-death issues in the detached, emotionless manner of the average scholar. He CARED for the truth. He LOVED the Bible!

John Burgon's defense of the Received Text has been very influential. Thousands of men in Britain and North America who were zealous for the Word of God were encouraged by John Burgon's writings in his own day, and men are still being encouraged by him. Burgon's *Revision Revised* has been reprinted in a number of editions. In 1959 it was reprinted by The Sovereign Grace Book Club with an introduction by Edward F. Hill. In 1978 Conservative Classics of Paradise, Pennsylvania, published a reprint of Burgon's masterpiece. In 1981 The Bible for Today of Collingswood, New Jersey, published a reprint of it. In 1983 a Centennial Edition of *Revision Revised* was printed by A.G. Hobbs Publications of Fort Worth, Texas. In 1990 the Sovereign Grace Trust Fund published many of Burgon's writings in a volume entitled *Unholy Hands on the Bible: Volume 1*.

Burgon's work has also been summarized in countless ways in sermons, articles, and books. D.O. Fuller summarized *Revision Revised* in *True Or False?* The Trinitarian Bible Society has used Burgon's research in its *Quarterly Record* since before the turn of the 20th century. A number of other magazines in Britain and elsewhere have carried sympathetic reviews and abbreviated editions of his writings. These in turn have been used by pastors and evangelists and Bible teachers. An example is a man we will mention later in this book: William Aberhart, founder and dean of the Calgary Prophetic Bible Institute, established in 1928. In his course on Bible transmission and preservation Aberhart freely used John Burgon's works. Aberhart's students, in turn, used Burgon's research

in their own defense of the Word of God. An example of the latter is Pastor Mark Buch in Vancouver, British Columbia, of whom we will say more later. Thousands of preachers in our time have been influenced by Burgon's zealous stand against corrupt Bibles.

Burgon's *Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established*, posthumously published by Edward Miller in 1896, is a classic in its field. For today's textual critics to pass over such a scholarly defense of the Traditional Text is evidence, to this writer at least, that they do not really want to get at the truth. They like to work in the dark. If their theories could stand up to a solid biblical critique, why are they content to caricature Burgon?

In *Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, Burgon begins where every child of God must begin in reference to the text of the Bible: with Divine preservation:

> There exists no reason for supposing that the Divine Agent, who in the first instance thus gave to mankind the Scriptures of Truth, straightway abdicated His office; took no further care of His work; abandoned those precious writings to their fate. That a perpetual miracle was wrought for their preservation—that copyists were protected against the risk of error, or evil men prevented from adulterating shamefully copies of the Deposit—no one, it is presumed, is so weak as to suppose. But it is quite a different thing to claim that **ALL DOWN THE AGES THE SACRED WRITINGS MUST NEEDS HAVE BEEN GOD'S PECULIAR CARE; THAT THE CHURCH UNDER HIM HAS WATCHED OVER THEM WITH INTELLIGENCE AND SKILL**; has recognized which copies exhibit a fabricated, which an honestly transcribed text; has generally sanctioned the one, and generally disallowed the other. **I am utterly disinclined to believe—so grossly improbable does it seem—that at the end of 1800 years 995 copies out of every thousand, suppose, will prove untrustworthy; and that the one, two, three, four or five which remain, whose contents were till yesterday as good as unknown, will be found to have retained the secret of what the Holy Spirit originally inspired. I am utterly unable to believe, in short, that God's promise has so entirely failed, that at the end of 1800 years much of the text of the Gospel had in point of fact to be picked by a German critic out of a waste-paper basket in the convent of St. Catherine; and that the entire text had to be remodelled after the pattern set by a couple of copies which had remained in neglect during fifteen centuries, and had probably owed their survival to that neglect; whilst hundreds of others had been thumbed to pieces, and had bequeathed their witness to copies made from them** (John Burgon, *The Traditional Text*, pp. 11, 12).

Burgon proceeded to lay out the problem of textual criticism in its simplest essence:

> Strange as it may appear, it is undeniably true, that the whole of the controversy may be reduced to the following narrow issue: Does the truth of the Text of Scripture dwell with the vast multitude of copies, uncial and cursive, concerning which nothing is more remarkable than the marvellous agreement which subsists between them? Or is it rather to be supposed that the truth abides

> exclusively with a very little handful of manuscripts, which at once differ from the great bulk of the witnesses, and—strange to say—also amongst themselves? (Ibid., p. 16).

In Chapter Three of *The Traditional Text*, Burgon sets forth the "seven notes of truth," being the seven-fold witness to the true text of Scripture:

1. Antiquity, or Primitiveness
2. Consent of Witnesses, or Number
3. Variety of Evidence, or Catholicity
4. Respectability of Witnesses, or Weight
5. Continuity, or Unbroken Tradition
6. Evidence of the Entire Passage, or Context
7. Internal Considerations, or Reasonableness

These seven principles define Burgon's method. Dr. D.A. Waite, the Baptist scholar who has reprinted many of Burgon's works for this generation, says of *The Traditional Text*: "This book lays down clearly Dean Burgon's Principles of textual criticism with his 'seven notes of truth,' discusses and dissects the Vatican and Sinaitic Manuscripts, and shows that the 'Traditional text' which underlies the KJV of 1611—reaches back before 400 A.D., before 300 A.D., before 200 A.D., or even before 100 A.D.—back to the VERY ORIGINAL AUTOGRAPHS THEMSELVES!"

A fascinating 18-page section of *The Traditional Text* describes an imaginary conversation between Burgon and a typical student who has been trained under the modern theories of textual criticism. We can believe, based on the fact that Burgon maintained a warm, fatherly relationship with many students at Oxford and elsewhere, that this "imaginary" conversation was very similar to many real ones he had conducted.

We close this overview of Burgon's life and work with one more quote from his own writings. He describes for us his motive in entering the fray of the Bible version controversy:

> My apology for bestowing so large a portion of my time on Textual Criticism, is David's when he was reproached by his brethren for appearing on the field of battle,—'IS THERE NOT A CAUSE?' (*Revision Revised*, Preface, p. xxix).

Amen, John William Burgon. There is a cause. Preach on!

EDWARD MILLER (1825-1901)

Edward Miller was John Burgon's understudy, co-worker, and co-author. He published two of Burgon's works posthumously. Of his relationship with Burgon he said:

> It is due both to Dean Burgon and to myself to say that we came together after having worked on independent lines, though I am bound to acknowledge my great debt to his writings. At first we did not agree thoroughly in opinion, but I found afterwards that he was right and I was wrong. It is a proof of the unifying power of our principles, that as to our system there is now absolutely no

> difference between us, though on minor points, generally outside of this immediate subject, we do not always exactly concur (Miller, Preface, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, p. xi).

Miller also published an important book of his own on textual criticism: *A Guide to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. First published in 1886, it was reprinted in 1979 by The Bible for Today. The dedicatory note reveals Miller's heartbeat: "This little treatise is gratefully inscribed, with the prayer, that it may minister in some degree, however humble, to the ascertainment and acceptance of the genuine words of Holy Scripture."

Genuine words of Holy Scripture. Yes, that is what we want.

In the ten chapters of *A Guide to Textual Criticism* this first-rate scholar offers a fascinating overview of the history of the transmission of the biblical text. I do not understand how this book can be ignored in Greek classes in colleges and seminaries today. It must be remembered that Miller was in a unique position to know the history of the Bible. He had access to Burgon's never-equaled research into the writings of ancient church leaders. This amazing work indexes more than 86,000 quotations which Burgon, with the shovel and pickax of careful scholarship, had dug out of the hoary past! When Miller spoke of the history of the transmission of the biblical text, he spoke with an authority few men have ever been able to match.

Miller believed the Greek Received Text is representative of that text that has come down to us from the pens of the Bible's authors. Miller believed, on the other hand, that the modern critical text came from the pens of third-century heretics and Bible corrupters! That is what he believed, and it is exactly what the "King James Only crowd believes today.

> Now there are various reasons for supposing that B [Vaticanus] and Aleph [Sinaiticus] were amongst these fifty manuscripts [created by Eusebius for Constantine in A.D. 330-340]. ... These manuscripts are unrivalled for the beauty of their vellum and for their other grandeur, and are just what we should expect to find amongst such as would be supplied in obedience to an imperial command, and executed with the aid of imperial resources. ... They abound in omissions, and show marks of such carelessness as would attend an order carried out with more than ordinary expedition. And even the corrector, who always followed the copyist, did his work with similar carelessness to the scribe whom he was following. ... There is therefore very considerable foundation for the opinion entertained by many that these two celebrated manuscripts owe their execution to the order of Constantine, and show throughout the effects of the care of Eusebius, and the influence of Origen, whose works formed the staple of the Library of Pamphilus, in the city where they were most likely written. Such was probably the parentage, and such the production of these two celebrated manuscripts, which are the main exponents of a form of Text differing from that which has come down to us from the Era of Chrysostom, and has since that time till very recent years been recognized as mainly supreme in the Church (Miller, *A Guide to Textual Criticism,* pp. 82, 83) Miller's conclusion that the Vaticanus and

> Sinaiticus manuscripts are copies of Bible manuscripts that were corrupted at the hands of heretics in Caesarea is devastating to the modern Bible version superstructure, for the vast majority of the major omissions in the modern versions are founded upon these two manuscripts. Westcott and Hort had an almost magical reverence (Miller described it as "superstitious adulation") for the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus—the manuscripts that stand at the head of those referred to by modern Bible translators as "the oldest and best."

Miller was convinced that the Traditional text, as represented in the majority of manuscripts that have come down to us through the centuries, is the preserved Word of God. He felt that the Westcott-Hort position of leaning on a few recently discovered early Egyptian manuscripts was untenable:

> **TO CAST AWAY AT LEAST NINETEEN-TWENTIETHS OF THE EVIDENCE** on points and to draw conclusions from the petty remainder, **SEEMS TO US TO BE NECESSARILY NOT LESS EVEN THAN A CRIME AND A SIN, NOT ONLY BY REASON OF THE SACRILEGIOUS DESTRUCTIVENESS EXERCISED THEREBY UPON HOLY WRIT, BUT ALSO BECAUSE SUCH A METHOD IS INCONSISTENT WITH CONSCIENTIOUS EXHAUSTIVENESS AND LOGICAL METHOD.** Perfectly familiar with all that can be and is advanced in favour of such procedure, must we not say that hardly any worse pattern than this in investigations and conclusions could be presented before young men at the critical time when they are entering upon habits of forming judgments which are to carry them through life? (Edward Miller, preface to *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established* by John Burgon, p. xii).

We see that Miller was also enthusiastic and outspoken on this subject.

For professing Bible-believing men to disagree with Miller's position is one thing; for them to ignore his position and to pretend that it is merely a quaint, sentimental, obscurantist one is folly. Miller believed that his and Burgon's position could hold up under serious examination:

> I ask from Critics who may not assent to all our conclusions a candid consideration of our case, which is rested solely upon argument and reason throughout. This explanation made by the Dean of his system in calmer times and in a more didactic form cannot, as I think, fail to remove much prejudice. ... If we appear to speak too positively, we have done this, not from confidence in any private judgment, but because we are sure, at least in our own minds, that we express the verdict of all the ages and all the countries (Ibid., pp. xiii, xiv).

The thing that most impresses me about Miller is his confidence in divine preservation. Without this foundation of faith in the God of the Bible, a textual scholar is adrift upon the sea of humanistic confusion. Miller had a happier stance:

> **IS IT INDEED POSSIBLE THAT THE GREAT KING OF THE NEW KINGDOM, WHO HAS PROMISED TO BE WITH HIS SUBJECTS 'ALWAY EVEN UNTO THE END OF THE WORLD,' SHOULD HAVE ALLOWED THE TRUE TEXT OF THE WRITTEN LAWS OF HIS KINGDOM TO LURK IN OBSCURITY FOR NEARLY FIFTEEN HUNDRED YEARS, AND A TEXT VITIATED IN MANY IMPORTANT PARTICULARS TO HAVE BEEN HANDED DOWN AND**

VENERATED AS THE GENUINE FORM OF THE WORD OF GOD? Could the effect of the sacred Presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church be looked for in any more important and peculiar province, than in the preservation of the fashion and lineaments of that body of written records and teaching which He Himself has inspired?

Therefore the Rival School of Sound or High Textualists [the name Miller ascribed to Bible-believing textual scholarship as opposed to the critical school represented by Westcott and Hort] is right in attributing the greatest importance to the Traditional Text, as the Text undoubtedly handed down in the Church, and importance also to the Received Text, as an excellent though by no means an exact exponent of the former of the two (Miller, *A Guide to Textual Criticism,* p. 63).

We see that Miller, like Burgon, did not consider the Greek Received Text, which underlies the King James Bible, absolutely perfect. We believe they were wrong, but the fact is that this was their position. Some take hold of this and say it is unethical for today's "King James Only" crowd to claim ancestry with these men. The fact is that Miller *was* "King James Only" in the sense that he believed the King James Bible to be the only accurate English translation of the preserved text of Holy Scripture. Does someone protest that this is merely my own definition of "King James Only"? Let me reply that my definition is at least as authoritative as any other man's. I am not boasting when I say that few men know this subject as well as this writer does. What I am doing is showing that there have been many men down through the years that have stood against the critical text and for the King James Bible. I do not have to agree perfectly with all of their conclusions to claim a kinship with them in general. These men are far closer to the position held by KJV men today than to that of the modern version defenders. I have the advantage of looking back over a century of history since these men lived. I can see the fruit of the critical Greek text and the modern versions. Could it not be that I therefore have light they did not have?

As to the business of Miller saying the Received Text is "an excellent though by no means an exact exponent of the [Traditional Text]," I say that Miller was, as many of us are, inconsistent in applying his own working principles. His tells us that he believes in God's preservation of the Bible. Amen. He tells us that it cannot be possible that God would allow a corrupted text to be the predominant text of Scripture circulated through history, that it cannot be possible that God would allow the pure text to lie "in oblivion," unknown and unused, century after century. I agree. I consider that an impossibility. To say that the purest copies of Scripture were hidden away until the mid-nineteenth century is an outrageous fairy tale. But I also say that this *same* position of faith forces me to make a decision as to *exactly* which version of the Traditional Text is the precise Word of God. There are many manuscripts, many ancient versions; in fact, there are several editions of the Greek Received Text itself. Which is to be preferred? The position of faith forces me to look for the edition that has been most blessed of God, and in my estimation that is the one that underlies the King James Bible.

Believe whatever you will, but my attachment to the King James Bible is based on the promises of God and the record of history. I revere it because it has demonstrated itself to be the preserved Word of God. What do you revere? If the King James Bible, with its glorious history of producing revival wherever it has gone in this dark world, is not the preserved Word of God, I don't believe there is such a thing. *We are not talking about just another translation.* The King James Bible is unique in numerous ways. I can't develop this line of thought in detail, because it is outside of the scope of this book, but on the basis of faith, I believe the preserved Word of God is the exact text underlying the King James Bible. (See the book *Faith vs. the Modern Bible Versions: A 10-Fold Defense of the King James Bible*, which is available from Way of Life Literature, fbns@wayoflife.org, http://www.wayoflife.org.)

This is a position of faith. Let me ask this of those who disagree with me. Can you demonstrate *conclusively* that the text underlying the KJV is NOT the text originally given to the prophets and the apostles? If not, you should be very cautious and humble in pushing any agenda to overthrow the Received Text and to replace the KJV.

It is an interesting sidebar that the leaders of the Protestant Reformation were satisfied that the Greek text they had was the preserved Word of God and they eventually ceased attempting to revise it:

> This text of Beza's had a powerful influence on the English New Testament from the 1560 Genevan to the Authorized Version, as did his Latin translation of it. ... **EVENTUALLY, THIS TEXT WOULD BE CALLED THE *TEXTUS RECEPTUS* (THE TEXT RECEIVED), NOT AS JUST A PUBLISHER'S BLURB, BUT AS A DESCRIPTIVE REALITY**, as Tregelles notes: 'Beza's text was during his life in very general use among Protestants; they seemed to feel that enough had been done to establish it, and they relied on it as giving them a firm basis. ... After the appearance of the texts of Stephen and Beza, many Protestants ceased from all inquiry into the authorities on which the text of the Greek Testament in their hands was based' (Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, *An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament with Remarks on Its Revision upon Critical Principles*, London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1854, pp. 33-35). ... In order for *sola scriptura* to have any meaning for the Protestant cause of withstanding the presumptions of the Roman pontiff, they, too, MUST HAVE A SOURCE OF INFALLIBILITY; what Bentley, a child of the Enlightenment rather than the Reformation, would deridingly refer to as 'the Protestant Pope Stephens' (Theodore Letis, *Theodore Beza 1519-1605 as a Text Critic*, Westminster Theological Seminary, 1983, pp. 16, 17).

This brings us back to the matter of authority. A single accurate Bible is a mighty authority. Two conflicting Bibles is confusion. It was not until the absolute authority of the Greek Received Text and the old Protestant versions was weakened that Rome began to make her comeback. Perhaps this is only a coincidence? Sure, and we believe in the tooth fairy, too!.

To return to the subject at hand, I praise the Lord for Edward Miller's faith in God's promises. If he was not perfectly consistent, I'm sure the Lord has straightened him out by now! I have the privilege before God of believing that the Received Text is the preserved Word of God. Miller's work largely confirms my position.

ARTHUR CLEVELAND COXE (1818-1896)

Arthur Cleveland Coxe, Bishop of the Episcopal diocese of Western New York, spoke out against the revision of the Authorized Version in 1871.

> During the spring of 1871, there appeared three communications of considerable length in the 'Independent' (New York) on this subject, from the pen of A.C. Coxe Bishop of the [Episcopal] diocese of Western New York. The first article (March 23rd) related to the undesirableness of any change in our present version on the ground of its associations and present unequalled English, and to the 'ill-conceived and mismanaged' attempts of the Southern Province to lead a movement in this direction. Of the other articles, one proceeds on the assumption that radical changes are contemplated by the revisers in the phraseology of the current version, and earnestly deprecates it, showing that even Dean Alford and Dean Stanley are but poorly 'qualified to mend the English of the seventeenth century, as we have it in the good old Bible.' **The third communication sets forth the insufficient qualifications of our present scholarship to cope with the important questions likely to arise in connection with the original text.** He affirms that the present state of things is especially unfavorable to an enlightened use of the ancient versions, particularly those of the Syriac. 'One of the most learned of the Old Testament committee,' he writes, 'now engaged in the revision confessed to me his grave doubts in this respect. He considered the whole science of the collection of codices yet in its infancy; and he surprised me by the expressions he used as to the unexplored mines of ancient manuscripts which might be opened by a little energy and enthusiasm ... He quotes Bishop Ellicott as saying: '**Even critical editors of the stamp of Tischendorf have apparently not acquired even a rudimentary knowledge of several of the leading versions which they conspicuously quote. Nay, more, in many instances they have positively misrepresented the very readings which have been followed, and have allowed themselves to be misled by Latin translations which, as my notes will testify, are often sadly, and even perversely, incorrect'** (Edwin Bissell, *The Historic Origin of the Bible*, pp. 356, 57).

EDMUND BECKETT

Sir Edmund Beckett (afterwards Lord Grimthorpe), Bart., LL.D., Q.C., F.R.A.S., published an attack against the Revised Version in early 1882 entitled *Should the Revised New Testament Be Authorised*? Beckett "deprecated its use in public worship as not legal, and elaborated his complaints with particular reference to Matthew, Hebrews, and the Apocalypse" (H. Wheeler Robinson, *Ancient and English Versions of the Bible*, p. 262). Hemphill described Beckett's position as "a

sweeping and fairly lively and interesting condemnation of the work as a whole." Beckett dealt with three aspects of the revision: "(1) transgression of the limits imposed by Convocation, (2) work of supererogation in recasting the Greek text, and (3) superabundance of correction of the English in non-essentials" (Hemphill, pp. 108, 09). Beckett also issued a reply to Dr. F.W. Farrar's defense of the Revision. The following citation from Beckett's *Should the Revised New Testament Be Authorised?* will give the reader a sample of his view on the subject:

> It is impossible to separate the English from the Greek interpretation, and therefore I disclaim acting on any principle in this matter, except using the best judgment I can; and especially that of preferring sense to nonsense, in spite of any number of scholars and their rules; and good English to bad, and clearness to obscurity. …
>
> If it is asked what else the Revisers as a body could do but adopt the conclusions of the prescribed majority, I answer, Nothing. But that leaves two other questions open: first, whether their rules were judicious, and sufficient for the prevention of important alterations which are materially short of being unquestionable; and secondly, whether the majority who carried them are to be accepted by the world outside as infallible and above criticism. I am only speaking of new readings of the Greek just now, and I could not say anything stronger as to the need of caution therein than the Revisers say themselves; for this, like most of their avowed principles, is excellent in the abstract, and the only wonder is how they can have written it all after they had done their work. They say, 'Textual criticism, as applied to the Greek N.T., forms a special study of much intricacy and difficulty, and *even now leaves room for considerable variety of opinion* among competent critics.' One would think that the natural and practical conclusion from that was that nothing which has hitherto been received as part of the Bible should be expelled on any evidence, or on the balance of evidence and reasoning, much short of certainty; and not on a mere preponderance of votes between members of the 'different schools of criticism which have been represented among the revisers.' TEXTUAL CRITICISM IS A VERY MUCH MORE SERIOUS THING THAN NEW TRANSLATION. Thousands and tens of thousands of persons can judge of the latter for one who has the means of judging of the former. Moreover, omissions of received words or sentences are a much more serious alteration than new translations, or even new readings, important as they may be. FOR IF ONCE A WORD OR A SENTENCE GETS PUT OUT OF THE AUTHORISED BIBLE IT WILL BE EXTREMELY DIFFICULT FOR ANY FUTURE SCHOLARS TO GET IT BACK AGAIN; while leaving it there, indicated as questionable in any way they like, does all that they had any right to do when they were not almost or altogether certain that it has no right to appear. I do not think they have added a single new sentence, and there are very few new words, except as substitutes for old ones, while they have expelled a vast number. …
>
> The Translators wisely propounded very little in the way of principles in their Preface, leaving their work to speak for itself, and leaving others to philosophise upon it. As I have said about architecture elsewhere, in the days when there was real art there was no philosophy of art: we have now plenty of the latter and very little of the former. Whenever they did state their principles of translation it was more the principle of having none than of being bound by any. …

> [The translators of the Authorised Version] always maintained the liberty to use the same English word for different Greek ones when the circumstances suggest it. The Revisers' Preface, among a multitude of other principles and rules, professes to explain how they have dealt with these inconsistencies … But the explanation explains nothing; or at any rate much less than reading any half a dozen pages of the book, which soon enables one to see that they have gone on exactly the opposite principle in both respects, as indeed they incidentally avow; and consequently they have introduced as much monotony as possible, for one thing. If their principles are right, I do not see what business dictionaries have to give so many different translations of the same words, and both ways between two languages. They give them because the learned men who make the dictionaries find the words manifestly used with all those different meanings; then come these Revisers and say in effect that there are none, except in a few extreme cases in which even they are obliged to allow them. Dictionaries must want revising even more than the A.V. …
>
> A great many of their alterations are due to modern rules about the meaning of using or omitting the Greek definite article—the only one there is, and also about the effect of the five past tenses which the language has. But scholars as good as the Revisers deny that the N.T. writers always observed those rules, and we shall see clearly that they did not, because if they did they sometimes wrote nonsense. Moreover, if they rigorously observed any rules they were very different from the best English writers, who use considerable latitude in such matters. And so did Greek ones, as Drs. Westcott and Hort admit. …
>
> The same may be said about the modern rules for construing aorists and perfect tenses, to which are due another multitude of alterations. Such rules are probably right enough generally (in the sense of usually), so far that there is a presumption in favour of observing them, but certainly no more, as we shall see continually. And as all such rules can only be matter of induction from experience in the books to which they are intended to be applied, and cannot be deduced from any axioms or necessary truths, as in mathematics, the assertion that any such rule is universal is at once refuted by finding that it would sometimes produce absurd or manifestly wrong results. … The English-speaking people of the world want the English Bible to express the full and substantial meaning of the writers of the original in the best way, and not in the way that is used to test schoolboys' knowledge of the parsing of every word. It is nothing to us whether Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, Paul, Peter, James, and Jude, and the uncertain writer to the Hebrews, all minded their aorists and articles, participles and particles, as good scholars may expect them to have done, but as it is clear that they did not; because we find it sometimes makes nonsense or confusion to assume that they did (Beckett, *Should the Revised New Testament Be Authorised?* 1882, pp. 1-15).

Beckett, who displayed a good sense of humor in his analysis of the Revised Version, understood that "the science" of textual criticism was very inexact and subjective. He refused to allow the scholarship of the revisers to blind him to sound common sense about the biblical text. He knew that the foundational problem with the Revised Version was the tampering that had been done to the underlying text. He understood that the omission of thousands of words in the new Greek text would have permanent and very serious consequences. In a

word, the man had a great deal more common sense than those today who claim that the textual issue is doctrinally and spiritually inconsequential.

In his conclusion to *Should the Revised New Testament Be Authorised*, Beckett reveals the haughty manner in which Westcott and Hort and most of the Revisers treated criticism of their work:

> I have spoken freely of the Company of the Revisers as a body … I give them all credit, collectively and severally, for meaning to do their best in this important work, and for having done it; but that is no reason why it should not be criticised as freely as anybody pleases, and their principles of revision condemned as fundamentally wrong, as well as contrary to their instructions. Yet I must say that some of them in their public utterances, and indeed their corporate utterance in the Preface, have displayed a rather singular impatience of criticism. …
>
> They seem to think that all the criticism that has appeared hitherto may be dismissed as 'hasty.' Soon they will be exclaiming that it is too late, and that it is odd that all the faults were not found out before. Anything seems to suit them better than specifically answering the objections that have appeared, except every now and then picking out some trivial mistake of a critic and parading it as a specimen of the general criticism—a very common controversial device. … Every objection that is made to their work ought to admit of such an answer, or it is a valid objection. Selecting a few weak objections and showing them up will not do; though showing up specimens of their objectionable alterations will do, for the purpose of proving that they ought not to be ratified by Act of Parliament, and therefore not the book which contains them (Ibid., pp. 193, 194).

CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH (1807-1885)

Christopher Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, "strongly upheld the exclusive authority of the Version of 1611, and denied any liberty at all to the clergy in the matter." During the discussion that surrounded the proposal for revision in May 1870, in the Lower House of the Province of Canterbury, Wordsworth stated unequivocally that he was not prepared for any alteration of the text "and he dwelt at some length upon the value of the Authorized Version" (John Stoughton, *Our English Bible*, p. 285). He refused an appointment to the revision committee.

After the Revised New Testament was published, Wordsworth delivered an address at his Diocesan Conference, on October 21, 1881, censuring the new version.

> He gives a long list of *censurae* ... and concludes by proposing two questions:
>
> 1. 'Whether with these numerous petty changes, which would keep us in a perpetual fidget in our churches, where we most desire to be at peace, we should do well to allow the Revised Version to supplant the Authorised translation of the Bible, which has sounded in the ears of our forefathers for 270 years?

2. 'Whether the Church of England could consistently accept a version in which 36,000 changes have been made, not a fiftieth of which can be shown to be needed or even desirable?'

This address contained two rather telling illustrations: one in which Wordsworth likens the transition from the Authorised to the Revised Version to that from a well-hung carriage rolling smoothly and pleasantly along a properly macadamised public road, to a springless cart jolting along a rough country lane; and the other in which he compares a vast multitude of little irritating corrections to a swarm of minute and venomous insects, which annoy their victim all the more because they are so small (Samuel Hemphill, *A History of the Revised Version*, pp. 103, 04).

In 1886, Wordsworth continued his opposition to the Revised Version in his book *The Authorized New Testament and Revised Contrasted*.

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW

The Edinburgh Review took much the same stand as *The Quarterly Review* in opposing the Revised Version. Though supporting a minor revision of the Authorized Bible for the sake of updating the language and making other minor improvements, most articles in *The Edinburgh Review* opposed the revision of the underlying text. In July 1851, an article appeared opposing the critical Greek texts. The July 1856 *Review* contained another article opposing the calls for a revision of the Authorized Bible. In July 1881, *The Edinburgh Review* published an article highly critical of the newly published Revised New Testament. In October 1885 the *Review* contained articles condemning the newly published Revised Old Testament and criticising the Revisers' emendations of the Hebrew Massoretic text.

GEORGE WHITEFIELD SAMSON (1819-1895)

George Whitefield Samson is another scholar who took an unqualified stand against the critical Greek text that was published by Westcott-Hort in 1881. Samson was President of Columbian University in Washington, D.C. He had accompanied a group of textual researchers who visited St. Catherine' monastery at Mt. Sinai and other sites in Egypt to examine manuscripts. In 1882 Samson published *The English Revisers' Greek Text Shown to be Unauthorized Except by Egyptian Copies Discarded by Greeks and to be Opposed to the Historic Text of all Ages and Churches*. This was written before Samson had seen John Burgon's critique of the Revised Version. In fact, as the last pages of his book were being typeset, Samson first came into possession of Burgon's article from the October 1881 issue of *The Quarterly Review*.

The title of Samson's book leaves no doubt as to the man's position on the subject. He was convinced that the Sinaiticus, the Vaticanus and similar manuscripts preferred by modern translators represent a corrupted text that has been rejected

down through the centuries by God's people. Speaking of the Greek text adopted by the English revisers, Samson said that "for the first time in the history of the Christian Church, the uncial manuscripts, made in Egypt by copyists, many of whom were ignorant of Greek, have been followed as supreme authority in a version of the New Testament" (p. 9). Like most men who have supported the Greek Received Text, Samson emphasized the divine preservation of the Scriptures:

> Christ alludes to the care with which the Hebrews copied the manuscripts of the Old Testament when he said: 'Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.' In this a double safeguard is indicated: first, the care of *men*, in the past so unparalleled, would prevent the omission of the minute letter, 'yod,' or even of the 'little curve' which distinguishes one letter from another, as, for example, the Hebrew d from r; second, **THERE IS PROMISED FOR THE FUTURE *A DIVINE WATCH-CARE*, ALIKE APPLICABLE TO THE REVELATION THEN GIVEN, AND TO THAT WHICH THROUGH HIS APOSTLES HE WOULD SUBSEQUENTLY GIVE** (Samson, p. 20).

Samson understood that the very existence of a Received Text of Scripture is a powerful witness to the original writings and that it could not be changed without an unquestionable demonstration that it was in error at some point.

> It should be distinctly observed that this text of the ages, preserved by the Greeks themselves, is like Justinian's 'Institutes' in all Europe, and like Blackstone in England and America. It is the 'common law text'; and therefore **on every critic**, who in German, England, or America disputes its authority, **the 'burden of proof' rests** (Samson, p. 23).

Samson exposed the commonly repeated error that the Reformation editors lacked sufficient manuscript evidence:

> **THE IMPRESSION HAS BEEN RECENTLY ENCOURAGED THAT THE MANUSCRIPTS AT ISSUE WERE UNKNOWN TO, OR WERE UNEXAMINED BY, PHILOLOGICAL STUDENTS UNTIL WITHIN THE LAST FORTY YEARS. ON THE CONTRARY, THESE FACTS ARE HISTORICALLY SUSTAINED: FIRST, THAT ALL OF THEM WERE KNOWN FOR CENTURIES TO GREEK SCHOLARS, BY WHOM THEY WERE EXAMINED AND CORRECTED; SECOND, THAT ROMAN CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT TRANSLATORS HAD BEFORE THEM MOST OF THESE MANUSCRIPTS, AS WELL AS THE 'COMMON' GREEK TEXT, AT THE ERA OF THE REFORMATION**; third, that of the uncial manuscripts most relied on by the present revisers, the Vatican was used by the Roman revisers of the Greek text; the Alexandrine, sent to Charles I., was thoroughly examined by Poole, under Charles II.; while it is the Sinaitic, the one most manifestly erroneous in its omissions, and the most corrected by Greek scholars, which has led to the newly controlling impression as to authoritative value ...
>
> It is certain, however, that these editions did not *make* a text; and that which they found in the cursive manuscripts at hand was, as a careful comparison now shows, the 'koine ekdosis,' [common edition] which has come down through the

> ages unchallenged in the Church which still uses only the Greek Scriptures. As to the Egyptian uncial manuscripts, **since the Vatican manuscript was in the catalogue of that library published in 1475, it must have been among those 'oldest' manuscripts used by Cardinal Ximenes in 1502-14; while both Erasmus and Stephens had some of the more important uncials** (Samson, pp. 13, 14, 40, 41).

Samson reviewed the various materials used in textual reconstruction, the uncial [capital letter] manuscripts, the cursives, the ancient versions, and the writings of ancient church leaders. After describing the chief uncials (of which Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are examples), Samson said:

> All the important ones are traceable to mere mechanical Egyptian copyists at the seat of the first cosmopolitan Christian school at Alexandria; **all were regarded by Greeks as unconformed to their own 'koine ekdosis' [common edition], and hence were repeatedly corrected; ALL WERE ESTEEMED OF NO VALUE EXCEPT AS RELICS**; and as such, mere relics, their Greek owners parted with them as fit collections only for a museum (Samson, p. 37).

Samson pointed out the FACT that manuscripts that for hundreds of years were considered OF NO VALUE by God's people have been exalted to the place of CHIEF VALUE by modern textual critics!

On the other hand, of the cursive manuscripts (which largely represent the Received Text) that are typically discounted by modern critics, Samson said:

> ... all these cursive manuscripts known to European scholars are but the rescripts from copies which the Greek Church have furnished from their numberless stores ... **From these cursive manuscripts, made by native Greeks from their 'koine ekdosis,' which, like the common-law, has come down from time immemorial**—from these cursive Greek manuscripts, as opposed to the uncials of Egyptian copyists [such as the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus], most of which were in their hands, both Protestant and Roman Catholic scholars made up the text, **which, when the art of printing was invented, became the editions which appeared at the age of the Reformation** (Samson, pp. 38, 39).

Samson reminded his readers that the ancient versions are an important witness.

> The versions of the New Testament, as the Syriac and Latin, made prior to the age of the earliest known Greek manuscripts, have an authority superior to the uncial manuscripts so far as antiquity is concerned. ... In his logical discussion of this point Hug says: 'We are in possession of documents which are much more ancient than the oldest manuscripts'; and he adds: 'so far as the antiquity of the testimony merits regard some of them will even surpass the manuscripts in authority (Samson, pp. 41, 42).

Samson also exposed the myth that implies that the Received Text was created only 500 years ago.

> **It has become an unwarranted custom to allude to the text used by both Catholic and Protestant translators at the era of the Reformation, styled in Latin the 'textus receptus,' as if it were made up at that time; whereas it was then FOUND as the universally received text** of the Roman, the Oriental,

and especially of the Greek Church, which Church still uses the original Greek as their vernacular (Samson, p. 18).

GEORGE SAYLES BISHOP (1836-1914)

George Sayles Bishop, D.D., is another illustration of those who took a stand for the King James Bible and against the Revision. Bishop was the pastor of the First Reformed Church of Orange, New Jersey, Vedder Lecturer for 1885, and President of the General Synod in 1899. A brilliant preacher and a mighty defender of the Protestant faith, he fought valiantly against the Higher Criticism that was permeating Christianity in his day. Bishop's sermons on this theme and his exaltation of the Bible as the infallible Word of God are marvelous. Consider a tiny excerpt:

> Our modern critics, with arrogance which rises to daring impiety, deny to Christ the insight which they claim for themselves. ... The authority of Jesus Christ, God speaking—not from heaven only, but with human lips—has given a sanction to every book and sentence in the Jewish canon, and blasphemy is written on the forehead of any theory which alleges imperfection, error, contradiction or sin in any book in the sacred collection (George Sayles Bishop, *The Doctrines of Grace and Kindred Themes*, 1910, p. 93).

Like Burgon and many others, Dr. Bishop plainly understood the intimate association between Higher Criticism and Textual Criticism. Bishop was a careful scholar. Consider how painstakingly he examined the question of whether 1 Timothy 3:1 should read "God":

> Soon after [1885] I went to Europe where I spent nearly three weeks in studying this text I Tim. iii:16 on the great uncials 'C' and 'A.' Through the kindness of Mr. Albert Le Faivre, Minister Plenipotentiary from France to the United States, I had the Codex 'C' for one week under my hands to study the membrane with lenses and under full sunshine. The parchment was also held up by an attendant in front of the great window so that the light could fall through the palimpsest page. I have compared the THEOS of line 14 on folio 119, the one in dispute, with every other THEOS on the page and, out of the five, find it the plainest one there. All five are written with two letters—ΟΥ, ΟΥ, ΟC, ΟΥ, ΟΟ. Two of the five only have the line, the mark of contraction, above. *One of the two, the plainest, is the one they deny.* Three of the five only have the hair mark in the Theta (Θ)—*one of these three is the one they deny*. To put it more plainly—the question is, is it OC 'who,' or is it ΘC with a line over the two letters and a mark in the Ο, God? **It is beyond question the latter. My eyes are as good as any man's** (George Sayles Bishop, "Sheol: The Principle and Tendency of the Revision Examined," *The Doctrines of Grace and Kindred Themes*, p. 79).

A discourse preached on June 7, 1885, "The Principle and Tendency of the Revision Examined," contained a devastating charge against the critical text and the new version that was founded thereupon. It also contained a marvelous exaltation of the blessed Word of God. Bishop sounded an alarm that has been

echoed by countless men of God from that day to this. Consider some excerpts from this 120-year-old sermon, which is as relevant today as when it was first preached.

> I have set before myself a simple straight-forward task—to translate into the language of the common people and in lines of clear, logical light the principles involved in the new version of the Bible and just in what direction it tends. This thing is needed. Nothing at the present time is more needed nor so needed, for I am convinced that the principle at the root of the revision movement has not been fairly understood, not even by many of the revisers themselves, who, **charmed by the siren-like voices addressed to their scholarly feeling**, have yielded themselves to give way, in unconscious unanimous movement, along with the wave on which the ship of inspiration floats with easy and accelerating motion, toward rebound and crash upon the rocks (p. 60).
>
> That a few changes might be made in both Testaments, for the better, no man pretends to deny; but that **all the learned twaddle about 'intrinsic and transcriptional probability,' 'conflation,' 'neutral texts,' 'the unique position of B' (the Vatican manuscript) ... that all this theory is false and moonshine and, when applied to God's Word, worse than that; I firmly believe** (p. 61).
>
> **Because I am a minister of Christ ... BECAUSE MY BUSINESS IS TO PREACH AND TO DEFEND THIS BOOK, I CANNOT AND WILL NOT KEEP SILENCE. 'If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?'** (p. 62).
>
> **THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IS BASED UPON A NEW, UNCALLED FOR, AND UNSOUND GREEK TEXT**—that mainly of Drs. Westcott and Hort, which was printed simultaneously with the revision and never before had seen light and which is the most unreliable text perhaps ever printed—one English critic says, 'the foulest and most vicious in existence' (p. 66).
>
> **I WILL OPPOSE B THE VATICAN MS. FIRST, FOREMOST, ALTOGETHER, *SIMPLY BECAUSE IT IS THE VATICAN MS.,* BECAUSE I HAVE TO RECEIVE IT FROM ROME, BECAUSE I WILL HAVE NO BIBLE FROM ROME, NO HELP FROM ROME AND NO COMPLICITY WITH ROME; BECAUSE I BELIEVE ROME TO BE AN APOSTATE.** A worshipper of Bread for God; a remover of the sovereign mediatorship of Christ; a destroyer of the true gospel, she teaches a system which, if any man believes or follows *as she teaches it*, he will infallibly be lost—he *must* be. ... I will not take my Bible—not the bulk of it—from her apostate, foul, deceitful, cruel hands. '*Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes'*—I fear the Latins bearing presents in their hands (p. 69).
>
> I have been confirmed in what had before been **A GROWING CONVICTION—THAT THE REVISION MOVEMENT, DATING FROM THE FINDING OF TISCHENDORF'S** [Aleph], unconsciously to most, but consciously to the Unitarian—to the Messrs. Vance Smith, Robertson Smith, etc.—liberal members of the New Testament Company, was **RUNNING STEADILY IN ONE DIRECTION THROUGH THREE POINTS: 1ST. TO WEAKEN AND DESTROY THE BINDING FORCE OF INSPIRATION IN THE VERY WORDS.** 2d. To

weaken and destroy the five Points of Grace founded on 'Free Will a Slave.' 3d. To weaken and destroy the old-fashioned notion of Hell as a place and a state of immediate, everlasting and utterly indescribable torment into which impenitent men go at once the moment they die (p. 74).

The Revised Version weakens and removes the deity of Christ in many places—one I mention in particular. 1 Timothy 3:1, 'Great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the flesh.' The Revised Version [as do all modern versions] leaves out *Theos*, God ... Dr. Scrivener, the foremost English critic, says it is *Theos*. ... That conviction of Dr. Scrivener is my conviction and on the very same grounds—**A CONVICTION SO DEEP THAT I WILL NEVER YIELD IT, NOR ADMIT AS A TEXT OF MY FAITH A BOOK PRETENDING TO BE A REVELATION FROM GOD WHICH LEAVES THAT WORD OUT. THE HOLY GHOST HAS WRITTEN IT—LET NO MAN DARE TOUCH IT—GREAT IS THE MYSTERY OF GODLINESS, *GOD* WAS MANIFEST IN THE FLESH** (pp. 78-80).

WHAT THEN IS THE GRAND SUMMING UP OF THIS ... AS TO THE TENDENCY OF THE REVISION?

1. A general weakening all along the line toward Rome. This must be, if Rome is to furnish the basal document which is to determine our Bible. ... No wonder I say that men have gone up valiantly to Church Courts to overturn if possible, the declaration of the Old School Assembly of 1845 by a vote of 173 to 8, that Rome is apostate and her baptism as a baptism into an apostate system is utterly invalid.

2. A second Tendency of the Revision is to loosen the Revelation of God from the letter, and to cast it floating out upon the winds. How can God inspire thoughts, ideas, but by words? Did you ever have a thought in your mind, an idea that was not in words? Never. If Inspiration is not verbal, in the very words, it is nowhere.

3. The tendency is to remove from men that fear of penalty, which, say what we please, is the kingbolt of the Divine Government over the world. **Take away the doctrine of Hell-Fire and the world would become one great Sodom**. ...

The time has not come for a New Translation of the Holy Scriptures. The Church is not spiritual enough. The Principle has not been settled, and the Data are not all in (George Sayles Bishop, "Sheol: The Principle and Tendency of the Revision Examined," *The Doctrines of Grace*, pp. 60-87).

The passion expressed by this man of God for the Holy Scriptures is foreign to the world of biblical scholarship today. For the most part, the textual critic views the Bible dispassionately as an interesting object of research, not as the eternal and infallible Word of God before which he will be judged in the next life. There are thousands of men today, though, who have the same faith that George Bishop had in the divine inspiration of Scripture and who have the same zeal he expressed in opposition to corrupted versions. They are passionate about the subject, because they are speaking about the Book through which they were redeemed from eternal destruction, a Book they consider to be inspired by God.

They cannot take the position that the precise wording of that Book is insignificant, that thousands of changes are inconsequential. *To say that such men are members of a recent cult is an incredible perversion of history.*

HERMAN CHARLES HOSKIER (1864-1938)

Herman Charles Hoskier, a respected textual scholar who labored at the turn of the century, wrote a number of critiques of the Westcott-Hort text. His two-volume, 909-page *Codex B and Its Allies—A Study and an Indictment* appeared in 1914. Alfred Marti, in his Th.D. thesis before the faculty of Dallas Theological Seminary, May 1951, gave the following overview of Hoskier's life and work:

> "Born in London, educated in England, France, and German, he was engaged in the banking and brokerage business in New York as a young man, but retired from business at the age of thirty-nine to give his time to his literary work (*Who's Who in America*, xx, 1938-39, p. 1258). He was one of the few men courageous enough to stand against the tide of the present century. While he has been little listened to, he could not be wholly ignored even by those who disagreed violently with him, for his knowledge of documents and his scholarship were beyond question" (Alfred Martin*, A Critical Examination of the Westcott-Hort Textual Theory*, p. 155).

Hoskier's 900-page indictment was aimed not only at the Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, but at Westcott and Hort and their theories as well. This textual scholar's critique was devastating to the entire foundation underlying the modern versions. His colleagues, for the most part, did not heed his warning and rushed pell-mell down the road of apostasy, but, like Noah and Jeremiah, he preached the truth in spite of the evident lack of converts, and in spite of the fact that his message placed him in the extreme (and despised) minority.

Modern version proponents tell us that we need the new Greek texts inasmuch as they represent an advance in knowledge beyond the sixteenth-century Received Text. We have discovered more manuscripts and we have advanced in our ability to use them, they claim. *To the contrary, Burgon, Scrivener, Hoskier, Miller, and others contended that the critical text is not a step forward but rather a giant step backward.*

> Those who accept the Westcott and Hort text are basing their accusations of untruth as to the Gospellists upon an Egyptian revision current 200 to 450 A.D. and abandoned between 500 to 1881, merely revived in our day and stamped as genuine (Hoskier, *Codex B and Its Allies*).

Consider some excerpts from Hoskier's monumental work:

> **It is high time that the bubble of codex B [Vaticanus] should be pricked**. ... I had thought that time would cure **THE EXTRAORDINARY HORTIAN HERESY**, but when I found that after a silence of twenty years my suggestion that Hort's theories were disallowed today only provoked a denial from a scholar and a critic who has himself disavowed a considerable part of the

readings favoured by Hort it seemed time to write a consecutive account of the crooked path pursued by the MS B [Vaticanus], which—from ignorance I trow—most people still confuse with purity and 'neutrality' (p. i).

I present therefore an indictment against the MS B and against Westcott and Hort, subdivided into hundreds of separate counts. I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT THE JURYMEN WHO WILL ULTIMATELY RENDER A VERDICT HAVE EVER HAD THE MATTER PRESENTED TO THEM FORMALLY, LEGALLY, AND IN PROPER DETAIL (p. ii).

I ask for a categorical answer count by count to my indictment of B. I ask for intelligent discussion of how it would have been possible for an 'Antiochian' revision to have displaced certain B readings had they been really genuine. And I ask for a proper explanation of certain Egyptian and Alexandrian features amounting to clear revision in the text of B and Aleph, if we are to divorce them from Alexandria and Egyptian soil where they belong properly (p. ii).

If now I throw some bombs into the inner citadel, it is because from that Keep **THERE CONTINUES TO ISSUE A LARGE AMOUNT OF IGNORANT ITERATION OF HORT'S CONCLUSIONS, WITHOUT ONE PARTICLE OF PROOF THAT HIS FOUNDATION THEORY IS CORRECT** (p. ii.).

My thesis is then that it was B and Aleph and their forerunners with Origen who revised the 'Antioch' text. And that, although there is an older base than either of these groups, the 'Antioch' text [the Received Text] is purer in many respects, if not 'better,' and is nearer the original base than much of that in vogue in Egypt (p. v).

It is well to bear in mind at all times that the questions at issue are not those of the 15th century versus those of the 4th. ... THE TEXTUAL QUESTIONS INVOLVED ARE ALL BACK OF THE 4TH CENT. In other words it is not a question of Turner's 'later MSS in favour of the earlier Greek MSS,' but as to who was right A.D. 125-400, when these questions arose. Turner is misstating the case. **Hort** did not do this. He **recognised the *textus receptus* as being quite as old as 350 A.D. or older** (p. viii).

We have now completed the arraignment of Codex B in the Gospels, referring to a similar condition of the B text elsewhere, and have presented the facts upon which the jury should base their verdict. ... The verdict asked is whether B represents a 'neutral' text or not. The claims put forward by us are that B does not exhibit a 'neutral' text, but is found to be tinged, as are most other documents, with Coptic, Latin and Syriac colours, and its testimony therefore is not of the paramount importance presupposed and claimed by Hort and by his followers. ... **That the maligned *textus receptus* served in large measure as the base which B tampered with and changed, and that the Church at large recognised all this until the year 1881—when Hortism (in other words Alexandrianism) was allowed free play—and has not since retraced the path to sound traditions** (p. 465).

This is dealing with the matter from a purely literary standpoint, a point of view which ruined Westcott and Hort's work on the New Testament text, and a standpoint which is as foreign to the spirit of the glorious Gospel as anything that can be imagined. ... **Progress is barred, gentlemen, unless**

> **we return to the 'old paths,' *for there can be nothing new in the religion of Jesus Christ*. Either there was one authoritative revelation, and one sacrifice once for all, *or there was not*. No *via media* exists. All this beating about the bush leads but to confusion and apostasy** (italics in the original) (p. 484).

Praise God for a man who refused to "beat around the bush"! Hoskier also published the following volumes in opposition to the modern texts and versions: *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the New Testament* (1911) and *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse* (1929).

FREDERIC CHARLES COOK (1810-89)

Frederic Charles Cook, reputed to have been acquainted with fifty-two languages and "such a master in biblical subjects that he was entrusted with the editorship of the *Speaker's Commentary*," also lifted his voice and pen in defense of the Traditional Text. The same month the Revised New Testament appeared, Cook published the first of his protests, dealing particularly with the revised translation "deliver us from the Evil One" in the Lord's Prayer. Cook's analysis of this translation appeared in the form of a letter to the Bishop of London (May 21, 1881). Cook's *Second Letter to the Bishop of London* appeared in November.

> Cook endeavours to bring the controversy back to the instructions laid down by Convocation, and contends that the alteration of such an important phrase should not have been made on any grounds short of necessity; and his whole pamphlet is an elaborate plea that no such necessity could be proved to have existed, and that the Revisers had therefore acted *ultra vires* in tampering with what was not a 'plain and clear error' of the Authorised Version (Samuel Hemphill, *A History of the Revised Version*, p. 105).

Cook was not finished with his opposition to the revision. His book *The Revised Version of the First Three Gospels* appeared the following year, further critiquing the English Revised Version and its critical Greek text. Hemphill summarizes this work as follows:

> "[It is] an elaborate defence of the textus receptus against the Revisers' treatment of it; a most valuable discussion of the Eusebian Recension, to which he believes B and Aleph belonged; and, in general, an attack on Westcott and Hort's theories. His work is of permanent value, and must be taken into account in any future discussion of textual questions" (Hemphill, *A History of the Revised Version*, p. 114).

WILLIAM NEWTON (1820-93)

William Newton, in 1881, opposed the English Revised Version and its new Greek text in his book *Remarks on the Revised English Version*.

SAMUEL WORCESTER WHITNEY (1822-1905)

Samuel Worcester Whitney joined his voice with those who were opposing the textual basis of the new English translation. His *The Revisers Greek Text: A critical examination of certain readings, textual and marginal, in the original Greek of the New Testament adopted by the late Anglo-American Revisers* appeared in 1892. This work examined the textual evidence for and against the readings adopted by the Revisers. Though supporting a few of the editorial changes made by the Revisers, Whitney largely defended the Received Text. In the preface he says:

> "While [my] readers may not accept every conclusion at which [I have] arrived, there can be but little question that most of them will agree with [me] that the Revisers' Greek Text is far from being perfect. They may even find good reason for believing that, as a whole, it is less trustworthy than the best editions of the commonly accepted Text..."

Whitney repudiated the Westcott-Hort theories of textual criticism and demonstrated the shaky rationalistic ground upon which modern textual criticism is founded:

> ... **it is supposed by some that the science of textual criticism in reference to the New Testament is matured ... All this implies that there is a very general and hearty concurrence** among students of the text in regard not only to the principles of criticism, but to the results attained by the application of those principles. But this can hardly be called an impartial, or even an intelligent, view of the subject. **The truth is, the Greek Text of the New Testament, in its present state, cannot be said to be settled. All modern editors are more or less at variance with each other; some of them, in different editions, are even at variance with themselves** (*The Revisers Greek Text*, p. 7).

Whitney said that the Westcott-Hort theory that the oldest Greek manuscripts exhibit the purest text ignores the facts of history:

> ... there is abundant evidence that much [copying of New Testament manuscripts], especially after the fourth century, was carefully and critically done,—the transcribers acting the part of editors as well as of copyists, comparing the various manuscripts in their possession, and following those readings which, according to their best judgment, embodied the true text. ... This well-known endeavor among copyists after the fourth and especially after the fifth century **RESULTED IN WHAT WAS REALLY A PURER, MORE UNIFORM, AND FAR MORE CORRECT TEXT THAN MANY EARLIER MANUSCRIPTS PRESENTED** ...
>
> The views thus presented by some of the ablest living textual critics of the New Testament not only accord with facts, but are very far from sustaining the widely received notion that our oldest manuscripts of the New Testament are necessarily the purest and most trustworthy, and that the later ones are scarcely deserving of notice because of blunders and oversights supposed to be consequent upon repeated transcriptions ... **It may even be said that the**

probabilities are that the later manuscript, as a whole, is quite as likely to present the genuine text as the older, if not more so ...

It is a false and altogether unsafe principle of action to accept unquestioningly the bare testimony of a handful of documents as affording the genuine text of the New Testament, simply because of their antiquity, and to exclude all other and opposing documentary evidence as worthless (*The Revisers Greek Text*, 1892, pp. 16, 20, 21).

JAMES H. BROOKES (1830-97)

James Brookes, in an article appearing in 1896, noted the dramatic contrast between the spiritual atmosphere of the King James Bible of 1611 and that of the Revision of 1881.

Whatever may be the opinion of some, the public has long since weighed the Revised Version in the balances and found it wanting. ... **THE AUTHORIZED VERSION IS THE OUTCOME OF FAITH AND ZEAL THAT HAVE NEVER BEEN EXCELLED.** Every sentence and every word of Tyndale's translation were steeped in prayer. They came forth from a soul that gathered up all its energies with Samson-like spirit and devotion, and devoted them to this one task of making the English people know the Word of God. **THE REVISERS CANNOT BE SAID TO HAVE BEEN BAPTIZED IN THE SAME SPIRIT OR TO HAVE BEEN OVERWHELMED BY ANY SUCH SELF-DEVOTION.** The spirit by which they have been actuated is entirely literary. ...

Much may be said for the accuracy of the Revised translation. But this is more than counterbalanced by a most serious drawback. **THE REVISERS' TEXT IS RADICALLY BAD**. Lachmann's mistaken principle of reliance upon the most ancient copies, to the exclusion of later testimony, was sure some day to be carried out so thoroughly as to supply its own refutation. It is this that the Revisers have done. They have clung to the most ancient copies without any regard to their character. Some of these are marked by such carelessness as to lead to the conclusion that they owe their preservation to the fact that they were too bad to be used. The much-maligned Authorized Version was based upon the text in use in the fifteenth century, and was the result of scholarly collaboration of the manuscripts. ... In two cases out of three those preachers who confide in them, and who give their congregations 'the more correct reading,' are not airing their knowledge but revealing their ignorance. ...

It is not only true that the spirit which actuated the Revisers was entirely literary, but, alas! **THEY COMPROMISED THE TRUTH OF GOD IN SOME RESPECTS**. They allowed men, for the sake of their scholarship, to be put into their company, and were forced to yield to their erroneous views of the Bible's teachings. 'What communion hath light with darkness?' 2 Cor. vi. 14 (James H. Brookes, ed., *The Truth or Testimony for Christ*, vol. xxii, 1896, pp. 89-91).

SAMUEL HEMPHILL (1859-1927)

Samuel Hemphill (1859-1927), D.D., Litt.D., opposed the English Revision in his *History of the Revised Version of the New Testament* (1906). We have already quoted extensively from this book. It offers one of the most honest and thorough histories of that project ever published. Hemphill wanted to see the Authorized Version revised only along conservative lines, and he was opposed to the introduction of the Westcott-Hort Greek text.

THE BIBLE LEAGUE

The Bible League was founded in Britain in 1892 "to promote the Reverent Study of the Holy Scriptures, and to resist the varied attacks made upon their Inspiration, Infallibility and Sole Sufficiency as the Word of God." Its objective was to defend God's Word against the onslaught of theological Modernism. In an article describing the history of the Bible League, S.M. Houghton associates its origin with the "Downgrade Controversy" that Charles H. Spurgeon fought in the 1880s and 1890s. Spurgeon's death in 1892 galvanized the convictions of some individual in the battle against Rationalism. The Bible League was formed later that same year. The *Bible League Quarterly* began to be published in 1912.

John P. Thackway (1950-), who has been editor of the *Quarterly* since 1993, told us that *since its inception* the Bible League "has stood for the TR and AV position, and from time to time since the *Quarterly* was first published in 1912 articles relative to this would have appeared." Some of the articles prior to 1970 were:

Textual Criticism: an Historical Note by S.E. McNair, 1949
The Holy Scriptures: the Task of the Translators and the Story of the Early Versions (three parts) by D.A. Thompson, 1960-61
Why I Prefer the AV of the Bible by E.J. Poole-Connor, 1962

At the Bible League's Annual Council Meeting, each trustee is required to sign the Doctrinal Basis "to signify his continued assent and adherence to these foundation truths." Number three of these doctrinal statements is "the divine inspiration, inerrancy, sufficiency (and finality) of Holy Scripture and its supreme authority in all matters of faith and practice." The Bible League also stands for biblical preservation. The following comments, which were published in the *Bible League Quarterly* in 1994, illustrate this society's position on preservation.

> What the Bible teaches about itself should never be viewed as a technical, dry and uninteresting subject. This should be one of the most thrilling of all themes for the people of God. Here we are at the very foundation for all we believe—'The impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture' as Gladstone put it—and what could be more enthralling than that? **TO BE ASSURED OF THE DIVINITY AND VERACITY OF OUR BIBLE IS ONE OF THE MOST POTENT HELPS TO**

FAITH AND CONFIDENCE, IN THESE CONFUSED AND TURBULENT DAYS....

Often a qualifying phrase can be heard in connection with the assertion of Scripture's inerrancy: 'Of the originals' or 'As originally given.' ... In one sense, to apply inerrancy to the proto-scriptures is valid because successive copies and translations can be corrupt. On the other hand, **to say this in order to imply that ONLY the autographs are inerrant is to deny something very vital: the providential preservation of Scripture.** The distance between the pure autographs and the Bible we hold in our hands is very great: thousands of years, multitudes of copies, and hours of translation. **We believe, however, that in this historic process the God of truth ensured that a pure stream of copies and manuscripts has come down to us in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament, and the Received Text of the New Testament.**

FOR OUR PART, WE HOLD TO THE POSITION THAT THE FOREGOING NECESSARILY LEADS US TO STAY WITH THE AUTHORISED VERSION AS THE TRANSLATION WHICH MOST ACCURATELY AND FAITHFULLY TRANSMITS TO US GOD'S WORD. First made in 1611, it has been prized by many generations of the godly for its sound textual basis, its word-for-word rendering, its accurate pronouns (thou, thee, thy/thine ... ye, you, your/yours), its elevated and dignified language, its prose rhythms, and its sheer memorableness. God has attested the AV as the Bible which has nurtured spiritual giants, founded great churches, inspired marvellous commentaries (like that of Matthew Henry), ignited glorious revivals, and shaped the English language itself. This can be said of no other version and probably never will. ...

We deeply deplore the lack of reverence that characterises so much worship today, together with the paucity of serious godliness and spiritual-mindedness found among the Lord's people. Truly, something seriously is wrong. **I fear that the almost frantic shift away from the AV is one more symptom of this malaise**, and leaves behind far more than just a Bible version. **IS IT ANY COINCIDENCE THAT THE PLETHORA OF MODERN VERSIONS—ALL BUT ONE BASED ON A DIFFERENT GREEK TEXT FROM THE AV AND OMITTING OR DOUBTING MORE THAN 3% OF IT—COMES AT A TIME OF HISTORIC DECLINE IN THE CHURCHES AND MORAL DEGENERACY IN THE NATION? THE BIBLE THAT WE USE IS THE FOUNDATION OF EVERYTHING ELSE; ITS RAMIFICATIONS GO DEEP AND FAR.**...

That the AV is not perfect we acknowledge. The revision of 1629,1638,1762 and 1769 improved it, and some word-changes today would do the same. ... However, we are talking about minimal revision. Even without it, the AV would still be the only translation for those who are convinced of the principles and issues that are at stake (emphasis added).

Thus we see the position held by the Bible League since 1912: God has providentially preserved His Holy Scriptures, and we have the preserved Word of God in the Greek Received Text and in the King James Bible as an accurate translation thereof.

WILLIAM WALLACE EVERETS (1849-1926)

William Wallace Everts, in 1921, summarized the opposition to the Westcott-Hort theories and the critical Greek texts. Everts' article "The Westcott and Hort Text Under Fire" appeared in the January-March 1921 issue of *Bibliotheca Sacra*. At that time, this publication was put out by the Bibliotheca Sacra Company of Oberlin, Ohio. John Burgon's opposition to Westcott-Hort and the ERV is mentioned prominently.

> But there was one who dared the lion in his den. It was J.W. Burgon, the Dean of Chichester, who had devoted his days and his nights to the collation of MSS. of the New Testament.

Everts described the duplicity of the English Revision Committee:

> They had been warned by Convocation to make as few alterations as possible, and to make no changes in the Received Text unless the evidence for them was decidedly preponderating. Nevertheless, they went on changing until they had altered the reading of the Greek text in 5,337 places, within a few hundred of those made by Westcott and Hort. Philip Schaff counted 36,191 corrections in the Revised Version, or four and a half to each verse.

Everts' review of the opposition to the Westcott-Hort textual theories during the first two decades of this century is fascinating. It reveals the error of those who dogmatically claim that the modern versions are founded upon scientific absolutes and a settled text and a concordant opinion of textual scholars:

> The theories upon which the changes in the Greek text had been made by Westcott and Hort were condemned by Dr. Scrivener as being dogmatic. 'There is little hope of the stability of their imposing structure,' he said, 'if the foundations have been laid on sandy ground of ingenious conjecture.' ... Canon Cook, editor of the *Speaker's Commentary*, recalled, 'It is already admitted on all hands that the Revised Version is a great blunder.' *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for 1896 asserted that '**in less than two years after publication the unanimous verdict of Great Britain was that it was an utter failure**.'
>
> The learned Dr. Field of Norwich, editor of Origen's 'Hexapla,' said ... 'They did not sympathize with those who set them to work or with those for whom they were working.' ... Kirsopp Lake referred to their thirty years' labor as a 'splendid blunder.' ... Eberhard Nestle concludes that 'if the objections to the Westcott and Hort text are valid, then the sure foundation which they seemed to have secured for the New Testament text begins to totter once more.' ...
>
> The various theories advanced by Dr. Hort in defense of his abridgment of the Greek text have lost favor with textual critics. What he called **the 'Syrian recension'** of the text, which, as he supposed, was made at Antioch in the fourth century, became the corner stone of his system. He conjured this scheme to account for the general prevalence of the longer text after that date. But F.G. Kenyon, in his *Bible and Ancient Manuscripts,* declares that 'there is no historical confirmation of the Syrian revision. The Church Fathers say nothing about it. We know the names of the translators of the Septuagint and the Vulgate, but there is

no mention of the name of the reviser of the Greek text in Syria.' Dr. Scrivener condemned the theory as precarious and even visionary; and E.D. Burton charged that Dr. Hort 'imputed too much of a deliberate intention to create a new text.' No one of Dr. Hort's conclusions, a writer in *Hastings Dictionary* declares, has aroused so much indignation. ... the *Church Quarterly* for 1914 notices that 'criticism has moved since the days of Westcott and Hort in the direction of the partial rehabilitation of the Western Text.' Theodore Zahn goes so far as to say that 'if this was the general text of the second century, then it deserves the preference over our oldest manuscripts.'

Later critics condemn Dr. Hort's **theory of interpolations**. F.G. Kenyon boldly rules out the idea that 'ignorant scribes deliberately and formally made corrections as Westcott and Hort supposed.' Frederick Blas, author of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, declares that 'there is not one fraudulent interpolation in ten thousand lines.' ... A.C. Clark, author of *Recent Development of Textual Criticism*, [says], 'It is dangerous to follow the best manuscript in its omissions, for omissions are commonly due to neglect, hurry, and ignorance.' R.C. Jebb calls it 'rash to conjecture an interpolation where a word or phrase which, though unobjectionable, is not indispensable.' Alexander Souter, author of *A Dictionary of New Testament Greek*, says, 'Not nearly so many glosses got into the text as was at one time supposed.' It would seem, in the judgment of the new editors, Dr. Salmon says, that 'any evidence is good enough to justify an omission.' F.H. Chase, the Syriac scholar, declares, 'I am constrained to express my doubt as to the soundness of Dr. Hort's position as to the occurrence of interpolations.'

The most serious omissions advocated by Westcott and Hort **were the last twelve verse of Mark**... The Revisers did not dare to remove so many verses from the New Testament; but they indicated, by the use of brackets or by separations from the context, that these passages were not authentic. The closing verses in Mark are found in all the uncials but two, and in ninety-nine per cent of the cursive manuscripts. Dean Burgon wrote a volume, and Abbe Martin has since followed it with another, in defense of the genuineness of this passage. Von Soden, author of a text of the New Testament, declares that 'there is no finer or more concise, no brighter or more pointed, paragraph in the New Testament. There is not a superfluous word in it. It is in the style of a master.' ... Dr. Salmon tells of thirty-eight witnesses for the passage before the year 400. ...

Dr. Hort, to strengthen further his defense of the shorter text, **adopted the group, or genealogical, method**—a method now generally called into question. By this method he arranged a vast number of documents that favor the longer text in one family group of thousands of MSS.; and over against this immense group he set up another, very small group, with only a few codices. Of this mode of procedure, Otto van Gebhardt, editor of *Ancient Texts*, says, 'It is a serious error to group manuscripts, and still worse to choose a few old manuscripts, and exclude a hundred others' (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1878). ... E.D. Burton says, 'More than one scholar has disputed the distinction which Dr. Hort makes between the neutral and the Alexandrian texts.' Frederick Blass complains because such confidence 'is placed in B [Vaticanus], that the opposing testimony of all the manuscripts counts for nothing.' ... Bishop Ellicott charged Tischendorf with 'a childish infirmity of judgment in his exaggerated preference for Aleph [Sinaiticus].' A similar charge might be brought against Dr. Hort. B was his

Jonathan, and Aleph the armor-bearer. But as Dean Burgon said, 'B and Aleph are not antiquity: they are only two specimens of antiquity. There are many older specimens in the Versions and Church Fathers. A pyramid cannot be made to stand on its apex.' Dr. Salmon suggested this dialogue with Dr. Hort: 'What authority should be followed?—B and Aleph.—If Aleph is against B?—B, if any support can be found.—If B stands alone?—B, unless there is an evident mistake of the scribe.—If B is blank?—Then Aleph.—What about D?—Kill him.' Dr. Broadus, in his *Commentary on Matthew*, says: 'Dr. Hort seems to err in following a small group of documents against internal evidence.'

Another method which Dr. Hort adopted to overcome the overwhelming opposition to the B text was **to rule out entirely all late codices**. Not quite all, for among a thousand rejected minuscules he found three or four that were abridged, like B; but this judgment of his has been reversed by a competent court. R.C. Jebb affirms that 'the age of a manuscript does not necessarily prove anything. **A LATE COPY OF A GOOD OLD MANUSCRIPT THAT IS NOT EXTANT IS BETTER THAN AN EARLIER MANUSCRIPT OF A CORRUPT TYPE**.' F.G. Kenyon says that 'a late vellum is often more correct than the oldest papyri. ... Jülicher thinks that 'every one will soon agree that the cursives have been undervalued.' 'We resist the scheme which excludes the cursives from all real influence in determining the text,' Dr. Scrivener protests. 'A judge is not impartial if he rejects the testimony of eighty-nine out of a hundred witnesses. It is a law of evidence that the very few are to be suspected rather than the very many.'

Another weapon that Dr. Hort used against the longer and commonly received text was an argument taken from Lachmann; namely, **that the text must be determined by external evidence exclusively**. Dr. Hort's words are, 'Readings are decided on their own merits, irrespective of interpretation.' ... 'Internal tokens of authority,' Dr. A.P. Peabody holds, 'have more value than external proofs.' Bernhard Weiss finds that 'there is a certain feeling of what is or is not possible. The criticism of the text cannot be separated from exegesis.'

It is little to the credit of textual criticism of the New Testament that Tischendorf, after having said, in his edition of 1859, that 'the principles of inner criticism are established on undeniable facts,' should have made 3,369 changes in the text of his next edition. To be sure, this great number of changes was due to the discovery of Aleph; but he had made 700 changes in 1859, and 1,300 ten years before. ... **HORT DID NOT PRODUCE THE FINAL TEXT, AS HE ANNOUNCED HE WOULD. ALL OF HIS POSITIONS HAVE BEEN ATTACKED IF NOT TAKEN, AND THE MISTAKES OF HORT'S GREEK TEXT ARE TRANSMITTED IN THE CANTERBURY REVISION, WHICH IS THUS SO FAR DISCREDITED** (William Everts, "The Westcott and Hort Text Under Fire," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January-March 1921, pp. 23-36).

We acknowledge that many of the men mentioned in the above summary did not support a return to the Received Text. What they did was admit the fallacy of the theories that formed the very foundation for all modern texts and translations. The fact that they are building on sand doesn't bother the biblical scholars of this century. They are happy to play their scholarly games in spite of the fact that they have no truth. It appears that the chief thing they esteem is the rejection of

absolute truth. Much the same thing has happened with the theories of evolution. Darwin has been discredited even by evolutionary scientists, but this does not mean today's scientists will follow where the evidence points: to God and to Creation. Oh, no. Anything but that! What Everts' summary demonstrates is this: *The ascendancy of the critical Greek text has resulted in confusion and uncertainty in the field of biblical authority. The textual scholars and translators who have rejected the venerable Received Text are certain of only one thing: They don't know what or where the Word of God is. Every man is his own authority. Apparently they like it that way.*

THE TRINITARIAN BIBLE SOCIETY

The Trinitarian Bible Society (TBS) is another example of those who were standing for the KJV prior to the present era. It was formed in 1831 from a conflict within the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS) over the doctrine of the Trinity and the deity of Jesus Christ. The BFBS refused to take a stand against Unitarianism, and those men that were concerned for doctrinal purity left to form the Trinitarian Bible Society (TBS). In the early years of the TBS, the issue of different Bible texts and versions was not the issue it was to become at the end of the nineteenth century. Though there were textual critics in the first half of that century, they did not exercise much influence in ordinary Christian circles. Trinitarian faced other battles in its earlier years.

The TBS did make public statements from the very beginning that they believed in the divine preservation of the Scriptures. For example, J. Lockhart said, "Let it be our zealous care, in our day and generation, to guard inviolate the precious treasure, and our delight to acknowledge with thanksgiving our infinite obligation to *the special providence of the Lord, Who hath conveyed it down to us in its original purity*" (TBS, *Holding Fast the Faithful Word*, p. 6).

From the beginning the TBS made a commitment to circulate only the Authorized Version in English. "They did not accept the so-called 'Improved Version' or the 'most correct text' upon which it was based, and they did not allow the Committee any latitude to circulate along with the Authorised Version such other English versions as the Committee might approve from time to time" (*Holding Fast the Faithful Word*, p. 6).

With the publication of the English Revised Version and the Westcott-Hort Greek text of 1881, the TBS began to take a more active stance on texts and versions. A number of articles were published in the TBS *Quarterly Record* at the turn of the century critiquing the ERV and supporting the Received Text. Some of these drew heavily upon John Burgon's *Revision Revised,* as well as the research of F.C. Cook and F.H.A. Scrivener. From that time to this Trinitarian has stood solidly behind the TR and the King James Bible. Though the TBS has never claimed perfection for either, their published writings have promoted all of the major points commonly given in defense of the KJV.

In 1904 the British & Foreign Bible Society issued an edition of the critical Greek text prepared by Eberhard Nestle and based upon the work of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and Weiss. That same year the Annual Report of the Trinitarian Bible Society made the following statement:

> There is a great shaking going on all around us; the foundations are being displaced; ancient landmarks are being removed; institutions are being assailed; confusion is written on all things ecclesiastical and political. There is only one thing that can sustain us in times like these, and that is living faith in the living God.
>
> **It is the design of the enemy to quench the lamp of Inspiration, to get rid of the supernatural and miraculous in the Word of God; to break down its authority and integrity by minimising differences of translations; for, IF THE BIBLE IS NOT THE WORD OF GOD, BUT ONLY 'CONTAINS' IT, THEN ONE VERSION CAN CONTAIN IT, OR AS MUCH OF IT, AS ANOTHER. IF THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS 'THE BIBLE,' THEN "A BIBLE' OR ANY BIBLE WILL DO.**
>
> The enemy cares not by what agency he gains his great end of making the Word of God of none effect. The enemy will use any instrument to accomplish his purposes; and the greater and the better the agent, the more effectually will he obtain his ends (*Holding Fast the Faithful Word*, p. 15).

Of particular note in the defense of the Authorized Bible within the TBS is Terence Harvey Brown, TBS Secretary from 1958 to 1990. Brown authored many of the publications produced by TBS during these years, publications that influenced great numbers of people around the world. This is described in the official history of the TBS: "From 1958 onwards the TBS waged war on all these fronts with considerable vigour. Successive modern English translations were reviewed by the secretary in the *Quarterly Record*, and their defects analysed" (Andrew J. Brown, *The Word of God Among All Nations: A Brief History of the Trinitarian Bible Society 1831-1981*, p. 118).

Titles of TBS articles leave no doubt about this society's position on the Bible version issue:

The Divine Original: Doctrinal Deficiencies of the Modern Versions Traced to their Source
Notes on the Vindication of 1 John 5:
A Textual Key to the N.T.: A List of Omissions and Changes in the Modern Versions
The Bible and Textual Criticism
The Deity of Chris: *Modern Versions and Romans 9:5*
The New International Version: *A Critique*
God Was Manifest in the Flesh: A Defense of "God" in 1 Timothy 3:1
Rome and the R.S.V
The Excellence of the Authorised Version
The Authenticity of the Last Twelve Verse of the Gospel According to Mark

The following excerpts from TBS publications illustrate the society's position in regard to the KJV:

Since 1881 modern versions have had a number of common features, the most important of which has been the adoption of emendations of the Greek text based upon the unreliable testimony of a comparatively small group of ancient manuscripts entirely unrepresentative of the great mass of documentary evidence that has come to light in the last one hundred and fifty years (*The Excellence of the Authorised Version*, TBS article No. 24).

Those who are favourable or tolerant towards the modern versions are apt to react very sensitively to any suggestion that any changes have been made in the interests of 'a lower Christology', but **it can be very clearly shown that the modern versions and their underlying Greek text eliminate or considerably diminish the force of many passages relating to the deity and Sonship of the Lord Jesus Christ**. ... The Bible testifies to the eternal deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son of the Eternal God. The modern versions, and the defective manuscripts upon which they rely, obscure this vital testimony, which the Authorised Version faithfully preserves (*The Divine Original*, TBS Article No. 13).

The architects and advocates of the modern English translations of the Holy Scriptures often assure us that their numerous alterations, omissions and additions do not affect any vital doctrine. While this may be true of hundreds of minute variations there is nevertheless **a substantial number of important doctrinal passages which the modern versions present in an altered and invariably weakened form** (*God Was Manifest in the Flesh*, TBS Article No. 10, 1965).

A comparison of the modern versions with the older ones reveals that the former all have something in common with the Rheims-Douay Roman Catholic Version which was translated from the Latin Vulgate. This was influenced by the Old Latin copies, which have some affinity with a small group of ancient Greek copies often at variance with the majority ("Good Will Toward Men," TBS *Quarterly Record*).

For too long the 'science' of Textual Criticism has been in bondage to the authority of a small class of ancient manuscripts, with the Sinai and Vatican copies at their head, which are in thousands of instances at variance with the Greek Text preserved in the great majority of the documents now available for ascertaining the true text. ... The result has been that **even in the 'evangelical' seminaries generations of theological students have been encouraged to accept without question theories which involve the rejection of the historical text and the adoption of an abbreviated and defective text cast in the mold of the Vatican and Sinai copies** (*Many Things*, TBS Article No. 33).

No evangelical Christian, learned or unlearned, would wish to follow [modernistic] writers along the perilous paths of infidelity in which they strode with such presumption. There is another danger, no less serious, in that **Textual Criticism, the evaluation of the actual manuscripts in the ancient languages, the preparation of printed editions of the Hebrew and Greek Text, and the modern translations now being made in English and many other languages, are very largely conducted under the direction or influence of scholars who by their adoption of these erroneous theories have betrayed the unreliability of their judgment in these vital matters**. **WE MUST NOT PERMIT OUR JUDGMENT TO BE OVERAWED BY GREAT NAMES IN THE**

REALM OF BIBLICAL 'SCHOLARSHIP' WHEN IT IS SO CLEARLY EVIDENT THAT THE DISTINGUISHED SCHOLARS OF THE PRESENT CENTURY ARE MERELY REPRODUCING THE CASE PRESENTED BY RATIONALISTS DURING THE LAST TWO HUNDRED YEARS. Nor should we fail to recognise that scholarship of this kind has degenerated into a skeptical crusade against the Bible, tending to lower it to the level of an ordinary book of merely human composition (*If the Foundations Be Destroyed*, TBS Article No. 14).

The TBS publishes an edition of the Received Text Greek New Testament that it considers to be the preserved Word of God:

> The Society uses the form of the Greek text of the New Testament known as the Textus Receptus or Received Text. This is the text which underlies the New Testament of the Authorised Version and the other Reformation translations. It is a faithful representation of the text which the church in different parts of the world has used for centuries. It is the result of the textual studies of conservative scholars during the years both before and after the Reformation, and represents for the most part over 5,000 available Greek manuscripts. The Society believes this text is superior to the texts used by the United Bible Societies and other Bible publishers, which texts have as their basis a relatively few seriously defective manuscripts from the fourth century and which have been compiled using twentieth-century rationalistic principles of scholarship *(The Trinitarian Bible Society: An Introduction to the Society's Principles*, TBS, London, copyright 1992).

The heartbeat of the Trinitarian Bible Society for pure copies and translations of the Word of God is seen in the following excerpt from the 1904 Annual Report referred to earlier:

> **How infinitely important, then, is it, that the Bibles we send out should contain (as far as we can assure it) only and exactly what He has said**, and what He can speak of and acknowledge as 'My Words' ... We ought to leave nothing undone in order to secure that every translation shall be as near to human perfection as human capability can make it.
>
> Satan's first words were, 'Yea, hath God said?' and the answer was given in a false version of what God had said. In that answer there was an omission from, and an addition to, and an alteration of what God had said. These are the only three ways in which the Word of God can be adulterated, and these are the three marks which have characterised all false versions from that day to this...
>
> **It is impossible to overstate the importance of these two things—unfeigned faith, and the Word of God.** This is the Divine provision for all the errors, and all the evils, and all the hostile influences of the present day.

PHILIP MAURO (1859-1952)

Philip Mauro was a patent lawyer who argued before the bar of the United States Supreme Court. As patent counsel for the Columbia Phonograph Company, Mauro had repeated encounters with Thomas Edison. Mauro was converted in 1903, ten years after he was admitted to the bar. Beginning in the 1920s, he wrote in

defense of the King James Bible and in opposition to the critical text that had been introduced by Westcott and Hort thirty years earlier, and to the modern versions that were beginning to multiply. Mauro's 1924 work *Which Version? Authorized or Revised?* is reprinted in David Otis Fuller' *True or False* Mauro leaned heavily upon the research of John Burgon, but his logic was his own. This brilliant lawyer carefully represented the side of the Traditional Text. The thing that characterized Mauro is that which characterizes each defender of the Received Text and the KJV: faith in God's providence and an emphasis on the divine preservation of Scripture:

> In view also of the leading part the English speaking peoples were to play in shaping the destinies of mankind during the eventful centuries following the appearance of the Version of 1611, we are justified in believing that it was through a providential ordering that the preparation of that Version was not in anywise affected by higher critical theories in general, or specifically by the two ancient Codices we have been discussing. For when we consider what the A.V. [Authorized Version] was to be to the world, the incomparable influence it was to exert in shaping the course of events, and in accomplishing those eternal purposes of God for which Christ died and rose again and the Holy Spirit came down from heaven—**when we consider that this Version was to be, more than all others combined, 'the Sword of the Spirit,' and that all this was fully known to God beforehand, we are fully warranted in the belief that it was not through chance, but by providential control of the circumstances, that the translators had access to just those Mss. which were available at that time, and to none others.** This belief in no way conflicts with the fact that man's part in the preparation of the A.V. is marked, and plainly enough, by man's infirmities (Mauro, "Which Version?" *True or False*, pp. 80,81).

SIR ROBERT ANDERSON (1841-1918)

Sir Robert Anderson spoke out in 1905 against the Revised Version and the Westcott-Hort Greek text in his book *The Bible and Modern Criticism*. Anderson was a famous lawyer. He entered the legal profession at age 22, was appointed adviser on Irish affairs to the Home Office in matters relating to political crime three years later, and in 1888 was appointed head of the Criminal Investigation Department. Saved at age nineteen, Anderson was also a popular Bible conference speaker and a preacher of the Gospel, "in church and mission hall, to rich and poor, to learned and unlearned." He was further known for his theological writings and his staunch defense of the Word of God against the unbelieving Rationalism that was pouring into Britain. He stood unhesitatingly for the verbal, plenary inspiration of Scripture. He authored many popular books, including *The Coming Prince, or the Seventy Weeks of Daniel*; *The Bible and Modern Criticism and Pseudo-Criticism: or the Higher Criticism and Its Counterfeit*; and *A Doubter's Doubts about Science and Religion*. This brilliant and godly Christian saw a direct connection between theological Rationalism and Westcott-Hortism and

understood the unscientific nature of the latter. He also understood the duplicity of the Revision committee:

> **In the Revised Version of the New Testament textual criticism has done its worst**. It is inconceivable that it will ever again be allowed to run riot as in the work of the Revisers of 1881. [The author did not foresee the wretched apostasy of this present century!] When that version appeared, **Bishop [Christopher] Wordsworth of Lincoln raised the question 'Whether the Church of England,—which in her Synod, so far as this Province is concerned, sanctioned a Revision of her Authorised Version *under the express condition, which she most wisely imposed, that no changes should be made in it except what were absolutely necessary*,—could consistently accept a version in which 36,000 changes have been made; not a fiftieth of which can be shown to be needed, or even desirable.'**
>
> But what concerns us here is not the changes in the translation, but **THE FAR MORE SERIOUS MATTER OF THE CHANGES IN THE TEXT**. The question at issue between the majority of the Revisers, who followed Doctors Hort and Westcott, and the very able and weighty minority led by Dr. Scrivener, the most capable and eminent 'textual critic' of the whole company...
>
> **If the Revisers had kept to the terms of their commission**, and been content with the correction of 'manifest errors,' a very few sessions would have sufficed to produce a text which might have commanded universal acceptance. But **IT IS CERTAIN THAT ERRORS WERE NOT MANIFEST WHEN MANY OF THE GREATEST OF CONTEMPORARY CRITICS AND SCHOLARS COULD NOT REGARD THEM AS ERRORS AT ALL**—men like the minority upon their own company, men like the eminent prelate I have quoted, and the learned editor of *The Speaker's Commentary* [F.C. Cook]. And **as several of the Revisers themselves have explained in detail the principles on which the revision of the text was conducted, and those principles are found to be unsound when judged by the science of evidence, our confidence in the result of their labours is destroyed.**
>
> The 'argument' of the present volume demands a reference to this question, but a fuller discussion of it would be out of place. I will therefore dismiss it by citing a single illustrative instance of reckless and erroneous alteration of the text. And instances of the kind abound, especially in the Gospels. The instance I select is 'the Herald Angels' song,' and I choose it not only as being thoroughly typical of the methods of the Revisers, but also because of its importance and the interest attaching to it. 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men': ... the miserable substitute offered us is, 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom He is well pleased.' **THIS ONE PIECE OF MUTILATION MIGHT SUFFICE TO DISCREDIT THE WORK OF THE REVISERS.**
>
> Two questions are here involved, the altered text, and the translation of that text. The English of the Revisers, says one of the most eminent of their own number, '**can be arrived at only through some process which would make any phrase bear almost any meaning the translator might like to put upon it'** (Scrivener's *Introduction*, vol. ii, p. 347). 'Men in whom He is well pleased,' says the editor of *The Speaker's Commentary*, 'seems to me impossible as a

translation of *anthropoi eudokias*. I do not know whether those Greek words have any meaning, but if they have they must designate men of a certain quality of character' (F.C. Cook, *R.V. of the First Three Gospels*, p. 30). Then as regards the text, the whole difference is the addition of the letter '*s'* to the word '*eudokia';* and the manuscript authority for this addition is the reading of four ancient Greek MSS., *every other known copy of the Gospels being against it*.

Now this is precisely the sort of question in respect of which any one who has practical acquaintance with the science of evidence would appeal to Patristic authority, and that appeal would dispose of the whole matter; for the testimony of the Greek Fathers in favour of the familiar reading is overwhelming.

'On earth peace, good will toward men'—the Christian may still rejoice in these hallowed and most precious words. And he may assume with confidence that here, as in so many other instances, the Revisers' changes in the text are new errors, and not the correction of old errors....

The method on which the revisers dealt with the text has been thus described by one of the company (Dr. Newth), whose account is confirmed by Bishop Ellicott himself. The Bishop, as chairman, asked whether any textual changes were proposed. 'By tacit consent' Drs. Scrivener and Hort were left to reply by stating their respective views. 'Dr. Scrivener opens up the matter by stating the facts of the case and giving his judgment on the bearings of the evidence. Dr. Hort follows ... and, if differing from Dr. S.'s [Scrivener] estimate of the weight of the evidence, gives his reasons and states his own view. After discussion the vote of the company is taken, and the proposed reading accepted or rejected. The text being thus settled, the chairman asks for proposals on the rendering.'

Is it any wonder that a learned writer declared that if this description of their action 'is not a kind of joke, it is quite enough to "settle" this Revised Greek Testament in a very different sense'? Fancy a question of prescriptive rights being 'settled' in such a manner as this in a court of justice! And remember that, while 'textual criticism' sounds very recondite, the question at issue in every instance was as definitely a matter of evidence as is the case in a suit about a water-course or a right of way. And it ought to have been dealt with according to the established principles and rules of evidence.

If the four or five most ancient MSS. were always in accord a plausible case might be made out for following them to the exclusion of the other authorities. But as a matter of fact they are scarcely ever in accord in any instance where they differ from the Received Text. Suppose that in a prescriptive rights action the 'ancient witnesses' called for the plaintiff differed in their evidence, and the jury by a majority vote decided to follow some of them in opposition to the others and also to the united voice of the rest of the community; and you have in a parable the action of the Revisers in 'settling' the Greek text.

And in numberless cases where the Revisers happily refused to mutilate the text, they compromised matters by allowing the **insertion in the margin of an alternative reading,** which, though possibly quite devoid of authority, **suggests a doubt as to the right reading of the passage.** ...

An old MS. may have survived its fellows for the same reason that an old pair of boots sometimes survives, namely, through having been put aside

on account of some fault or blemish (Robert Anderson, *The Bible and Modern Criticism*, 1905, pp. 104-109, 269, 270).

WILLIAM HOSTE (1861-1938)

William Hoste published a refutation of the English Revised Version and modern textual criticism in 1931, and publicly stood on the side of the King James Bible. This work was titled *Why I Abide by the Authorized Version*. This has been reprinted by the Penfold Book & Bible House under the title *The Case against the Revised Version*. The following biography is given by the publisher:

> William Hoste was born in Dover Castle [in England]. His father was Commander of the Royal Artillery and his grandfather, Gentleman Usher to Queen Victoria and Deputy Governor of Jersey. Saved in early life, he was educated at Clifton College and then entered Trinity College, Cambridge. He graduated in theology under the direction of Dr. Handley Moule, after which he went through the studies necessary for ordination as a Clergyman.
>
> However, he found it impossible to subscribe to the doctrines of baptismal regeneration, clerisy, and many other ideas that he was being taught and so, at the cost of much that he could have kept by compromise, he left the Established 'Church' to be baptised and join an assembly gathered to the Lord's Name alone.
>
> He was proficient in several languages and preached the gospel in Europe, India, South Africa and throughout the homeland. His ministry has been passed on through the numerous scholarly works which he wrote. For seven years prior to his death he was editor of the *Believer's Magazine*

Hoste documented the theological corruptions that were brought into the English Bible through the critical Greek text. He cited John Burgon, Herman Hoskier, F. Scrivener, Edmund Beckett, Samuel Hemphill, and other scholars of his day who opposed the Revision. Hoste listed nine reasons for rejecting the Revision and for remaining faithful to the KJV:

> 1. The A.V. (though, of course, not perfect) was translated on more reliable principles.
>
> 2. The Revision was unnecessary. All knew the Authorised contained archaisms (which practically everyone understood), and some 'plain and clear' blemishes. It was not necessary to alter the complexion of the whole to correct these.
>
> 3. The Revision was not generally wanted.
>
> 4. The Revisers exceeded their mandate.
>
> 5. The methods of the A.V. were more reliable. There was no secrecy in connection with the A.V. Competent scholars outside were kept informed and opinions invited. The Revisers sat with closed doors for ten years: all was secret.
>
> 6. The manuscripts of the A.V. were more reliable.
>
> 7. The margin of the A.V. is more reliable.
>
> 8. The men of the A.V. were more reliable.

9. The doctrine of the A.V. is more reliable.

For the last seven years of his life Hoste was the editor of *The Believer's Magazine*. In this capacity he defended the King James Bible against the modern versions. In comparing the Authorized Bible with the Revised Version he testified:

> The differences between A.V. and R.V. may be summarised as follows: the former contains a certain number of archaisms and defective renderings, *though in the main it is trustworthy and excellent*: the latter offers a certain number of improvements, along with a mass of needless or harmful changes. *We can no more reject the A.V. for its few blemishes, than accept the R.V. for its few betterments* (emphasis added) (William Hoste, *Bible Problems and Answers*, p. 167).

Hoste does not here specify what he means by "defective renderings," but from his writings we can determine that it has to do with words in the KJV that he believed to be incorrectly translated. He had the typical (but we believe erroneous) habit employed all too frequently by commentators of correcting the KJV with his own private translations. For example, in one article he claimed that "damnation" in Romans 8:1 and 1 Corinthians 11:29 "ought to be translated 'judgment.'" To say that "damnation" *means* judgment or condemnation is correct. That is the dictionary meaning of damnation, and it is the teacher's job to define Bible words, to *interpret* the Bible, to give the meaning. To go beyond this, though, and to *correct* a masterpiece like the King James and to leave the impression that "damnation" is an error is (1) wrong (it cannot be proven that this is an error and many do not agree that it is an error), (2) dangerous (it creates doubt in people's minds about the Bible), and (3) unnecessary (to explain the word *damnation* is sufficient).

We do not agree that the AV contains "defective renderings." There are changes that COULD be made and archaisms that COULD be updated, but we don't agree that there are "defective renderings" that need to be corrected in the KJV.

Apart from this, Hoste defended the KJV against the modern versions and that he did not swallow the popular line in regard to the critical Greek text.

Host was not impressed by the boastings of the textual critics. Consider the following statements which first appeared in various issues of *The Believer's Magazine*:

> Though it may seem a hard saying to the critics, whoever they may be, they must be criticised as freely as they criticise, as they have no monopoly either of learning, or of the critical faculty (Hoste, *Bible Problems and Answers*, p. 201).

> They were all, no doubt, great scholars [the translators of the ERV] but 'even the wise and prudent' know nothing as such of the things of God, and 'great ecclesiastics' are not generally prepared to take their place in the infant class of the babes, to whom God reveals His secrets (Hoste, *Bible Problems and Answers*, p. 166).

Hoste also understood that the most influential men of the English Revision were liberal in their theology:

> The moving spirit of the American Company was Dr. Philip Schaff, L.L.D., of the Union Theological Sem., New York, a very learned man of 'broad' and 'high' sympathies, corresponding to Drs. Westcott and Hort, the dominant spirits of the English Company, **BOTH SACERDOTALISTS AND DOCTRINALLY UNSOUND**, with whom he was closely allied (Hoste, *Bible Problems and Answers*, p. 166).

Hoste was convinced that the critical Greek text and the modern versions are theologically unsound. He contributed the following information for "The Question Box" section of the *Believer's Magazine*:

> Q. Were the Revisers justified in changing the word, 'God,' in 1 Tim. 3:1 into 'He who'?
>
> A. On the contrary they would have been justified, I believe, on principles of textual criticism, by the claims of the context, and by the instructions laid down for their guidance by the Southern Convocation in letting the word, 'God,' alone. **As for textual criticism, I know it is customary to assert that none but experts can form an opinion on such matters, but in reality it is not so difficult for a person of average intelligence ... to weigh their [the textual critics] findings.** Thus though some of the earliest known Uncial MSS., do favour 'Hos' (He Who), the later ones (quite possibly copied from as early or even earlier MSS. than the others) favour 'Theos' (God) ... [Ellicott] adds: 'In the great majority of the fathers who cite the passage we certainly find *Theos* as in the received text.' ... When we come to the 'Copies' of Paul's epistles, known as the Cursives; out of 254 which contain the passage, all except two, agree in writing 'Theos' (God). ...
>
> **To an ordinary person, then, it does not seem clear that the weight of testimony is so unfavourable to 'Theos' (God), as some would have us believe.**
>
> **THE SENSE MOREOVER DEMANDS 'GOD**,' for the passage is not a mere mention of 'someone manifest in the flesh,' but a statement that 'Someone was manifested in the flesh.' We could say that our Lord Jesus Christ was 'God manifest in the flesh,' but not 'manifested in the flesh, for He was the manifestation—of whom?—of God. Therefore why not let the verse say so clearly? **It seems surprising that persons, who presumably believe in the true Deity of Chris, should be so ready to yield the benefit of the doubt to 'He who,' rather than to 'God'.** ...
>
> **[The Revisers] have impoverished the Holy Scriptures of one of its most direct testimonies to the Deity of Christ.** I know of no passage in the Revised Version in which testimony to this great truth has been INTRODUCED, where it was not already in substance in the Authorised Version (William Hoste, *Bible Problems and Answers*, pp. 369,70).

LEBARON WILMONT KINNEY (b. 1876)

Lebaron Wilmont Kinney, a Brethren Bible commentator, in 1942 took a public position against the modern versions and for the King James Bible in *Hebrew Word Studies—Acres of Rubies* (Loizeau Brothers).

> **When a Bible teacher refers to the original languages of the Bible, there is a danger of giving a wrong impression about the authority and true value of the standard King James Version.** Too many are ready to say that they have a better rendering, and often in such a way as to give an impression that the King James Version is faulty, or that other versions are much better. We believe that God overruled His gift of the King James Version of 1611, so that we have in it the very Word of God. We believe that no other English Version will ever take its place. As a whole it is nearer to the original Greek and Hebrew than any other version. Every one of the various English versions claims to be nearer the original than the others. This could not be true of more than one of them.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN DEARMORE (1897-1969)

Benjamin Franklin Dearmore is an example of the Texas Baptists who were standing for the King James Bible prior to 1950. Dr. Dearmore was Chairman of the Faculty at the Bible Baptist Seminary (J. Frank Norris's school in Ft. Worth) until 1948, and his son, Dr. James Dearmore (b. 1929), who worked with his father prior to going to the mission field in 1963, says in those days, "there was a very heavy emphasis on the KJV-AV Bible and a rejection of all other versions as 'per-versions'" (Letter to D. Cloud, May 24, 1995). In 1948 B.F. Dearmore and a few other pastors founded the Worth Bible College, which graduated several hundred students during its existence through the mid-1960s. Again, James Dearmore tells us that this school "always consistently defended the KJV-AV Bible."

The elder Dearmore also co-founded with Dr. L.E. Miller the Trinity Valley Seminary in the South Fort Worth Baptist Temple, a church he had founded. "From its founding until the deaths of B.F. Dearmore and L.E. Miller, none could have graduated from that school without strong teachings and belief in the defense of, and acceptance of, the KJV-AV as the ONLY acceptable English version of the Bible" (Letter from James Dearmore).

For many years the elder Dearmore edited an independent Baptist paper entitled *The Message*. According to his son, who co-edited this paper for a number of years, it "only recognized the KJV as truly God's Word in the English language, rejecting all other (per)versions."

This opens a window into that time period in the south central and southwestern United States. There were hundreds of Baptist churches in Texas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas in those days that stood exclusively for the King James Bible and that

opposed the modern versions. Those who believe that the "King James Only position is a new invention are ignoring the facts of history.

HUGH FARRELL (b. c. 1912)

Hugh Farrell is a converted Catholic priest who stands for the King James Bible. Born of Roman Catholic parents, Dr. Farrell became a member of the Discalced (barefooted) Carmelite Fathers when he reached manhood. As time passed he began to doubt the doctrines of Rome. Eventually he left the monastery and became a Protestant minister. He was still unsaved, though, and his theology was liberal. For 15 years he served in this condition in various pulpits in the United States. By the grace of God, Farrell was finally led to Christ by a Christian layman and he was born again. Since that day he has preached the Gospel of everlasting forgiveness and peace through repentance and faith in the blood of Jesus Christ. For many years he has also defended the King James Bible and has been associated with the Trinitarian Bible Society. In May 1968, Dr. Farrell delivered a message entitled "Rome and the R.S.V" before the Annual Meeting of the Trinitarian Bible Society at Bridewell Hall, London. Following are some excerpts:

> Over a year ago, back home in U.S.A., to which I returned in 1966 from the British Isles, I was going over my notes and trying to decide what to throw away. ... As many of you know, because I can see many friends here today, for many years I was a Roman Catholic monk, and then for fifteen years a 'liberal' Protestant minister, and finally in 1955 I had a real experience and was truly converted. During the years ... I have accumulated a great deal of material, and as I get nearer to sixty, and remembering that the Scriptures speak of 'three score years and ten,' I decided that I should dispose of what I have, and thus not depend upon relatives, or make them unhappy, if they have to decide what to throw away.
>
> While I was looking over my material I came to the realisation that two of the things I had spoken about coming some day had already arrived—that the R.C. Church in the English-speaking world especially would eventually achieve predominance, politically and educationally—and I realised that this had occurred. For a moment I thought—'Well, my battle is over, I have lost, we have all lost temporarily, but the final judgment is with God.' Then I thought—what can they do now? Once you are in the rider's seat politically, and also in the rider's seat educationally, you seem to have control of the nation.
>
> Then I realized that the final step must be the distortion of God's Word. In other words, no organisation can triumph unless it destroys the testimony against itself, if that organisation is in error. Now the days of Bible burning are over in most places. That is no longer the thing to do under the ecumenical movement. It is highly frowned upon, as a matter of fact, and would only alienate people, and might even prevent an organisation from achieving its purpose. But by subtly introducing differences into the pure Word of God they can gradually achieve the same purpose as Bible burning. **THEY DO NOT HAVE TO BURN BIBLES, THEY MERELY HAVE TO CHANGE A WORD HERE AND THERE, SO THAT IT IS NO LONGER ACCORDING TO THE ORIGINAL TEXT**, and if they use

what they consider a more suitable word, they have achieved their purpose.

I am very sorry to tell you that in my own country, the U.S.A., the majority of evangelicals are not only totally unaware of this, **but it seems that they do not wish to know—for several reasons—but the most important reason is that if they have this knowledge, they must make a stand, if they believe in the pure, unadulterated Word of God. This they do not want to do, because it will cost them too much.** In much of the world today we want our faith in God to be easy. We do not want to make sacrifices. We merely want to enjoy all the benefits of believing in the Triune God, without any of the responsibilities.

Today I am merely going to take one book, one translation, and show you how subtly these differences can be introduced gradually, and how eventually any organisation can thus achieve its purpose of destroying the Scriptural testimony against itself. I have been asked to speak on the Revised Standard Version Roman Catholic edition. ...

... **the R.S.V. itself has deceived many, including many evangelicals**. **I have heard repeatedly from the lips of evangelicals here, as well as in the U.S.A., 'Is it not wonderful that we have in the R.S.V. what can now be used as a *Common Bible*?'** ... The R.S.V. is at this present time as near as possible a *Common Bible* between R.C.s and Protestants. ...

There are many other places in here, almost too numerous to mention, in which **the text has been slightly altered, but IN THE SLIGHT ALTERATION OF THE TEXT IS THE POISON**. ... How careful we must be. All medicine dispensed in this country, as well as in my country, must if it is poisonous, have 'POISON' written on the label. This is the law, and any pharmacist who disregards it can lose his license or even be imprisoned, but **POISON INTRODUCED IN THE NAME OF HOLY SCRIPTURE IS BEING SPREAD THROUGHOUT THE WORLD TODAY**, and it is only a Society like the Trinitarian Bible Society that can warn the people and help to prevent the further spread of such a poison (Hugh Farrell, *Rome and the R.S.V.*, pp. 1-7).

THE NEW DEVOTIONAL FAMILY BIBLE

The defense of the King James Bible was also being made in that day in the forewords to some family Bibles. An example is *The New Devotional and Explanatory Pictorial Family Bible* published between 1873 and 1877 by The National Publishing Company, Philadelphia, PA; Chicago, IL; St. Louis, MO, and Atlanta, GA. One of these was owned by James Garrison, the great-great-great grandfather of Pastor Bobby Mitchell Jr., Mid-Coast Baptist Church, Brunswick, Maine. The statement concerning the Authorized Version from pages 10 and 11 of this family Bible is as follows, as given by me by Brother Mitchell.

We are very sure that the results of all such investigations will be to heighten confidence in the present version, and fill the heart with unfeigned gratitude to God, for that blessed book which we now enjoy, and which, for nearly two centuries and a half, has been pouring its light and consolation wherever the English tongue is spoken. Let science toil, and diligence labor ... let literature

hold up her torch, and cast all possible light upon the sacred text, but we must and ever shall deprecate any wanton attacks upon our received version—any gratuitous attempts to supersede it by a new and different translation. It is the Bible which our godly fathers have read, and over which they have wept and prayed. It is the good old English Bible, with which are associated all our earliest recollections of religion. As such let it go down unchanged to the latest posterity. Let us give it in charge to coming generations, and bid them welcome to all the blessings it has conveyed to us. Let it be our fervent prayer, that the light of the resurrection morning may shine on the very book which we now read,— that we may then behold again the familiar face of our own Bible, the very same which we read in our childhood.

There is no book, says the illustrious Seldon, so translated as the Bible for the purpose. If I translate a French book into English, I turn it into English phrase, not French English . . . But the Bible is rather translated into English words than into English phrase. The Hebraisms are kept, and the phrase of that language is kept. The style of our present version, says Bishop Middleton, is incomparably superior to anything which might be expected from the finical and perverted taste of our own age.

WILLIAM ABERHART (1878-1943)

William Aberhart stood for the Traditional Text and the King James Bible in western Canada during the first half of the twentieth century. Aberhart was a high school principal, pastor, Bible school dean, radio Bible teacher, and a political leader. For 20 years (1915-1935) Aberhart was the principal of one of the most prestigious high schools in Canada, the Crescent Heights High School in Calgary, Alberta. He was Premier of Alberta from 1935-43, his Social Credit party having been swept into power on a tremendous landslide victory. During those years, he also served as Attorney-General and as Minister of Education. Though greatly beloved by the common man, Aberhart was hated and slandered by the media of that day. The press loved to call him "Bible Bill," though he was not known by such a name to those who knew him.

For many years Aberhart expounded upon the Bible in weekly lectures attended by hundreds on Sunday afternoons in Calgary. His specialty was Bible prophecy. He was a fundamentalist and a Scofield dispensationalist. He was also a Baptist. Though reared in a Presbyterian home, he left Presbyterianism as a young man. In November 1925, he began his pioneer radio broadcasts which were beamed across Alberta and enjoyed a large and dedicated following. He preached the Gospel in plain and simple language, and he always had the humble farming community of that day in mind, having himself been raised on a farm. As to Christ's love for man, Aberhart announced, "This truth of the gospel is a wonderful thing. It is, without doubt, the greatest news that has ever been proclaimed. When Christ died, once for all, and made atonement for all our sins, past, present, and future, He did a complete work and made our salvation an assured fact" (Lecture delivered June 28, 1942).

Aberhart also founded the Radio Sunday School. Bible lessons were broadcast over the radio and coordinated with printed materials. Follow up was accomplished by volunteers who gave their leisure time to reach boys and girls for Christ. At the time of his death, six thousand young people were enrolled. During his years as Minister of Education in Alberta, Aberhart was responsible for legislation making it compulsory for the Bible to be read daily in every classroom in the province.

In the late 1920s Aberhart separated from the Regular Baptists over issues such as Bible inspiration and prophecy. He was a dispensationalist and rejected the amillennialism prevalent among the Regular Baptists. In 1924 Aberhart established the Calgary Prophetic Bible Institute. The first student enrolled in this Bible Institute was Ernest Charles Manning, who eventually became the premier of Alberta, holding that position from 1943 until 1968. Aberhart also founded the Bible Institute Baptist Church, which was dedicated by the fundamental Baptist leader William B. Riley. The Bible Institute Baptist Church, which seated 1,250, was a prominent church in Calgary in those days. On Sunday mornings the main floor was commonly filled, and on many special occasions the church was packed. Well-known fundamentalist leaders from the States, such as W.B. Riley and Harry Rimmer, preached there.

Aberhart trained his people and his students to have confidence in the divine preservation of the Bible. Aberhart saw the Bible text issue as one involving the authority of God's Word. On his stationery in dark orange ink were the words "We believe in an inspired Bible." Aberhart was not satisfied, though, to believe that an inspired Bible had come from the hands of the Scripture writers only to be corrupted in its transmission through the centuries. He argued that not only was it God's responsibility to give a divinely inspired Bible, but it was also His responsibility to keep it. He believed that the King James Bible is the preserved Word of God.

The following summary of Aberhart's teaching was given by Pastor Mark Buch who was educated by Aberhart in the 1930s.

> Mr. Aberhart was one of the greatest Bible teachers in Canada. He was the first person I came in contact with who knew the true story of the divine inspiration and preservation of God's Holy Word. He explained how it came down from the first apostolic faultless autograph, its safe keeping through the Byzantine church, the majority reformation copy by Erasmus of Rotterdam, William Tyndale's translation, the Authorized committee of mental and spiritual giants, and the resultant glorious treasure—the Authorized Version (Mark Buch, *In Defence of the Authorized Version*, People's Fellowship Tabernacle, Vancouver, British Columbia, p. 25).

One of Aberhart's lectures on the subject of Bible versions, *The Latest of Modern Movements: Or What about the Revised Version of the Bible?* was printed and distributed by the thousands. In this message Aberhart expressed his views on the multiplication of versions in English. The following excerpts illustrate Aberhart's

affecting manner of speaking and the position on Bible versions that he taught to great numbers of people in the first half of this century. Aberhart's message is as relevant today as the day it was first preached.

> A storm at sea is not so dangerous as a fog. Ships are built to wrestle with storms, but not to withstand a fog. I was reading not long ago of an invention recently perfected to help a vessel in a fog. The apparatus consists of a horizontal outlook pipe, eight feet in length and eight inches in diameter. At the mouth of the tube is a wide flange; the rear end is covered with a thick disk of glass. About two feet from the rear end a pipe enters the tube from below, at an obtuse angle with the forward section. This connection is fastened to a sort of turntable which permits the outlook tube to be pointed in any desired direction, up or down, from one side to the other. The pipe below connects with a powerful blower down in the vessel. When the dispeller is in use the blower sends a forceful stream of air into the pipe, into the tube, and the current hurtles into the fog, boring a hole through it as it were. The fog rolls back in every direction. A great cone of clear atmosphere, with its apex at the mouth of the tube, results. The eye of the pilot is at the glass at the rear end of the tube and he gazes into the bowels of the fog. The inventor hopes to make the fog-dispeller useful at a thousand feet.
>
> But there is another kind of fog, that I have in mind, a religious one. I should like to use a powerful dispeller upon it, if I could, so that earnest people may not be cast upon the rocks of unbelief and doubt.
>
> ***The Attack of the Critics***
>
> **During the last half of the 18th century, and the greater part of the 19th, the Philosophic, Evolutionary or Higher Critical School of Thought struck its deadliest blow and made its most determined effort against God's Written Word, the Bible.**
>
> It was a real storm and it struck the old van of the Church broadsides. Her colleges were almost ruined. For a time there was a wavering among the people. Many wondered if she would be able to weather the storm. **It was a brazen attempt to establish a priest craft—not ecclesiastical but philosophic**. ...
>
> During the last 50 years, as the rank and file of God's people have been gradually losing confidence in these vaporings that were regularly declared from certain platforms, pulpits and church papers, there has arisen a steadily-increasing interest in the study of Holy Writ. Finding no certain help in philosophy and skepticism of the Higher Critical type, they have thought to return to the faith of their fathers.
>
> Some of our greatest intellects are studying—not about the Bible, but the contents of it, and its power and force is being felt, as the Word itself declared. ...
>
> ***The Modern Craze***
>
> **Contemporaneous with this splendid movement back to the scriptures there has arisen the latest modern religious movement, which is settling down upon the human race like a dense fog. I refer to the popular, apparently insatiable craze to undertake the seemingly insignificant task of correcting the Bible by revision**.

They tell us about 'the intrinsic and transcriptional probability of mistakes'; or 'the conflation of whole verses and chapters'; and 'neutral texts'; and behind it all 'the primitive archetype,' that must be conjectured. And finally the bold and bad assertion 'that we are obliged to come to the supreme court of the individual mind to correct the Word.' (Please note the drift.)

One can almost picture the magicians of old saying a few incoherent, unintelligible phrases and then presto! change! the thing is gone.

Constantly we hear from mere tyros and the unlearned in the Greek and Hebrew, that, 'such and such' a word is in the original and should be translated 'so and so.' The strange, inexplicable point of it all is that many of these do not know even the Greek or Hebrew alphabets, and certainly do not know that the original manuscripts are not in existence, and have not been seen by anyone in modern times.

Think of it! All this in the face of God's Definite Warnings:

(1) Deut. 4:2—'Ye shall not add unto the Word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you.'

(2) Prov. 30:6—'Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.'

(3) Rev. 22:18-19—'If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.'

Solemn warnings indeed are these, placed as great sentinels, one at the beginning, another in the middle and the last at the close of the Word, to protect man and keep him from presumptuously rushing in where angels fear to tread: And yet how little they give heed!

What is the Result?

Simply this, side by side, are to be found scores of Bible translations and revisions, each claiming greater perfection than any other of its kind.

We have Darby's Version, Russell's Diaglot, Prof. Moulton's Bible, English Revised Version, American Revised Version, 20th Century in Modern Speech, Moffatt's Translation, Goodspeed's New Testament, Kent's Shorter Bible. I would not attempt to give an exhaustive list. ...

One would almost imagine that we had reached the place where we considered that the only requisite to write a correct Bible was a number of the old manuscripts and a knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew. The presence and guidance of the Holy Spirit seems of no account. **How quickly Satan can get people to bow down to scholarship or the heroic in mankind. Let us be warned. Conditions are fast becoming as they were in France just previous to the horrible Infidelity and Revolutionary period. The French Protestants had three different versions**—those of Osterwald, Martin and Segond. In their churches and homes sometimes one was read, sometimes another. A story is

told that a visiting clergyman entered a church in Paris, and found the minister reading from one version, while in the pew was another version, at the bottom of a page of which was pencilled, 'not two words in five alike.' **Imagine the influence of such a condition!**

Are we blind to the force of a statement such as this: 'You have many different Bibles and no two are alike'? **Can you estimate the effect upon the rising generation to have nothing settled? Will our children not soon begin to think that Holy Scripture is a nose of wax to be twisted hither and thither? No wonder the Roman Catholics smile as they say, 'Where does the infallibility of your Bible come in?' What a fog! Would to God I could use a dispeller that would roll back this fog in every direction, for I believe God has spoken.**

Psalm 11:3—'If the foundation be destroyed, what can the righteous do?'

The Problem that Confronts us in this

If we grant Modernism the authority to revise and correct our Bibles, we must be prepared to grant three concessions and all that appertains thereto.

(1) That the translators of the Authorized version were not guided by the Holy Spirit, since they made so many (?) blunders. And further that they knew very little Hebrew and Greek; in fact were mere tyros when compared with the many giants of today.

And again, for the last 300 years, through the numerous mistakes, terrible mistranslations and gross blunders, our forefathers who in many cases willingly gave their lives for the truth, were led astray into doctrines that had no foundation in fact.

(2) That, considering the number of modern attempts that have been made, each claiming to be the best rendering, the correct form of translation must be very difficult to ascertain and hard to recognize when it is secured. And thus, the greater portion of humanity are entirely incapable of certain knowledge regarding the most vital truths of life. **We must therefore be prepared to abandon the doctrine of the individual's responsibility and accept the priestcraft of the Greek and Hebrew scholars.**

Bear in mind that all the Protestant churches in their creeds accepted the infallibility of the inspired Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

(3) That, after all is said and done, we can never have an infallible guide upon which to base our faith. Who knows but that the next ten years will see further translations and revisions by greater 'intellectual giants' than those of today, and we shall find that we have been groping in the dark. Thus, not having an infallible guide, we are cast adrift on the seas of life in a vessel that has no rudder. On what coast, think you, we can hope to land in such a case?

Are you prepared, dear reader, to grant all this? Will you set out to sea under such conditions?

I can still believe the Lord Jesus Christ, when he said: 'For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled' (Matt. 5:18). 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away' (Matt. 24:35).

If these words mean anything, they inform us that the Lord Jesus intended to see to it that the Bible, His Word, would be preserved for us in a perfect, infallible state. I think it is high time we arouse ourselves and follow the example of Jude: 'Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. For there are certain men crept in unawares who were, before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness and denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ' (Jude 3,4).

No one questions the need of Bible revision. It is an obvious fact, that, as centuries pass by, the spoken language will become different from the printed page. We are constantly changing the import of various words that we use.

For example, take the word 'let.' In 1611, when the Authorized Bible was published, this word meant 'hindered,' the very opposite of its meaning today. ... But when the revisers take the ground that more reliable manuscripts and better translations have been discovered, I claim this is too uncertain and vague to carry conviction and it makes one become a living interrogation point. ...

It is hardly necessary to state that the Original Manuscripts that came from the hands of the inspired writers are not in existence and have not been for nearly nineteen centuries. ... God did not need the originals in order to give us His pure and holy Word. He has kept it, as Jesus said. Not one jot nor one tittle has passed from it. ...

No, modernists, serious-minded people who recognize the latest Modern Drift will need to be shown more convincingly before they will hand over the Bible of our forefathers. ...

The New Testament, English Revised, was published in May, 1881 ... The whole Bible, English Revision, was published in May, 1885. ... The American committee were not altogether satisfied, and in 1900 published the New Testament, American Revision. The following year the whole Bible, American Revision, was published. It is evident ... that many of the Higher Critical School and some with Unitarian ideals would be found in these committees....

This is the finding and product of the latest Modern movement. It still goes on. **HERE AND THERE AND EVERYWHERE MEN ARE RISING UP ABOVE THE SCRIPTURES TO CORRECT THEM. THE TABLES ARE BEING TURNED TODAY. INSTEAD OF THE BIBLE CORRECTING MEN AND MEN'S OPINIONS, SOME ARE CORRECTING THE BIBLE.** ...

Personally, I am willing to accept Christ's declaration at its face value. 'Verily, I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled' (Matt. 5:18).

Why then should we be attracted by the error and nonsense which everywhere plead for a hearing because they are new? **To suppose that theology can be new is to imagine that the Lord Himself is of yesterday. To propose that we need a new Bible is to declare that God has not spoken. A doctrine that declares itself new must of necessity be false. Falsehood has no**

> **beard, but Truth is hoary with age immeasurable.** Pity should be our feeling toward those young preachers who cry, 'See my new theology! See my latest Revision!' in just the same spirit as little Mary says, 'See my pretty new frock!'
>
> The time has not yet come when all things have been fulfilled. The heavens and the earth have not yet passed away. Therefore not one jot nor one tittle has passed. **The Authorized version is reliable. I believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God and the only infallible rule of faith and practice** (William Aberhart, *The Latest of Modern Movements*, c1925).

With these wise words we close this historical overview of the battle against the Westcott-Hort Greek text and the Anglo-American Revisions of 1885 and 1901. These perversions of Scripture were soundly rejected by a wide variety of Bible-believing people, including a great many men whose scholarship was at least equal with that of the critical text proponents. That many scholars accepted the innovations is no surprise in light of the perverse inclination of human nature to follow that which is wrong. Sadly, most men are more inclined to follow majority opinion, or popular thinking, than to be committed exclusively to what the Bible teaches.

CHAPTER FOUR

FROM 1950 TO 1970

The Battle against the Revised Standard Version

Another landmark in the battle for the pure Bible was the publication in 1952 of the Revised Standard Version. The Revised Standard Version (New Testament, 1946; Old Testament, 1952) was a successor to the English Revised Version and the American Standard Version. It was produced by the theologically liberal National Council of Churches in America.

Though the Revised Standard Version is not very influential in North America, it is widely distributed by the United Bible Societies in other parts of the world. In South Asia, for example, the RSV is very popular due to the influence of the Bible societies. On a trip to India in the 1980s I visited the Calcutta branch of the Bible Society in India [a member of the United Bible Societies] and saw a large supply of RSV Bibles containing the apocrypha. On the same trip I visited a Roman Catholic bookstore in Calcutta and was told by a nun that the main version they distribute is the RSV. I wanted to purchase a Roman Catholic translation, but they had only a few dusty copies of the Jerusalem Bible. They were pushing the RSV, and the copies they had were published by the Bible societies.

In addition, many of the Bible society translations are based on the Revised Standard Version. This is true for the Hindi language, which is one of the two official languages of India and is spoken by at hundreds of millions of people. Many of the vernacular translations of the Bible in India are based either on the Revised Standard Version or the Today's English Version

The RSV translators were some of the most notorious modernists of this century. To demonstrate this we will *not* quote what someone else has said about them; we will give excerpts directly from their own books which we have obtained at considerable expense. The heretical position on biblical inspiration held by these modern translators can be contrasted sharply with that of the men who have produced the text and translations in the lineage of the King James Bible.

WILLIAM FOXWELL ALBRIGHT (1891-1971) served on the Old Testament committee of the Revised Standard Version.

> One cannot of course place John on the same level with the synoptic Gospels [Matthew, Mark, Luke] as A HISTORICAL SOURCE (William Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity,* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1957).

WALTER RUSSELL BOWIE (1882-1969) served on RSV New Testament committee. He also contributed to *The Interpreter's Bible* of 1951-57.

> According to the ENTHUSIASTIC TRADITIONS which had come down through the FOLKLORE of the people of Israel, Methuselah lived 969 years (Walter Russell Bowie, *Great Men of the Bible*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1937, p. 1).
>
> The story of Abraham comes down from ancient times; and how much of it is fact and how much of it is LEGEND, no one can positively tell (Bowie, *Great Men of the Bible*, p. 13).
>
> The man of whom these words were written [Jacob] belongs to a time so long ago that it is uncertain whether its records are history or legend (Bowie, *Great Men of the Bible*, p. 37).
>
> Moreover it can be maintained that the kind of supernatural belief which seems to be embodied in the Old Testament can be not only illusory; it can be definitely hurtful (Walter Bowie, *Where You Find God*, Harper & Row, 1968, p. 24).
>
> The imprecatory psalms and other utterances like them reflect a God who is dead and ought to be dead—and never was alive except in unredeemed imagination (Bowie, *Where You Find God*, p. 25).
>
> The Israelites trying to escape by night from Pharaoh came to water which they had to cross. Biblical scholarship suggests that this was the relatively shallow 'Sea of Reeds' or 'Papyrus Lake,' which could have been passable at the moment Moses seized, when a strong east wind blew; but would not have been passable for Pharaoh's chariots when the wind had changed. … Accordingly there grew the tradition that the passage had been through the wide and formidable Red Sea, and made possible by a visible intervention of the power of God which enabled the Israelites to pass through the Red Sea 'on dry ground,' with the waters being 'a wall to them on their right hand and on their left' (Exodus 14:22). Similarly again and again in the Old Testament narratives there appear conceptions of God almost as mythological as the conceptions elsewhere of the gods of Olympus (Bowie, *Where You Find God*, pp. 26, 27).
>
> Men in ancient Israel could not anticipate, any more than other human beings could, the knowledge of the universe which has come through the patient thought and study of the centuries since. They could only draw the picture which their reverent IMAGINATION saw. ... The details of their story of Creation could not go beyond CONJECTURE ... Such was the picture of Creation—coming probably from priests and scribes of the temple in Jerusalem some 2400 or 2500 years ago—*as they conceived the Creation to have been*. ...worshipful IMAGINATION ... FOLKLORE ... stream of TRADITION ...

spontaneous IMAGINATION... (Bowie, *The Living Story of the Old Testament*, Prentice-Hall, 1964, p. 4-7).

We cannot tell in any sure way just how the Resurrection happened. We do not know just exactly in what form or at what time the risen Jesus appeared. ... The writers of the Gospels were trying to put into words an overwhelming experience that could not be expressed (Bowie, *I Believe in Jesus Christ*, New York: Abingdon Press, 1959, p. 55).

Bowie was dead wrong. The Bible's history is not folklore and its miracles are not mythical. Israel actually passed through the Red Sea. Christ actually rose from the dead. We know the exact form of His resurrection. It was bodily! We know the exact time. It was three days after the crucifixion. The writers were not trying to describe the resurrection in their own words; they were writing words given by inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Their description of the resurrection was not a haphazard attempt to put the event into fallible human words. To claim such a thing is a presumptuous denial of biblical inspiration. Bowie's book was misnamed. It should have been titled "I Believe in the Jesus Christ of My Own Imagination."

MILLAR BURROWS (1889-c.1990), Yale University, served on the RSV New Testament committee as well as the Old Testament committee. He also helped produce the RSV Apocrypha.

We cannot take the Bible as a whole and in every part as stating with divine authority what we must believe and do (Millar Burrows, *Outline of Biblical Theology*).

HENRY JOEL CADBURY (1883-1974), Harvard Divinity School, served on the RSV New Testament committee. He also helped produce the RSV Apocrypha.

As they [the first Christian authors] wrote with neither grammatical precision nor absolute verbal consistency, he [the modern translator] is willing to deal somewhat less meticulously with the data of a simple style that was naturally not too particular about modes of expression or conscious of some of the subtleties which some later interpreters read into it (Henry Cadbury, Introduction, Revised Standard Version, 1952, p. 52).

HE [JESUS CHRIST] WAS GIVEN TO OVERSTATEMENTS, in his case, not a personal idiosyncrasy, but a characteristic of the oriental world (Henry F. Cadbury, *Jesus, What Manner of Man?).*

As to the miraculous, one can hardly doubt that time and tradition would heighten this element in the story of Jesus (Cadbury, *Jesus, What Manner of Man?*).

A psychology of God, IF that is what Jesus was, is not available (Cadbury, *Jesus, What Manner of Man?*).

CLARENCE TUCKER CRAIG (1895-1953) served on the RSV New Testament committee and helped produce the RSV Apocrypha. He taught at Yale University Divinity School, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, and Drew Theological

Seminary. He boldly denied the infallible inspiration of Scripture. In *The Study of the New Testament* (Abingdon Press, 1939), he begins by saying it is no longer possible to believe that the Bible is the inerrant Word of God (p. 9). He goes on to say there is "no infallibility" in the text of Scripture (p. 10). He claims that the Gospels were not given by inspiration of God, but are based on various oral and written accounts and are not historically accurate (pp. 21-28), the book of Matthew was written by an anonymous and unknown author and is merely a revised edition of Mark (pp. 40, 41), and the author of John was an unknown "devotional mystic" (pp. 49, 50). According to Craig, the Gospel of John teaches there would be no future resurrection of the dead and no literal second coming of Christ (p. 53), the book of Acts was probably not written by Luke and "bristles with difficult problems" (pp. 68, 69), Paul did not write by divine inspiration (p. 76), the book of Ephesians "is not a letter of Paul to Ephesus" (p. 91), the books of Timothy and Titus were not written by Paul (pp. 92, 93), First and Second Peter were not written by Peter (pp. 96, 99), James was written by an unknown person who "holds that salvation is by works rather than faith" and who "did not understand what Paul meant by faith" (p. 97), and the first epistle of John "does not come directly from the apostle John" (p. 98). Craig denies the blood atonement of Jesus Christ, claiming that the book of Hebrews is wrong to teach "that a bloody sacrifice was necessary in order to make possible the forgiveness of men's sins" (p. 111). He said that the writer of Hebrews wrote only "in terms of the ideas of a particular age" (p. 111).

Following are other examples of Craig's unbelief from another of his books:

> Revelation has sometimes been understood to consist in a holy book. ... Even on Christian soil it has sometimes been held that the books of the Bible were practically dictated to the writers through the Holy Spirit. ... I DO NOT THINK THAT THIS IS THE DISTINCTIVELY CHRISTIAN POSITION. If God once wrote His revelation in an inerrant book, He certainly failed to provide any means by which this could be passed on without contamination through human fallibility. ... The true Christian position is the Bible CONTAINS the record of revelation (Craig, *The Beginning of Christianity,* 1943, pp. 17, 18).

> The mere fact that a tomb was found empty was CAPABLE OF MANY EXPLANATIONS. THE VERY LAST ONE THAT WOULD BE CREDIBLE TO A MODERN MAN WOULD BE THE EXPLANATION OF A PHYSICAL RESURRECTION OF THE BODY. ... The resurrection of Jesus did not mean the reanimation of a corpse for a brief continuation of fellowship with his friends. It meant that the new age of God had already begun. ... In other words, Paul was not talking about an event which could be photographed by eye-witnesses, but an event in the world of spiritual perception. ... It was not to be demonstrated by appeal to graves that were empty. It was a proclamation that must appeal to religious faith (Craig, *The Beginning of Christianity,* pp. 135, 36).

ROBERT CLAUDE DENTAN (1907-) is a translator for the New Revised Standard Version. He authored *The Apocrypha, Bridge of the Testaments* (Greenwich, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1969), *Preface to Old Testament Theology* (New

Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), and *The Design of the Scriptures: A First Reader in Biblical Theology* (New York: Seabury Press, 1965). He also edited *The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955).

> In accordance with the ecumenical perspective of the planning for the NRSV, the membership of the committee had been expanded to include ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOLARS ... the presence of an eminent JEWISH SCHOLAR on the Old Testament committee, participating as a full contributing member, was intended as both an expression of good-will and an assurance that the NRSV translation of the Hebrew Scriptures ... WOULD CONTAIN NOTHING OFFENSIVE TO OUR JEWISH NEIGHBORS (*The Making of the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991, pp. 10,11).

EDGAR JOHNSON GOODSPEED (1871-1962), of the University of Chicago, was a member of the translation committee for the Revised Standard Version New Testament. He also published his own translation called the *American Translation of the New Testament* in 1923.

> The oldest of these elements [Genesis] was a Judean account of the nation's story from the beginning of the world to the conquest of Canaan by the tribes. ... BABYLONIAN MYTHS AND LEGENDS AND CANAANITE POPULAR TALES HE FREELY APPROPRIATED to his great purpose of enforcing morality and the worship of one God. Sometimes crude old SUPERSTITIOUS IDEAS still cling to some of these. The writer of this ancient record was a prophet ... He wrote his book about 850 B.C. in the Southern Kingdom of Judah. ... And IN THE CAPTIVITY IN BABYLONIA THESE BOOKS [THE FIRST SIX BOOKS OF THE BIBLE] WERE COMBINED INTO A GREAT COMPOSITE WORK of history and law ... So at last, not long after 400 B.C., arose the Hexateuch (Goodspeed, *The Story of the Old Testament*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934, pp. 107-110).
>
> JESUS ... WAS FAR FROM GIVING TO THE OLD TESTAMENT AS A WHOLE THE UNQUALIFIED ASSENT natural to a Jew of his day. His attitude is a discriminating one, combining eager acceptance of its statements of enduring spiritual truth and free criticism of its moral imperfections (Goodspeed, *The Formation of the New Testament*, 1926, p. 7).
>
> The books of the New Testament show a decided development in the degree of regard which their several writers feel for the Old Testament. From the free critical treatment of it on the part of Jesus, the very modified authority which Paul ascribes to it, the Old Testament returns in the hands of later New Testament writers to its larger Jewish claims (Goodspeed, *The Formation of the New Testament*, p. 8).
>
> Paul did not expect his letters to be preserved or collected, still less to be regarded as Holy Scripture (Goodspeed, *The Formation of the New Testament*, p. 11).
>
> John ... In his great effort to restate Christian truth in Greek terms he departs widely from the positions of the earlier evangelists and he differs from them in

> many important historical particulars. ... He had no scruple about changing and correcting their material (Goodspeed, *The Formation of the New Testament*, p. 14).

FREDERICK CLIFTON GRANT (1891-1974), Union Theological Seminary, served on the RSV New Testament committee. He also helped produce the RSV Apocrypha. Grant translated works by the Neo-orthodox theologian Rudolf Bultmann. One of these was *Form Criticism: a New Method of New Testament Research; including the study of the Synoptic gospels* by Rudolf Bultmann (1962).

> We may admit at once that the older view of Jesus' life and ministry was NOT ENTIRELY HISTORICAL (Frederick Grant, *The Beginnings of Our Religion,* New York: Macmillan Co., 1934).

WALTER J. HARRELSON was a translator of the New Revised Standard Version. He authored *Interpreting the Old Testament* (New York: Hold, Rinehart and Winston, 1964) and contributed to *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament,* edited by Douglas A. Knight.

> It is a genuine pleasure ... to be able to read the lessons appointed for the day in such a way as to ELIMINATE ENTIRELY MASCULINE REFERENCES TO THE DEITY, and to do so without having had to retranslate or reproduce the biblical lessons in advance. ... [the NRSV] is by far our most inclusive Bible... (*The Making of the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991, p. 84).

RSV translator **H.G.G. HERKLOTS** made the following announcement of his modernism:

> But few scholars outside the Roman Church now believe that St. Matthew was the first Gospel: most are convinced that—as it exists to-day—it is essentially a Greek book, partly dependent upon two Greek sources, one of which has been lost, but the other of which is St. Mark; and that these two sources were also used by St. Luke (Herklots, *How the Bible Came to Us*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1954, p. 75).

According to the modernist, the Gospels are a hodgepodge of almost haphazard man-made writings, but according to the apostles the Gospels were written under inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

WILLIAM ANDREW IRWIN (1884-1967), University of Chicago Divinity School, served on the RSV Old Testament committee.

> This phrase ['Thus saith the Lord'] is an almost unfailing mark of SPURIOUSNESS (William Irwin, *The Problem of Ezekiel*).

> Only bigotry could bring us to deny an EQUAL VALIDITY WITH THE PROPHETS OF ISRAEL in the religious vision of men such as Zoroaster or Ikhnaton or, on a lower level, the unnamed thinkers of ancient Babylonia (Irwin, *The Problem of Ezekiel*).

FLEMING JAMES (1877-1959), dean emeritus of the School of Theology, the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., served (beginning in 1947) on the RSV New Testament committee.

> The narrative of calling down fire from heaven upon the soldiers sent to arrest him is PLAINLY LEGENDARY (Fleming James, *The Beginnings of Our Religion*).

> What REALLY happened at the Red Sea WE CAN NO LONGER KNOW (James, *The Beginnings of Our Religion*).

JAMES MOFFATT (1870-1944) was Yates Professor of Greek at Mansfield College, Oxford, and later Professor of Church History at the United Free Church College, Glasgow. From 1927-1940, he was Washburn Professor of Church History at Union Theological Seminary. He served on the translation committee for the Revised Standard Version New Testament. He also made two translations of his own: The first was *The Historical New Testament* in 1901. The second, *The Moffatt Version New Testament,* first appeared in England in 1913 and in the United States in 1917. The Moffatt complete Bible was printed in 1926. In his *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (Scribner's, 1925), Moffatt plainly denied the infallibility of the Scripture. He frequently denied the historicity and authorship of the New Testament books. For example, he said that the book of Revelation is a composite work by unknown authors (pp. 488, 501). Moffatt denied that the epistles of 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus were written by Paul (p. 406). He claimed that the book of Ephesians was not written by Paul and was not written to the church at Ephesus (pp. 389,393) and that 2 Peter was not written by Peter (p. 366).

> But once the translator of the New Testament is freed from the influence of the theory of verbal inspiration, these difficulties cease to be so formidable (James Moffatt, preface, *New Testament: A New Translation*, 1913).

> The writers of the New Testament made mistakes in interpreting some of the Old Testament prophecies (James Moffatt*, The Approach to the New Testament*).

> Only one or two of these visions [of Christ's resurrection] are recorded in the gospels, and it is still a mystery how Jesus rose. But what is common to all the tales of the resurrection is the belief that the personality of Jesus passed into life eternal, that he lived again and lived as Lord of life and death. … Such is the fundamental truth which the tales of the resurrection embody and imply in their own way, a truth which is naturally far greater than any expression of itself (Moffatt, *Everyman's Life of Jesus*, New York: George H. Doran Co., 1925, pp. 221-223).

WILLARD LEAROY SPERRY (1882-1954), Dean of the Harvard Divinity School, was on the RSV Old Testament committee.

> WE DO NOT PRESS THAT GOSPEL [JOHN] FOR TOO GREAT VERBAL ACCURACY IN ITS RECORD OF THE SAYINGS OF JESUS (Willard L. Sperry, *Rebuilding Our World*, New York: Harper & Bro., 1943, p. 32).

> …we find it hard to imagine what can be meant by the word 'heaven' if we try to think of it in terms of time and space (Sperry, *Rebuilding Our World*, p. 32).
>
> We are now told, and probably rightly, that each of the Gospels reflects the point of view of one or another of the groups in the early Church (Sperry, *Rebuilding Our World*, p. 51).
>
> Plainly no divine fiat compounded man out of the dust of the earth and the universal spirit on a Friday in the year 4004 B.C. It is harder than once it was to see God walking in that garden in the cool of the evening (Sperry, *Signs of These Times*, New York: Doubleday, 1929, p. 110).

It is obvious that the translators of the RSV were unbelieving modernists.

Not only did the RSV translators base their work upon the critical Greek text, they also introduced many liberal readings of their own. When the RSV was published, the chairman of the translation committee, Luther Weigle, stated that the use of THEE, THOU, and THINE had been restricted to the address of deity. This was a testimony to the fact that the revisers did not believe Jesus Christ is God, *because they never addressed Him with these terms in their version*.

The duplicity of the RSV committee is seen in many ways. For example, they placed a footnote at Matthew 1:1 which said, "Other ancient authorities read: Joseph, to whom was betrothed the Virgin Mary, was the father of Jesus who is called Christ." This lying note claims to be based on "ancient authorities," (plural) but the fact is that it had only one so-called authority: a rogue Syriac version. Only a wicked unbeliever would place such a footnote into the Bible. Dr. Gordon Clark believed it was significant that the RSV translators did not place this footnote in the 1946 edition of their New Testament, but waited until the publication of the whole Bible in 1952.

> Before they completed their work on the Old Testament, they published the New Testament alone in 1946. It was well advertised and made quite a stir. People who picked it up would probably look at the first page and then leaf through. On the first page they would see nothing suspicious. ... When the entire Bible first appeared, those interested might look at the first page of Genesis and then leaf through. It was unlikely that anyone would pay attention to the first page of the New Testament. But **the first page of Matthew in 1952 was not the same as its first page in 1946**. A footnote had been added. It would have generated wide-spread criticism in 1946, but it would be generally overlooked when hidden by the preceding Old Testament pages (Clark, *Logical Criticisms of Textual Criticism*, p. 17).

This footnote was dropped from later editions of the Revised Standard Version.

Another thing that stirred up considerable debate was the replacement in Isaiah 7:1 of the word "virgin" with "young woman." The RSV translators argued that the Hebrew word here, *almah*, does not necessarily have to be translated virgin. The fact is that only an unbeliever would translate it ANYTHING but virgin in this verse.

Alma is used nine times in the Bible (Gen. 24:43; Ex. 2:8; Psa. 68:25; Prov. 30:19; Song 1:3; 6:8; Isa. 7:14). *Almah* is translated "maid" in Exodus 2:8 and "damsels" in Psalm 68:25. Though many commentators claim that the word can refer to a woman that is not strictly a virgin, it cannot be proven that it is ever so used in Scripture. Genesis 24:43 refers to Rebekah before she became Isaac's bride. She obviously was a virgin in the strictest sense of the word. Exodus 2:8 refers to Moses' sister when she was a girl living at home. Again this is a clear reference to a virgin. Psalm 68:25 and Song of Solomon 1:3 and 6:8 are not as clear as to what kind of girls are in view, but there is no indication in the contexts that these are *not* virgins. To say that they are not is mere speculation. The reference in Isaiah 7:14 without question speaks of a virgin, because it was fulfilled in the life of Mary, the mother of Jesus. The New Testament plainly tells us that though she was espoused to Joseph, she conceived the Lord Jesus Christ "before they came together" (Mat. 1:18). The Holy Spirit quotes Isaiah and applies it directly to the Lord Jesus Christ. The Greek word used for "virgin" in Matthew 1:23 is *parthenos*, and it never means anything except "virgin" in its 14 usages in the New Testament. Any "theologian" who questions the Authorized Version's translation of Isaiah 7:14 is denying the testimony of God.

In this context, we note that the RSV's perversion of Isaiah 7:14 had appeared in Jewish translations as early as 1853. This was in the Isaac Leeser translation of the Old Testament, which was revised and reissued in 1917 by the Central Conference of American Rabbis. It read, "Behold, the young woman shall conceive..." The Moffatt version also replaced "virgin" with "young woman," as did the *Improved Edition* of the Bible issued in 1912 by the American Baptist Publication Society of Philadelphia.

The presumptuous wickedness of the RSV translators stirred up no small debate across the land by men that were opposed to Modernism. The debate on the new version generally followed the Fundamentalist-Modernist line. At that point in time the King James Bible was without question the Bible of the evangelicals and the fundamentalists, and the RSV made no headway in shaking the KJV's hold upon Bible-believing churches. One defender of the King James Bible in 1953 spoke of "the terrific wave of resentment and offence which their Bible [the RSV] has caused among evangelicals in general and fundamentalists in particular" (Mark Buch, "Comparisons Made Between Two Books," *The Vancouver Province*, June 27, 1953). H. Robert Cowles, Editor of *The Alliance Witness*, testified: "The rejection of the R.S.V. by the evangelical wing of the church was nearly complete." Pastor Allen Dickerson, a respected fundamental Baptist leader, has pastored the Maranatha Baptist Church of Elkton, Maryland, since June 1954. That was only two years after the publication of the RSV. In looking back at the changes that have occurred within the fundamentalist movement since those days Dickerson testifies:

> I remember when the RSV came on the market back in the '50s and **fundamentalists went into their pulpits and cried out against it as an exercise in blasphemy**. Now we have scores of paraphrases, revisions, and translations that have come basically from the same text as the RSV, but many fundamentalist pulpits have gone silent. In fact there are many fundamentalists who have allowed higher criticism and modern scholarship to convince them that the King James Version of the Bible is not totally reliable. I am one fundamentalist that believes the KJV is absolutely reliable and I need no other (Dickerson, *Maranatha Baptist Watchman*, June 1992).

Fundamental preachers did cry out against the Revised Standard Version.

In Canada Perry Rockwood, for example, took up the battle against the RSV on the east coast and Mark Buch on the west.

PERRY ROCKWOOD (1917-2008)

Perry Rockwood was an old timer in the fundamentalist battle. He was born again in 1936 during his final year in high school. "The moment I was saved God called me to preach the Gospel. God gave me a burden for other young people who were not saved" (Rockwood, *Triumph in God*, p. 2). He began his theological studies at Presbyterian College, Montreal, but he was discouraged because of its modernism and worldliness. At the end of the first year he sent a letter to the principal, "giving seven reasons why I could not return to the college." He completed his training at Knox College in Toronto, graduating in 1943. His fight with Modernism was not over, though, by a long shot. In his second pastorate as an ordained minister of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, Rockwood could not hold his voice any longer. In 1946, he preached a series of messages to his church in Truro, Nova Scotia, entitled "The Church Sick Unto Death." He charged that the Presbyterian Church in Canada was sick unto death doctrinally, educationally, ecumenically at home, and ecumenically abroad. The final message in the series was preached on December 1, 1946. In early 1947 he was brought to trial by the Presbyterian Church for his stand. A letter from The Presbytery of Halifax and Lunenburg dated February 20, 1947, brought the following tidings:

> You are indicted by the Presbytery of Halifax and Lunenburg at the instance of the said Presbytery to appear at Halifax, N.S. on the 4th day of March, Nineteen Hundred and Forty-seven to answer to the following charge, namely, that you are following a divisive course and acting in a manner contrary to the dignity of a Minister of our Church, and that the sermons published and distributed by you be the grounds of the evidence, which conduct of yours was contrary to the laws of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, and inconsistent with your position as a Minister of the Gospel.

The *Truro News* for December 9, 1946, carried this notice: "Mr. Rockwood explained Sunday morning that in view of the Presbytery's action he would follow the Word of God, even if the church forsakes it. *We must have faith in the infallible Word of God*" (emphasis added).

On March 4, 1947, Rockwood was found guilty of "following a divisive course." In his defense, Rockwood said, "I have sought to be loyal to the church and it has been difficult for me to criticize. At any time when the church departs from the Bible it is up to us to point out the error, irrespective of consequences." On March 10 Rockwood left the Presbyterian Church and started an independent fundamentalist church in the same area. In 1947 he founded the People's Gospel Hour radio ministry. When I visited Rockwood in 1987 in Halifax, he told me that he had not missed one daily radio broadcast in all of those years. He distributed hundreds of thousands of copies of his booklets on various Bible themes.

Rockwood's love for the Word of God is evident in the stand he took against Modernism. Such a public stance is very difficult and few men are willing to pay such a price for the Truth. Consider again his words upon hearing of his indictment*: "We must have faith in the infallible Word of God."* The same faith in an infallible Bible which gave him the courage and conviction to resist Modernism made him care about the issue of corrupted Bible versions. Upon the publication of the Revised Standard Version, Rockwood issued a book through his People's Gospel Hour opposing it in no uncertain terms.

After that Rockwood expanded his opposition to modern versions. Articles regularly appeared in his monthly periodical on this subject. In the 1970s he published *God's Inspired Preserved Bible*, which was a compendium of articles on various facets of the Bible version issue. Five of the articles were by Rockwood, one was by D.O. Fuller, one by Ian Paisley, and three by the Trinitarian Bible Society. One article dealt with the RSV, while others dealt with the Living Bible, the New English Bible, Roman Catholic versions, the New American Standard Version, the Good News for Modern Man, and the New International Version.

MARK BUCH (1910-95)

Mark Buch of Vancouver, British Columbia, defended the King James Bible for sixty years. He was born November 30, 1910. I had the pleasure of interviewing this gracious man of God on a couple of occasions. He started the People's Fellowship Tabernacle of Vancouver in 1939 and pastored it for 40 years. Buch knew and preached with many of the well-known fundamentalist leaders of that century, including J. Frank Norris, G. Beauchamp Vick, and Bob Jones, Sr. In 1990, Buch retired from the pastorate (though he continued his radio broadcasts until his death in 1995), and People's Fellowship Tabernacle merged with the Bethel Baptist Church to become the Tabernacle Baptist Church of Vancouver. Its pastor is Gordon Conner, who continues to hold a standard for the King James Bible and biblical fundamentalism in western Canada.

Pastor Buch first heard the position that the Greek Received Text is the preserved Word of God from the founder and dean of the Calgary Prophetic Bible Institute, William Aberhart, whom we mentioned earlier in these studies.

Buch, a Scandinavian immigrant, came to Canada knowing nothing about English. "I learned English first from an Irish school teacher who was teaching school in New Norway. She taught me the A-B-C's. Later on I learned English, the highest English, by reading the Authorized Version of the Bible. I didn't read anything else. I would write so much every day from the Authorized Version, that's why my English is colored by the Elizabethan English expressions. My speech became saturated with the Authorized Version's incomparable English" (Mark Buch, *In Defence of the Authorized Version*, 1977).

Buch was saved in 1931. Between the first and second year at the Prophetic Bible Institute, Buch took a home study course in Greek produced by Vine in England. His goal was to know God's Word in its original language. The consternation Buch experienced in learning that the Greek text he purchased was different from the Received Text has been experienced by countless men and women. Consider:

> Then one day I was looking at my Greek New Testament and I read on the flyleaf that this Greek New Testament had followed the preparations of Professor Eberhard Nestle. We call it Nestle's Greek New Testament. I then found down in the middle paragraph: 'The text is the resultant of a collation of three of the principle recensions of the Greek New Testament' [two of these were Tischendorf and Westcott-Hort]. I looked this up in my dictionary. Collation means texts put side by side, one here, one there for comparison. Principle recensions means reviewing or examining an ancient text—a text so corrected. Corrected? Now we are correcting God? And then I turned over the page and it gave an explanation of the critical apparatus. What is the critical apparatus? I found there were notes all along in Nestle's Testament. It then dawned on me—I've gone to all this trouble trying to read [the Greek] and I'm no further ahead than I was before! How am I to know which God wrote and which God didn't write? My faith was shaken because faith comes by hearing ... of the Word of God. The Word of God is the basis of our faith. If you don't have a true copy of the Word of God, forget about faith (*In Defence of the Authorized Version*, pp. 30, 31).

Many make light of the dilemma described by Pastor Buch, but the fact that Buch's FAITH WAS SHAKEN by the modern critical approach to Bible texts is a very serious issue that cannot be ignored. It can be demonstrated that not only has the faith of individual men been shaken, but the faith of an entire generation has been shaken by the modern approach. Buch was not satisfied with the arguments of the textual critics. He wanted a perfect Bible! God soon brought him into contact with the information that would throw light on the area of his concern.

> In the Fall I went back to the Prophetic Bible Institute in Calgary [William Aberhart's school]. I came to the second year of Apologetics. It opened the subject of Divine Inspiration and preservation in particular, of the original manuscripts. It was a very helpful and blessed time. During that time I also took Greek at Western Baptist Bible College in Calgary. My heart leaped for joy as my mind was saturated with new confidence. The moment the story began to dawn upon me as we were tracing our way following the pure stream of the divinely

> inspired Bible, back, back to the divinely inbreathed autographs, my whole life changed (*In Defence of the Authorized Version* p. 31).

In a phone conversation with me on March 1, 1995, Buch explained just how important the textual issue was to him: "When Aberhart helped me to see the Bible textual issue, it was like being saved again. I saw that God has preserved His Word and that the Authorized Version was an accurate translation of the divinely-preserved Scriptures."

Many men smile at such a "simplistic approach" to Bible versions, but this author believes it is a dangerous thing to make light of a position that gives men confidence in their Bible.

With the appearance of the Revised Standard Version in 1952, Buch's stance for the King James Bible became much more visible. He held public debates and rallies in opposition to the new Version. These were held across western Canada—Vancouver, Victoria, Kelowna, Calgary, Medicine Hat. On November 28, 1952, soon after the publication of the RSV, Buch debated Dr. Vernon Fawcett, professor of Union College at the University of British Columbia. This debate was broadcast on the powerful and influential CJOR radio station and was conducted in CJOR's radio theater. The public as well as the media and the scholarly world were intensely fascinated with the debate. Many news reporters covered the exchange, including a correspondent for the communist newspaper *Pravda*. The theater was packed. Buch said, "They practically had to carry me out over the heads of the people." The young pastor was frightened at the prospects of facing a brilliant professor in such a public arena, and he prayed to God in an alley before he was scheduled to appear. Buch said the Lord encouraged his heart with Galatians 6:2. He knew that he was facing a burden he would have to bear alone, but though no man could help him, God could and would.

The response following the debate was overwhelming. Buch said he literally had to take the phone off the hook to get some rest. By December the *Calgary Herald* had given this King James Bible defender the moniker "the burning Buch" for "his public denunciation of the new Bible" ("Vancouver Minister Scores New Bible," *Calgary Herald*, Calgary, Alberta, Dec. 17, 1952). The *Vancouver Province* newspaper ran four articles by Buch in June 1953, which gave a reply to articles that had been printed in other papers in support of the RSV. The following excerpt gives the heartbeat of Buch's defense of the Old Bible:

> To grant the original manuscripts were the perfect, inspired Word of God two or three thousand years ago, is small comfort to man today, for it is common knowledge that they are lost. The big question to us then is not, 'Did God inspire the original manuscripts?' We know He did, but has God preserved that perfect revelation through time in copying and translation? Again and again the Word itself emphatically states He has. 'The Word of the Lord endureth forever, and this is the Word which by the gospel is preached unto you' (1 Peter 1:25) (Mark Buch, "Christians Took Scrolls into Alps," *The Vancouver Province*, Saturday, June 13, 1953).

The story of how Buch's articles came to be published in the *Vancouver Province* is fascinating in itself. Because of his public outcry against the RSV, Buch's position on the Bible version issue was well known. The *Vancouver Sun* had published a number of articles covering the new Revised Standard Version, but the *Vancouver Province* had more or less stayed out of the controversy. One day the editor of the *Province*, a Mr. Cunningham, invited Pastor Buch to his office to discuss the issue. We pick up here with Buch's narrative of this encounter:

> We met in his spacious office overlooking Victory Square Park and downtown Vancouver. I found Mr. Cunningham to be a very gracious and knowledgeable person, courteous and soft spoken with a delightful English accent. I was seated opposite his large desk in a big leather chair. Mr. Cunningham acknowledged my contribution in the controversy. I gently reminded him of the immense publicity he and others had given the R.S.V. through advertising but not a word about the Authorized Version. I asked him why the hesitancy to give the Old Bible its deserts.
>
> He answered, 'I can't see it. The Bible to me is the Bible, whatever the version. What's the difference?'
>
> I immediately took him up on that, handing him the Authorized Version and opened to Colossians 1:14.
>
> 'You are a man of words. You live by your knowledge of English. I also do in a way.' Then putting my finger on verse 14 I asked that he read it. He did, out loud! Then I asked, 'Which is the most important phrase in that verse?'
>
> After a very brief pause he answered, 'Through his blood.'
>
> 'Why?' I asked.
>
> 'Through his blood tells us how,' was his answer.
>
> I stressed how important this was. I then handed him a copy of the R.S.V. I believe it was the first edition out. I still have it. Opening it to the same text I asked him to read it. He began again, reading out loud and then stopped after the first line and with furrowed brow looked up and said, 'Why, the phrase "through his blood" is missing, but why?'
>
> I answered, 'Either they refused to translate it out of prejudice to the old time faith of our fathers which requires the blood of God's sacrificial lamb Jesus Christ to wash away our sins, or it wasn't in the Greek manuscripts they used.'
>
> Looking up at me he asked, 'What do you think?'
>
> I answered, 'Knowing what we do of the R.S.V. translators committee, I'd say they spurned the Majority Text or Textus Receptus and used rather the polluted Westcott and Hort line of manuscripts.'
>
> After a few moments silence he asked, 'Could you prepare a series of articles on the historicity of the Authorized Version of the Bible?' (Mark Buch, *In Defence of the Authorized Version: One Pastor's Battle*, pp. 37, 38)

Buch's stand against the modern versions has had an influence in western Canada, particularly, in encouraging other men to stand for the KJV; these men in turn have influenced others.

In 1977 Buch published an overview of the battle against the RSV, and he used the occasion to give this testimony: "[Since the] R.S.V. appeared on the market, the battle of the Bible has raged with a flood of false Bibles from spurious manuscripts. ... After twenty-five years I am stronger and more confident in the veracity of the Authorized Version and the divinely inspired origin of its text*" (In Defence of the Authorized Version*, p. 14). On his radio broadcast for the third week of April 1995, Buch's message was on the corruption of modern Bible versions.

CECIL CARTER (1913-2005)

Cecil Carter is another example of those who opposed the Revised Standard Version and have stood for the King James Bible from the 1950s to present. Carter was born March 27, 1913, in Victoria, British Columbia. He trusted Jesus Christ as his Savior in 1932 and was involved in all sorts of front-line Gospel ministries through the years. Prior to full-time ministry to the men and women of the armed forces in World War II, he preached to conscientious objectors in work camps on Sunday afternoons and to the sailors in training at the Comox "Spit" in the evenings. In 1943 he established a new branch of the "Soldier's and Airmen's Christian Association" in Prince Rupert, B.C., continuing there ministering to the armed forces of Canada and the U.S.A. until the cessation of hostilities. After the war he spent 19 years preaching in remote parts of western Canada, the Yukon, and Alaska. During those years he traveled hundreds of thousands of miles holding forth the Word of Life in logging camps, mining towns, jails, construction camps, Indian villages, and occasionally in gambling halls. The last many years of his life were spent as an elder in a Brethren Assembly in Prince George.

Early in 1952 Carter obtained a copy of *The New Testament in the Language of the People* by Charles William (published by Moody Bible Institute). The New Testament edition of the Williams Version came out in 1937 and the full Bible in 1960. As Carter and his wife began to go through this new version, they found that though the language was simpler in some ways, it contained an endless number of changes that affected the doctrine of passages. What they did not understand at the time was that Charles Williams had rejected the Greek Received Text and had founded his version upon the critical Greek text. The foreword says, "Our translation is based on the Westcott and Hork Greek text..." The Williams Version also incorporated the dynamic equivalence method of translation: "This is not a word-for-word translation ... It is rather a translation of the thought of the writers with a reproduction of their diction and style." The more the Carters looked at this new version, the more they realized it was loaded with difficulties.

In 1952, when the Revised Standard Version came out, Carter read a book by John Stormer (*None Dare Call It Treason*) exposing the Marxist leanings of the National Council of Churches in America, the publisher of the Revised Standard Version. Stormer revealed that 30 out of the 95 RSV translators had been identified as members of communist front organizations by the FBI. Five of the RSV translators—Bowie, Cadbury, Dahl, Waterman, and James—held membership in 105 different communist front causes. Upon learning this, Carter contacted a friend at Prairie Bible Institute, knowing that they had purchased copies for distribution. He was so concerned about this matter that he visited the school and discussed it with the leadership. As a result they bought back all copies of the RSV and announced that they were not supporting it. A similar thing happened at Moody Bible Institute. They returned 1,000 copies that had been purchased for distribution.

In 1973 Carter came across David Otis Fuller' *Which Bible?* He was recuperating from an illness at the time and gave careful attention to the book. In a telephone conversation with me on March 10, 1995, Carter said he was so powerfully moved by the facts brought forth in *Which Bible?* that he dedicated himself before the Lord to help others understand these things. The chief concern that he laid before the Lord at that time had to do with his friends who supported the modern versions. What should be his attitude toward them? The passage that came into his mind as he prayed about this was Galatians chapter 2. Peter and Barnabas, in spite of the fact that they were spiritual men who were ministering in apostolic power, fell into hypocrisy and error. They had to be corrected by Paul. If it were possible for an apostle to err in such a fashion, we should not be surprised that good men today can err in various ways, including in the issue of Bible texts and versions. Carter determined not to treat such as enemies, but to seek to lead them kindly to the truth. Christian gentleness and patience were characteristics of Cecil Carter's life and ministry, and he influenced a great many. As we spoke on the phone, he told me that he was looking at an eight-foot desk literally covered with letters he had not had time to answer.

After learning about Frank Logsdon's repudiation of the modern versions (see under the chapter "1970 to Present"), Carter contacted him and requested a letter containing his testimony. Logsdon graciously consented, and his letter, dated June 9, 1977, is reproduced at the end of this book.

Cecil Carter published three books in defense of the King James Bible: *The Thinking, Theories, and Theology of Drs. Westcott and Hort*, *The Oldest and Best Manuscripts: How Good Are They,* and *What's New About the New International Version*? These were preceded by a 12-page essay, *Should Christians Trust the Revised Standard Version,* and a number of articles. His pamphlet *The New American Standard Version and the Deity of Christ* had an estimated 80,000 or more copies in print in 1994.

There were evangelical leaders that accepted the Revised Standard Version, but in general it remained strictly the darling of the liberal ecumenical world. An article that appeared in a well-known fundamentalist publication in 1956 observed that "the RSV has met the most vigorous opposition. It has not been accepted as a replacement for the King James Version as the National Council desires it to be" (*Christian Beacon*, December 13, 1956).

While we have focused on the battle against the RS in Canada, we could write at length of this same battle as it was mirrored in the United States.

E.L. BYNUM (b. 1926) pastored two churches in Texas from 1953 to 1960 and since 1961 has been pastor of the Tabernacle Baptist Church of Lubbock, Texas. He is also editor of the *Plains Baptist Challenge*. In a letter to me dated June 6, 1995, he explained the situation that existed among Bible-believing Christians at the time the Revised Standard Version was published:

> I graduated from Bible Baptist Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas, in 1952 (school founded by Louis Entzminger and J. Frank Norris). Later on in 1952 I preached my first sermon against the New Versions. The complete Revised Standard Version had just been published. Even though I was young and green, I was appalled at their perversion of the Word of God. My sermon was entitled *Seven Reasons Why I Reject the RSV*. I soon found out that the text they used was corrupt. When you add this to their liberal theology, it was evident that their Bible would be corrupt.
>
> You must understand that prior to 1952 you rarely ever heard of any other version. I remember seeing a Moffat Version as a young man, but I never heard of anyone owning one, reading one, or preaching from one. It simply was not an issue, because even the liberals used the KJV, while they corrected it and explained it away. I never heard of anyone owning or preaching out of an AS. I don't remember ever seeing it in a bookstore.
>
> Much is made by our enemies of the fact that this was not a big issue until the 50s and 60s. The reason it was not an issue, is because all Bible-believing fundamental independent Baptists used the KJV. Even the charismatics and liberals used the KJV. The KJV was about all that could be found in the bookstores. It simply was not an issue because all of these new perversions had not been dumped on us. You do not hunt lions, tigers, and elephants unless you live in an area where they are.
>
> In retrospect, of course, someone should have been raising the roof over this issue. While the saints were using the KJV, the seminaries and colleges were quietly using the Westcott-Hort text and slowly laying the groundwork for the new versions.

(See Index for more on Bynum.)

CARL MCINTIRE's *Christian Beacon*, raised a standard against the RSV.

Pastor **DAVID OTIS FULLER** of the influential Wealthy Street Baptist Church in Grand Rapids, Michigan, lifted his voice against the RSV. In his pulpit and through his many other spheres of influence Dr. Fuller thundered against this

modernistic version. An example was a sermon he preached on January 31, 1954, entitled "Cost, Calamity, and Confusion of Compromise." He charged that the Revised Standard Version was an attempt by the National Council of Churches to promote their nefarious goals. (See Index for more on Fuller.)

We could also mention **HAROLD B. SIGHTLER** of Greenville, South Carolina. In a letter to us in April 1995, he listed several Baptist leaders who stood boldly against the Revised Standard Version. (See Index for more on Sightler.)

J.G. THARPE, head of the Louisiana Baptist Seminary of Shreveport, Louisiana, told us in a letter dated April 18, 1995, "I became interested in a special way when the RSV came out. I declared war on all translations but the King James Version."

Even **CHRISTIANITY TODAY** (November 1946) jumped into the conflict, publishing "The Revised Standard Version of 1946—A Review," which exposed the modernism of the new version. This was written by **OSWALD T. ALLIS** and was about as dogmatic as *Christianity Today* ever gets: "If by a 'liberal' version is meant a version which represents a lax and 'liberal' attitude to the question of the plenary, verbal inspiration and the divine authority of Scripture, then RSV is clearly such a version." Of course, it has been a long time since *Christianity Today* cared about an attack on the infallible inspiration of Scripture.

The December 1952 issue of **MOODY MONTHLY** carried a plain indictment of the Revised Standard Version.

The **AMERICAN BOARD OF MISSION TO THE JEWS** published a booklet entitled *The Revised Standard Version—A Sad Travesty*. The author, Joseph Hoffman Cohn, contended that the rendering of Isaiah 7:1 as "young woman" was a perversion, noting that the Hebrew word "almah" certainly means virgin.

The **FELLOWSHIP OF EVANGELICAL BAPTIST CHURCHES IN CANADA**, meeting for their second annual convention in October 1954, passed a resolution condemning the Revised Standard Version in the following words:

> WHEREAS this Fellowship of Evangelical Baptist Churches in Canada has come into existence as the result of protest against modernism and modernistic affiliations;
>
> AND WHEREAS it is necessary to reaffirm our loyalty to God and His Word in the face of new dangers which arise to threaten the faith of God's people;
>
> AND WHEREAS there has come into being a new translation of the Scriptures entitled the Revised Standard Version, which has been promoted with continent -wide publicity, with the avowed purpose of replacing the King James Version now being used in most of the churches of the English speaking world;
>
> AND WHEREAS almost every scholar who helped translate this version is known to be an outstanding modernist who no longer holds to the old fundamentals and accepted foundational truths upon which the Christian Church has rested through the centuries;

AND WHEREAS this translation has the effect of undermining the authority of the Scriptures, and of casting doubt upon the eternal existence and Deity of Chris, and contains many serious additions and omissions which indicate a disregard of the verbal inspiration of the original Scriptures;

AND WHEREAS this translation is published under the authority of the modernistic National Council of Churches of Christ in America which owns the copyright and receives a royalty on the sale of each Bible;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we as messengers of the Fellowship of Evangelical Baptist Churches in Canada gathered in convention this October, 1954, at High Park Baptist Church, Toronto, place ourselves on record as rejecting the Revised Standard Version as a reliable translation.

BIBLE TRUTH PUBLISHER, Oak Park, Illinois, opposed the RSV in an article in March 1953, entitled "A Brief Examination of the New Revised Standard Version." The conclusion: "We stand by our earlier statements that the R.S.V. is untrustworthy, and strongly advise against its use, except as a reference book, and then only with great caution."

The President of the **AMERICAN COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES**, Dr. **W.W. BRECKBILL** (1907-1974), boldly opposed the Revised Standard Version as soon as it appeared.

The **TRINITARIAN BIBLE SOCIETY** opposed the Revised Standard Version in their literature. (See Index for more on the Trinitarian Bible Society.)

The **FUNDAMENTAL EVANGELISTIC ASSOCIATION** (FE) of Los Angeles, California (today based in Fresno), headed up by **MARION H. REYNOLDS, SR**., took the RS to task through its radio and literature ministries. Reynolds was one of the pioneers in Gospel radio broadcasting. The FEA was founded in 1928 by Pastor Reynolds to expose the modernism that was making great inroads into churches and denominations in that day and to stand for the Old Paths of the Word of God. Pastor Reynolds had been in the heat of the theological battles. He had resigned from the Northern Baptist Convention (now the American Baptist Church) in 1923 because of liberalism. In 1928 he was fired from the staff of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles (BIOL) after he had spoken out publicly in a 30-page pamphlet against the error and compromise being promoted by Dr. John MacInnis, the Dean of the school. Pastor Reynolds had been on the staff at BIOLA for 12 years. The same year Pastor Reynolds was fired for his stand at BIOLA, he founded the Fundamental Evangelistic Association, which has remained true to its original vision and doctrinal position for 80 years. The FEA was headed up by the founder's son, **M.H. REYNOLDS, JR**, until his death several years ago. Today the director is Reynolds' son-in-law **DENNIS COSTELL**. For many years the FEA published a paper called the *FEA News & View*. Over 20 years ago this was incorporated into the respected and influential bi-monthly magazine, *Foundation: A Magazine of Biblical Fundamentalism*. The Fundamental Evangelistic Association is noted for its careful scholarship and its

boldness to defend the Word of God against every enemy. Its reports are not based on hearsay or second-hand information, but upon eye-witness reporting and diligent, firsthand research.

Through the long years of its existence, the FEA has stood unequivocally for the King James Bible and in opposition to the modern versions. In 1951 M.H. Reynolds, Sr., warned, "Religious leaders are trying to put over a 'New Bible' (Revised Standard Version) and replace the old message of calling sinners to repentance with a new concept of God as the Father of all and all men as brothers" (*Foundation*, January-March 1988, p. 24). The FEA has never ceased to warn of the "new Bibles" in the years since then. Following are some of the articles on this subject that have appeared in the FEA magazine:

"De-sexing the Bible: Steps toward a Uni-sex Theology"—*Foundation,* January-February 1981
"The Reader's Diges Bible: Penknifing God's Holy Word"—*Foundation,* September-October 1982
"Hypocrisy and Deception in New King James Versio Advertising"—*Foundation*, October-December 1988
"The New King James Bible Examined"—*Foundation,* June-August 1991
"Modern Bible Versions Are Dangerous"—*Foundation*, November-December 1991
"Modern Bibles—the Dark Secret"—*Foundation*, September-October 1992

Beginning in 1972, the leaders of the FEA helped organize the annual **Fundamental Bible Conference of North America**. These conferences promoted biblical fundamentalism, and one of the keynotes was the defense of the Authorized Version. The 8th annual conference, for example, held July 13-18, 1980, in Boston, Massachusetts, included a message entitled "Is the King James Version the Inspired Word of God?" The official proclamation which was issued at the 16th annual conference, held in Halifax, Nova Scotia, July 10-15, 1988, included these words:

> The rapidly continuing production and sale of modern polluted Bible versions, translations and paraphrases should be a matter of great concern to every true believer. Instead, enticed by multi-million dollar advertising campaigns launched by publishers of various translations; and deceived by the recommendations of so many pastors, Radio and T.V. broadcasters and so-called 'scholars,' more polluted Bibles are now in circulation than ever before in history. At the same time, increasing attacks are being made upon the accuracy and reliability of the Authorized King James Version of 1611.
>
> We, therefore, reaffirm without equivocation or reservation our complete confidence in the Authorized King James Version of 1611 as the pure, Divinely preserved Word of God and we repeat our warnings against ALL the modern versions including the NEW KING JAMES, the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD, and the NEW INTERNATIONAL Bibles which are used and recommended by many prominent evangelical and fundamental leaders.
>
> Furthermore, we are concerned about the large number of pastors and leaders who say 'they are for the old KJV' but who will not inform their listeners or members concerning the dangers of the new versions. We call upon all who truly

love the pure Word of God not only to use and defend it, but to expose the impurities of all the modern Bibles (*Foundation*, April-June 1988, pp. 8,,9).

In 1952 **BEN D. JOHNSON** (c. 1885-1968), pastor of the Tabernacle Baptist Church, Lubbock, Texas, published a 40-page booklet exposing the apostasy of the Revised Standard Version. The title, *Modern Infidelity and a Mutilated Bible,* leaves no doubt as to Johnson's position. Johnson exposed the modernism and communistic leanings of the National Council of Churches. He also noted the serious omissions in the text of the RSV, including 44 entire verses either removed entirely or questioned by footnotes.

There is much evidence to prove the evil influence of the new Revised Standard Version of the Bible. Any one of these issues should be enough to cause true Christians to rise in alarm, and a real Bible-believing preacher to stand in protest against the new Bible (p. 4).

Satan is the great deceiver. He often deceives men in the most unrecognizable fashions. He tempted Eve through the serpent. He tempted Job through his wife. He tempted Christ through the Apostle Peter. Now, he tempts by the changing of the scriptures. Yet, some preachers and churches will put their approval on such a corrupt organization and support their 'Bible' (p. 8).

Back in 1933, the United States Naval Intelligence reported that the Federal Council of Churches (this is the outfit that put out the new translation—things got so hot for them that they changed their name in 1950) was subversive and was one of the strongest of the organizations 'while not openly advocating the "force and violence" principles of the Communist Party give aid and comfort to the communist movement and party ... It is a large, radical, pacifist organization ... its leadership consists of a small radical group which dictates its policies. It is always extremely active in any matters against national defense' (pp. 10, 11).

Ladies and Gentlemen, once again I repeat that such a crowd does not possess the fundamentals of honesty and virtue required to give a good translation of the Sacred Scriptures (p. 16).

But I am not finished! My charge at the start ... was that the leaders of this Council publishing the Revised Standard Version of the Bible were men whose positions were both communistic and infidelistic. I have given abundant proof of the former, now just a word about the latter. ... An infidel is simply one who does not believe what the Bible teaches. **My charge is that the men high in the leadership of the National Council do not believe the basic doctrines of the Bible which Christians of all ages have held dear to their hearts**.

Dr. George A. Buttrick, a former president of the Council, wrote about the Bible in one of his books: 'Literal infallibility of Scriptures is a fortress impossible to defend ... That avowal held to its last logic would risk a trip to the insane asylum.' Dear Friend, do you honestly think that a council which would place a man who believed like that about the Bible to its highest office, would be a qualified group to give an honest, accurate translation of the Scriptures?

> The fundamental, basic doctrine of all the Bible is that Christ died in the place of sinners to obtain their salvation. Yet Harry Emerson Fosdick, who for many, many years was the official radio voice of the Council, wrote in a letter recently, 'Of course, I do not believe in the Virgin Birth, or in that old fashioned substitutionary doctrine of the atonement.' And in a radio address he stated, '... the theology of our forefathers is an insult to our intellect.'...
>
> Right along this line, another past president of the Council, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, wrote, 'God for us cannot be ... an ... avenging Being who because of Adam's sin must have his Shylockian pound of flesh. No wonder the honest boy in justifiable repugnance could say, "dirty bully."' Once again I ask if you think that a Council which would elect men to their highest office who call the Jehovah of the Old Testament a 'dirty bully,' is a council qualified to give the English reading public a new translation of the Word of God? Frankly, I do not! ...
>
> One of their former presidents, Bishop Francis J. McConnell ... stated, 'Back in the early ages of the Church there were some thinkers ... who taught that Satan had a claim on the souls of men which only the death of the Son of God could satisfy and that God met the obligation by sending the Son to the Cross. As an intellectual construction, this theory arouses only an amused pity today.'
>
> A magazine co-edited by Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen [long a prominent figure in the Council] declared, 'The god of the earlier books of the Bible is a creature in a perpetual rage, with not even an elemental sense of justice.'
>
> Even an atheist has sense enough to know that the ship of Christianity will sink if the fundamental doctrines of the Scriptures are tossed overboard. So again I repeat my charge that the very ones who are throwing these precious truths out the window in infidelity are not capable, nor qualified to translate honestly the Word of God (pp. 16-18).
>
> All the footnotes you find in the new Revised Bible indicate the fact that these men did not believe they belonged in the Bible, so they left them out. **Everywhere you find them leaving them out and placing them at the bottom of the page in a footnote they are denying the Bible truth as we have believed it through the years, and if a part is not to be in the Bible, what part would be left for us to believe. It is all inspired of God or we would have to be inspired of God to know what part was not inspired. SO WE MUST LEAVE IT ALONE, AND ACCEPT IT TO BE THE VERBALLY INSPIRED WORD OF GOD OR REJECT IT ALL. AS FOR ME, I WILL TAKE IT AS IT IS IN THE KING JAMES VERSION** (Ben Johnson, *Modern Infidelity and a Mutilated Bible*, p. 26).

In 1953 **JAMES MCGINLEY**, pastor of the Baptist Temple of Brooklyn, New York, preached a powerful message in the pulpit of Highland Park Baptist Church, Chattanooga, Tennessee, on the subject "the R.S.V. Bible and the N.C.C." Dr. Lee Roberson was present on the platform during this service. Pastor McGinley, in his distinctive British diction, gave the ugly details of the modernism and the communist-affiliation of the translators of the Revised Standard Version. Consider an excerpt:

> Now I'm going to sit in judgment upon these fellows [the RSV translators] tonight. Some of you folk will say, 'Judge not that ye be not judged.' Well, I have a verse for myself. 'But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ' (1 Cor. 2:15,16). We who are born again and have the Spirit of God living within us are given the power of discernment, while unregenerate men who know not the Holy Spirit of God, they know nothing about the things of God. **Therefore, it is an insult to God Himself for a born again believer to sit at the feet of unregenerate men and to have them interpret for us the things of the Lord.**
>
> Dr. Weigle, chairman of the RSV committee, stated that 'we will use the words THOU and THEE and THINE only when deity is addressed.' ... As far as I am concerned, this new version is not a translation; it is an interpretation; and these men do not believe that Jesus Christ is God. And if there is a National Council preacher here tonight, or a college professor here tonight, I challenge you to come to this platform now with your new Revised Standard Version and stand up under what I am going to say from Dr. Weigle's own statement. **The new translation cuts the heart out of Christianity, and the heart of Christianity is the deity of Jesus Chris the Lord.** ... The thing I respect is their consistency. If they are going to bring about a world religion, they will have to do away with the deity of Jesus, His virgin birth, His blood atonement, His bodily resurrection, and look upon Him as a great man, a wonderful example, a great teacher, like all the rest. Dr. Weigle said that when they were addressing deity, they will use the words THEE or THOU or THINE. Now, will you find one Thee, one Thou, or one Thine in the new translation when Jesus Christ is being addressed? Will you? Just one? Listen, in Matthew 9:18, when the ruler came to Christ and asked Him to heal his daughter, the RSV says, 'My daughter has just died; but come and lay YOUR hand on her, and she will live.' You expect us to believe that this man believed that Jesus could raise his daughter from the dead but that he did not recognize the deity of Christ? Do you believe that? Listen to this: In Matthew 14:28, when Jesus came to the disciples walking on the water, Peter said, 'Lord, if it is you, bid me come to YOU on the water.' The RSV translators would have us believe that Peter did not recognize Christ's deity, though he believed He could enable him to walk on the water! Hear Dr. Weigle again: 'We will use THEE, THOU, and THINE when deity is addressed.' Now listen, men and women: These men do not believe in the deity of Jesus Christ the Lord. And do you think they are going to give us a Bible that propagates the opposite from what they believe? No!

This was similar to the critique of the RSV which was sounding forth from pulpits and on the airwaves across the land, and a great many other fundamentalist men, churches, and publications could be listed in the battle against the Revised Standard Version.

"King James Onlyism" Is Not a Man-Made Delusion but Is Zeal for God's Word

We must emphasize that "King James Onlyism," as it is scornfully labeled by its detractors, is not the product of any one man's thinking, whether it be Burgon or

Ray or Hill or Fuller, but is the working of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men who are zealous for the purity of God's Word. This explains the title of our book*: FOR LOVE OF THE BIBLE*. We see this in the lives of each of the men we have mentioned. Before Mark Buch came into contact with Aberhart, he was zealous for the precise words of God and was praying about why there were different versions and what his position on this should be. Did God allow the devil to answer this zealous young Christian's prayer? We think not! Consider the fruit of Buch's position on Bible versions. For 70 years he enjoyed perfect confidence in his Bible and encouraged others in the same confidence. To say this is evil or dangerous is to turn truth on its ears. Likewise, before D.O. Fuller began to come into contact with the writings of John Burgon and others he was exceedingly bold for the purity of Holy Scripture. In the early 1950s he was already preaching sermons in defense of the KJV and in opposition to the RS. His heartbeat toward the holy Word of God is seen in a message he preached on Bible Versions:

> If I can, through this brief presentation, cause you, and myself also, *to have more reverence and devotion and faith in and awe and jealousy for this Blessed Book, God's true Word*, I will not have come and spoken in vain. I am getting sick and tired and fed up to HERE with the way God's Word is being kicked around like a football, and I refuse to keep silent (D.O. Fuller, *A Position Paper on the Versions of the Bible*, nd.).

In regard to John Burgon himself, the thing that impressed me the most about his writings when I first began reading *Revision Revised* was his lovely zeal for God's Holy Word. Consider:

> ... we begrudge no amount of labour, reckoning a long summer's day well spent if it has enabled us to ascertain the truth concerning one single controverted word of Scripture.

Burgon's biographer, Edward M. Goulburn, spoke of "that profound veneration for the Word of God which formed the chief feature both of his spiritual character and his teaching." Goulburn chose his words well. It is one thing to venerate the Word of God; it is another thing to *profoundly* venerate it. Goulburn quotes the following testimony that appeared in the *Record* newspaper of August 17, 1888: "From first to last, all my reminiscences of Dean Burgon are bound up with the Bible, treated as few teachers of divinity now appear to regard it, as God's Word written; 'absolute, faultless, unerring, supreme.'"

In researching this subject, I have found that this intense love for the Word of God and zeal to stand in defense of its purity is the hallmark of the defenders of the Greek Received Text and the English King James Bible and translations of the TR in other languages. The Psalmist cried, "O how love I thy law! It is my meditation all the day" (Psalm 119:97). I have found this to be the heartbeat of those who defend the KJV. If this is evil, there is no such thing as good. The Psalmist also cried, "I am a companion of all them that fear thee, and of them that keep thy precepts" (Psalm 119:63). There are those, perhaps, who use the KJV position for

their own self-interests. There are those who seem to delight in bitter wrangling. But as a rule—and I have wide experience in this matter—KJV defenders are great lovers of God's Word. They fear God and keep His precepts, and I am happy to be a companion of them.

The Corrupting Tide of New Evangelicalism

It is important to note that New Evangelicalism had only recently arrived on the scene when the RS was published. It can be demonstrated that New Evangelical compromise has paved the way for today's wholesale acceptance of the modern versions in the evangelical world. Already in 1952 Billy Graham, New Evangelicalism's foremost popularizer, accepted a copy of the RSV and told a crowd of 20,000 people: "These scholars have probably given us the most nearly perfect translation in English. While there may be room for disagreement in certain areas of the translation, yet this new version should supplement the King James Version and make Bible reading a habit throughout America" (cited by Perry Rockwood*, God's Inspired Preserved Bible*, nd., p. 15).

Graham's endorsement of the Revised Standard Version foreshadowed evangelicalism's capitulation to the endless stream of modern versions. Graham has endorsed practically every new version to appear on the scene, no matter how flippant and unfaithful, including the Living Bible (which he almost single-handedly rescued from oblivion), J.B. Phillips' New Testament (Phillips, *The Price of Success: An Autobiography*, p. 116), and the blasphemous *Good News for Modern Man* which replaces the word "blood" with "death" in speaking of the atonement of Jesus Christ.

As New Evangelicalism has leavened the entire evangelical world over the past fifty years, the modern versions have increased in popularity. Many seem confused by the fact that most evangelical leaders today give wholehearted endorsement to the critical Greek text as well as to the versions based upon them. "How could all of these men be wrong?" they muse. The answer, which many find difficult to accept but which is based upon historical reality, lies in the fact that New Evangelicalism is a form of apostasy. It is founded upon a willful repudiation of many of the negative aspects of biblical Christianity.

The term "New Evangelicalism" was coined by the late Harold Ockenga (1905-1985) to define a new type of evangelicalism and to distinguish it from those who had theretofore born that label. Ockenga has had a phenomenal influence upon today's Evangelicalism. He was the founder of the National Association of Evangelicals, co-founder and one-time president of Fuller Theological Seminary, first president of the World Evangelical Fellowship, a director of the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, and chairman of the board and one-time editor of *Christianity Today*. In the foreword to Dr. Harold Lindsell's book *The Battle for the Bible*, Ockenga stated the position of New Evangelicalism:

> Neo-evangelicalism was born in 1948 in connection with a convocation address which I gave in the Civic Auditorium in Pasadena. While reaffirming the theological view of fundamentalism, this address repudiated its ecclesiology and its social theory. The ringing call for **A REPUDIATION OF SEPARATISM** and the summons to social involvement received a hearty response from many Evangelicals. It differed from fundamentalism in its repudiation of separatism and its determination to engage itself in the theological dialogue of the day. It had a new emphasis upon the application of the gospel to the sociological, political, and economic areas of life.

Ockenga and the new generation of evangelicals, Billy Graham figuring most prominently, determined to abandon a militant Bible stance. We don't believe New Evangelicalism was born with Ockenga's 1948 address. Ockenga merely verbalized a position of neutrality that already existed in the hearts of many evangelicals of that generation.

Ockenga contended that evangelicals should practice infiltration rather than separation, meaning they should stay in the apostate denominations and organizations and try to change them from within rather than separate from them and serve God in pure churches. He contended that evangelicals should practice dialogue rather than exhortation, that they should not be negative in their message by rebuking error and warning of false teachers publicly and specifically, but should attempt to engage false teachers in dialogue. He taught that evangelicals should reexamine their doctrine of worldliness and not be as strict about separating from worldly evils as Bible-believing Christians had been in earlier days.

Ockenga thought that evangelicals should consider the possibility that modern science was right in some areas in which it disagreed with the Bible. The prime example of this was in the origin of the world. He hoped that there could be a synthesis between modern science and the Bible.

Ockenga also believed that Christians should aim to meet modernists and the men of the world on their own scholastic level and contended that Christian leaders should be as well educated in the social sciences and liberal arts as unregenerate scholars and as well-versed in Bible criticism as the modernists. The idea was that the Christian leader should seek to influence men through human wisdom and scholarship rather than purely though the power of the Holy Spirit and the preaching of the Word of God as we see in the ministries of the apostles.

God says, "Walk ye in the old paths," but the New Evangelical reassesses the old paths. God says, "Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set" but the New Evangelical has removed them one by one. God says, "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness," but the New Evangelical reasons that such fellowship is necessary. God says, "A little leaven leaventh the whole lump," but the New Evangelical thinks he can reform the already leavened lump. God says "evil communications corrupt good manners," but the New Evangelical thinks good manners can uplift evil communications. God says, "I

resist the proud but give grace to the humble," but the New Evangelical thinks the way to reach the world is by meeting them on their own proud turf, matching them scholarly degree with degree, even though the degrees must be obtained at the feet of unbelievers.

The Bible warns that a little leaven leavens the whole lump. This is why God requires that His people separate from error. If they do not, they will be devoured by the error. Since 1945 the fearful consequences of apostasy have become evident throughout the evangelical world.

Evangelicalism's apostasy is seen in its cozy relationship with Roman Catholicism. Most popular evangelical men and organizations have strong sympathies toward the Roman Catholic Church. Endless examples could be given of this. In the book *Evangelicals and Rome* we document this amazing and fearful thing. The 1994 statement "Evangelicals & Catholics Together," which was signed by many well-known Evangelicals, called for an even closer relationship between Evangelicals and Catholics. Evangelical publishers are busy putting out books sympathetic to Rome and calling for ecumenical relationships. As early as 1971 Fleming H. Revell published *A Prejudiced Protestant Takes a New Look at the Catholic Church* by James Hefley. Eerdman's *Handbook to the History of Christianity*, which appeared in 1977, used two Roman Catholic historians as contributing editors. It is no wonder that Rome's butchery of Bible believers receives small thrift in this evangelical publication, while Pope John Paul XXIII is praised as having "a deep but traditional piety"! In 1979 Tyndale House Publishers came out with *Three Sisters* by Michael Harper. This book called for ecumenical unity between evangelicals, charismatics, and Roman Catholics. The author stated, "It is my own conviction that a growing unity between the three forces in the Christian world is both desirable and possible" (p. 41). In 1985 InterVarsity Press stirred the ecumenical waters with *A Tale of Two Churches* by George Carey (who later became the Archbishop of Canterbury). Carey called for the "eventual reunion of the two streams [Protestantism and Romanism] of Western Christendom." The foreword to this book, subtitled *Can Protestants & Catholics Get Together*, was written by J.I. Packer. In 1990 Thomas Nelson published *Evangelical Catholics: A Call for Christian Cooperation to Penetrate the Darkness with the Light of the Gospel* by Keith Fournier, a Roman Catholic. In 1994 InterVarsity Press came out with the *Handbook of Christian Apologetics* by two Roman Catholic authors, Peter Kreeft and Ronald Tacelli. The latter is a Jesuit priest and a professor at Boston College. Moody Press joined its voice in this theme in 1994 by publishing *Roman Catholicism: Evangelical Protestants Analyze What Divides and Unites Us*. Not to be outdone, that same year the Navigators' NavPress published *House United? Evangelicals and Catholics Together: A Winning Alliance for the 21st Century*. The authors are Roman Catholic Keith Fournier and evangelical William Watkins (a graduate of Dallas Theological Seminary).

Most of these books acknowledge that there is doctrinal error in the Roman

Catholic Church, but all of them speak of Rome's heresies in gentle, "understanding" tones rather than labeling them the heretical blasphemies they really are. Let me give an example. *In Roman Catholicism: Evangelical Protestants Analyze What Divides and Unites Us*, John Armstrong says, "For centuries the magisterium had insisted that there was no salvation outside the church ... which meant, of course, the Roman Catholic Church. This sometimes caused *a decidedly uncharitable response* to Protestant evangelicals, who were considered lost outside of Rome and her sacramental system" (emphasis added). To describe Rome's fearful, bloody, centuries-old persecution of Bible-believing Christians as "decidedly uncharitable" is insanity. Many of today's evangelicals want to believe that Rome's official doctrinal position is not the real position of the so-called evangelical Catholic today. All of these books call upon evangelicals to lay aside the age-old divisions and to work hand-in-hand with Rome in social, religious, and political causes. The cover jacket for *House United* quotes Pentecostal Vinson Synan's recommendation of the book: "Keith Fournier is truly a twentieth-century apostle of unity for the Body of Christ." This unscriptural unity in the so-called Body of Christ is one of the apostate keynotes of late twentieth-century evangelicalism.

Evangelicalism's apostasy is also seen in its attitude toward the Bible. The downgrade of the doctrine of biblical inspiration has been documented by evangelical leaders themselves. Dr. Harold Lindsell, former Vice-President of Fuller Theological Seminary and Editor Emeritus of *Christianity Today*, published two volumes on the downgrade of the Bible within evangelicalism, with particular focus on Fuller Seminary, the Southern Baptist Convention, and the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. Lindsell's *The Battle for the Bible* was first published in 1976. The sequel, *The Bible in the Balance*, came out in 1979. This careful exposé by a man who has been in the inner circle of evangelicalism's leadership for many decades leaves no doubt about the fact that the evangelical world of the last half of the twentieth century is leavened with apostasy.

In 1984 well-known evangelical leader Francis Schaeffer published *The Great Evangelical Disaster*. The book's title leaves no doubt about its thesis. The cover jacket says, "In this explosive new book Dr. Francis Schaeffer exposes the rise of compromise and accommodation, and the tragic consequences of this, within the evangelical church." The issue that Schaeffer called "the watershed of evangelicalism" is the inspiration and authority of the Bible. He testified, "Within evangelicalism there are a growing number who are modifying their views on the inerrancy of the Bible so that the full authority of Scripture is completely undercut" (*The Great Evangelical Disaster*, p. 44).

A more recent exposure of the corruption of doctrine in the evangelical world is found in *No Place for Truth: or Whatever Happened to Evangelical Theology?* by David F. Wells, professor at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. *Time*

magazine described Well's book as "a stinging indictment of evangelicalism's theological corruption." Though Wells is himself a committed New Evangelical, he properly identifies evangelicalism's chief problem as its repudiation of biblical separation and its accommodation with the world: "Fundamentalism always had an air of embattlement about it, of being an island in a sea of unremitting hostility. Evangelicalism has reacted against this sense of psychological isolation. *It has lowered the barricades. It is open to the world*. The great sin of fundamentalism is to compromise; the great sin in evangelicalism is to be narrow" (emphasis added) (David Wells, *No Place for Truth*, p. 129). Wells also made the following telling statement which acknowledges precisely where New Evangelicalism is today:

> But in between these far shores [Anglo-Catholicism and fundamentalism] lie the choppy waters that most evangelicals now ply with their boats, and **here the winds of modernity blow with disconcerting force, fragmenting what it means to be evangelical**. This is because evangelicals have allowed their confessional center to dissipate (p. 128).

I believe a clear case can be established connecting evangelicalism's apostasy with its acceptance of the critical Greek text and the modern versions. The fundamentalist who defends the modern versions joins hands with modernists and New Evangelicals, because this has long been their position and they are the ones doing the vast majority of the "scholarly" writing on this subject.

Pastor Mark Buch of Vancouver, British Columbia, who was involved in the fundamentalist movement since the 1930s, gives the following testimony to the fact that evangelicalism has become corrupted: "[Evangelicalism] today has fallen away from the old faith and this is not the case of an exception among them, it is common and general. They no longer believe in the veracity, the verbal inspiration of the Holy Bible and they have gone a whoring after all sorts of innovations and foolishness in order to fill their churches..." (*In Defence of the Authorized Version*, 1977, p. 33).

Consider this summary of the downgrade of the doctrine of inspiration by today's evangelical leaders:

> **My main concern is with those who profess to believe that the Bible is the Word of God and yet by, what I can only call surreptitious and devious means, deny it. This is, surprisingly enough, a position that is taken widely in the evangelical world. Almost all of the literature which is produced in the evangelical world today falls into this category**. In the October 1985 issue of *Christianity Today*, (the very popular and probably most influential voice of evangelicals in America), a symposium on Bible criticism was featured. The articles were written by scholars from several evangelical seminaries. **Not one of the participants in that symposium in *Christianity Today* was prepared to reject higher criticism**. **All came to its defense**. **IT BECAME EVIDENT THAT ALL THE SCHOLARS FROM THE LEADING SEMINARIES IN THIS COUNTRY HELD TO A FORM OF HIGHER CRITICISM**.

> These men claim to believe that the Bible is the Word of God. At the same time they adopt higher critical methods in the explanation of the Scriptures. **This has become so common in evangelical circles that IT IS ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO FIND AN EVANGELICAL PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS OF OUR LAND AND ABROAD WHO STILL HOLDS UNCOMPROMISINGLY TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE INFALLIBLE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES**. **The insidious danger is that higher criticism is promoted by those who claim to believe in infallible inspiration** (Herman Hanko, *The Battle for the Bible*, pp. 2, 3). [Editor: Hanko's book should not be confused with Harold Lindsell's book by that same name.]

The author of the above critique is Professor of Church History and New Testament, Protestant Reformed Seminary, Grandville, Michigan.

Remember these sad facts the next time your hear something about how "thoroughly evangelical" certain modern Bible translators are. Today's evangelicals are polluted with the modernism from which they have refused to separate. A little leaven has indeed leavened the whole lump.

Evangelicalism's apostasy is not only seen in its relationship with Rom and its downgrade of biblical inspiration, it ***is also seen in its repudiation of biblical holiness***. The old evangelicalism was staunchly and boldly opposed to worldliness. The New Evangelical crowd rejected this. The result has been incredible to behold. R-rated and PG-13 movies are reviewed in evangelical publications. Evangelical music groups look and sound exactly like the world. Evangelical Bible college campuses typically have the look and feel of secular colleges. The students wear the same immodest fashions as the world; they drink the same liquor; they dance to the same music; they celebrate the same worldly events; they sympathize with the same politically-correct, pacifistic-feminized-environmentally-sensitive philosophies. Richard Quebedeaux documented this in his 1978 book *The Worldly Evangelicals*. Francis Schaeffer also described it in *The Great Evangelical Disaster*:

> How the mindset of accommodation grows and expands. The last sixty years have given birth to a moral disaster, and what have we done? Sadly we must say that the evangelical world has been part of the disaster. ... **With tears we must say that ... a large segment of the evangelical world has become seduced by the world spirit of this present age** (Schaeffer, p. 141).

Let us return to our subject. We are discussing the fact that most evangelical leaders endorse the critical text and reject the Received Text and the King James Bible. Consider a statement by James Boice, who headed up the Evangelical Council on Biblical Inerrancy:

> I might add that the issue has come before the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy on several occasions and that every one of these men see the value of the newer texts in translations and are not defenders of the King James Version as the only text. Every man on this council is committed to inerrancy. Some PREFER the King James Version and use it, for various reasons. But not

> one defends it or the textus receptus as the true and only valid text. ... Let me say personally that the English text that I work from most often is the New International Version. IT IS NOT PERFECT, but it is a very good text and may well win a place in the contemporary church similar to the place held by the King James Version for so long. ... I must say, although I do not always agree with the NIV, that GENERALLY it does a better job of translating the Greek text than the King James does (James Boice, Sept. 13, 1985, letter to Dr. Tom Hale).

This is the situation among evangelical leaders today in regard to Bible texts and versions. They believe in a "concept Bible." The inspired Word of God is not to be found in one place, but it is scattered throughout the texts and versions. What are we to say to this? I say that in light of the carnal, apostate condition of evangelicalism, it is not surprising that its leaders and institutions cannot see the truth about Bible versions. A man who thinks the pope is a great evangelist (as Billy Graham does) or that Karl Barth was a great Christian (as many of today's evangelical leaders do) could not be trusted to give sound advice about Bible versions or any other spiritual matter. Men who are unwilling to proclaim Romanism an abomination or who hesitate to label the historic-critical views of Scripture as wicked heresy simply cannot be trusted.

As we noted in the introduction, the pure Gospel and the pure Bible have always been held by the minority, the remnant. In light of the prophecies of the New Testament that foresee the apostasy of the visible "church," I do not find it strange that the pure Bible is rejected by the majority of those who profess to be Christians today (e.g., 2 Timothy 3:13; 4:3-4).

Other Men Who Stood for the AV Prior to 1970

Now we continue our survey of men who stood for the Traditional Text and the King James Bible in the period 1950-1970. The following men are included in this chapter not because they figured prominently in the battle against the RSV, but because they were writing in defense of the King James Bible and in opposition to modern versions in general *prior to 1970,* which is the subject of this chapter.

EDWARD FREER HILLS (1912-81)

Edward Freer Hills (1912-1981) was a respected Presbyterian scholar. He was a distinguished Latin and Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Yale University. He earned the Th.B. degree from Westminster Theological Seminary and the Th.M. degree from Columbia Theological Seminary. After doing doctoral work at the University of Chicago in New Testament textual criticism, he completed the program at Harvard, earning the Th.D. in this field. Though largely ignored by professional textual critics and translators, Hills has encouraged thousands of pastors, evangelists, missionaries, and Bible teachers by his defense of the Received Text and his exposure of the unbelief of modern textual criticism. In 1956 he published

The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscripts. The following were some of the chapter titles:

"A Short History of Unbelief"
"A Christian View of the Biblical Text"
"The Facts of New Testament Textual Criticism"
"Dean Burgon and the Traditional New Testament Text"
"The Textus Receptus and the King James Version"

Hills refuted the Westcott-Text theories and exposed the rationalistic foundation of the entire modern version superstructure.

Following is Hills testimony about how he came to a "faith position" on the text-translation issue:

> I have been interested in the problem of New Testament textual criticism since my high school days in the 1920's. At that time I began to read the commentaries of Charles Hodge, books that were a part of my Presbyterian heritage. I noticed that Hodge would sometimes mention variant readings, most however, just to show that he was knowledgeable, for he rarely departed from 'the common text' (Textus Receptus) and 'our English version' (King James). Even so my curiosity was roused, so that in 1931, when I was a sophomore at Yale University I took down C.R. Gregory's *Canon and Text of the NT* from a library shelf and began to read. I was dismayed at the large number of verses that, according to Gregory and his teachers Westcott and Hort, must be rejected from the Word of God. Nor was I much conformed by Gregory's assurance that the necessary damage had been done and the rest of the text had been placed on an unassailable basis. How could I be sure of this? It seemed to me that the only way to gain assurance on this point was to go to Westminster Seminary and study the question under the tutelage of Dr. Machen, who preached in New Haven rather frequently in those days, talking to Yale students at least twice.
>
> When I began to study New Testament textual criticism at Westminster (under Dr. Stonehouse) I found that the first day or so was mainly devoted to praising Dr. B.B. Warfield. He was lauded for being among the first to recognize the 'epoch making' importance of the theory of Westcott and Hort and for establishing the Westcott and Hort tradition at Princeton Seminary, a tradition which was now being faithfully perpetuated at Westminster Seminary. To me, however, all this was very puzzling. Dr. Warfield was a renowned defender of the Reformed faith and of the Westminster Confession, yet in the department of New Testament textual criticism he agreed entirely with liberals such as Westcott, Hort and C.R. Gregory. He professed to agree with the statement of the Westminster Confession that the Scriptures by God's 'singular care and providence' had been 'kept pure in all ages', but it was obvious that this providential preservation of the Scripture was of no importance to Dr. Warfield when he actually began to deal with the problems of the New Testament. When he engaged in New Testament textual criticism, Dr. Warfield ignored the providential preservation of the Scriptures and treated the text of the New Testament as he would the text of any book or writing. 'It matters not whether the writing before us be a letter from a friend, or an inscription from Carchemish, or a copy of a morning newspaper, or Shakespeare, or Homer, or the Bible.'

I may be reading back into my student days some of my later thinking, but it seems to me that even at that time I could see that the logic of Warfield's naturalistic New Testament textual criticism led steadily downward toward modernism and unbelief. For if the providential preservation of the Scriptures was not important for the study of the New Testament text, then it could not have been important for the history of the New Testament text. And if it had not been important for the history of the New Testament, then it must have been non-existent. It could not have been a fact. And if the providential preservation of the Scriptures was not a fact, why should the infallible inspiration of the Scriptures be regarded as a fact? Why would God infallibly inspire a book and then decline to preserve it providentially? For example, why would God infallibly inspire the Gospel of Mark and then permit (as Warfield thought possible) the ending of it (describing the resurrection appearances of Christ) to be lost?

Why was Dr. Warfield so inconsistent in the realm of New Testament textual criticism? Dr. Van Til's course in apologetics enabled me to supply the answer to this question. Dr. Warfield's inconsistency was part of his scholastic inheritance, an error which had been handed down to him from the middle-ages. Let me explain. During the middle-ages the school men tried to reconcile the philosophy of Aristotle with the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church by separating faith from reason and praying from thinking. While dealing with dogma, faith and prayer were appropriate, but the study of philosophy was reason's province. So the medieval school men contended, and soon this doctrine of the separation of faith from reason became generally accepted throughout the medieval Roman Catholic Church.

The Protestant Reformers were fully occupied with other matters. Hence they spent but little time combating this medieval, Roman Catholic error of the separation of faith and reason. Hence this false scholastic doctrine survived the Reformation and soon became embedded in the thinking of conservative Protestants everywhere. In the 18th century Butler and Paley built their apologetic systems on this false principle of the separation of faith and reason, and in the 19th century, at Princeton and other conservative theological seminaries, this scholastic principle even governed the curriculum and the way in which the several subjects were taught. Systematic theology, practical theology and homiletics were placed in one box labeled FAITH. All the other subjects, including New Testament textual criticism, biblical introduction, apologetics and philosophy, were placed in another box labeled REASON.

We see now why Dr. Warfield was so inconsistent. We see why he felt himself at liberty to adopt the naturalistic theories of Westcott and Hort and did not perceive that in so doing he was contradicting the Westminster Confession and even his own teaching in the realm of systematic theology. The reason was that Dr. Warfield kept these subjects in separate boxes. Like an authentic, medieval scholastic, he kept his systematic theology and the Westminster Confession in his FAITH box and his New Testament textual criticism in his REASON box. Since he never tried to mingle the contents of these two boxes, he was never fully aware of the discrepancies in his thinking.

When I began to study New Testament textual criticism at Westminster in 1935, I noticed another thing. Almost as much time was spent in disparaging Dean Burgon as in praising Dr. Warfield. This again aroused my curiosity. Who was

this Dean Burgon? Upon investigation, I found that he had been a British scholar that had not fitted into the usual scholastic mold. He had not kept his theology and his New Testament textual criticism in two separate boxes, but had actually dared to make his theology the guiding principle of his New Testament textual criticism. For this he was pronounced 'unscholarly.'

Actually, however, he was merely following the logic of faith. He believed that the New Testament was the infallibly inspired Word of God. Hence it had been preserved down through the ages by God's special providence, not secretly in holes and caves and on forgotten library shelves but publicly in the usage of God's Church. Hence the text found in the vast majority of the New Testament manuscripts is the true text because this is the text that has been used by God's Church. As soon as I began to read Burgon's works, I was impressed by this logic of faith and also by the learned arguments by which Burgon refuted the contention of Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott, Hort, etc. Finally, after some years of hesitation, I definitely committed myself to his view in 1952.

Hills understood the issue of authority in the field of Bible texts and versions:

In regard to Bible versions many contemporary Christians are behaving like spoiled and rebellious children. They want a Bible version that pleases them no matter whether it pleases God or not. 'We want a Bible version in our own idiom,' they clamor. 'We want a Bible that talks to us in the same way in which we talk to our friends over the telephone. We want an informal God, no better educated than ourselves, with a limited vocabulary and a taste for modern slang.' And having thus registered their preference, they go their several ways. Some of them unite with the modernists in using the R.S.V or the N.E.B. Others deem the N.A.S.V or the N.I.V more 'evangelical.' Still others opt for the T.E.V. or the Living Bible.

But God is bigger than you are, dear friend, and **THE BIBLE VERSION WHICH YOU MUST USE IS NOT A MATTER FOR YOU TO DECIDE ACCORDING TO YOUR WHIMS AND PREJUDICES. IT HAS ALREADY BEEN DECIDED FOR YOU BY THE WORKINGS OF GOD'S SPECIAL PROVIDENCE**. ... Put on the spiritual mind that leads to life and peace! Receive by faith the True Text of God's holy Word, which has been preserved down through the ages by His special providence and now is found in the Masoretic Hebrew text, the Greek Textus Receptus, and the King James Version and other faithful translations! (*The King James Version Defended*, pp. 242, 43).

Was Hills some kind of crackpot? Of course not. Even those who disagree with his position admit that he was a conscientious scholar. Hills saw more in the history of Bible transmission than mere men bumbling around with the text; he saw the hand of God on the Bible through the ages. He understood the rationalism that underlies the modern versions:

Has the text of the New Testament, like those of other ancient books, been damaged during its voyage over the seas of time? Ought the same methods of textual criticism to be applied to it that are applied to the texts of other ancient books? These are questions which the following pages will endeavor to answer. An earnest effort will be made to convince the Christian reader that this is a matter to which he *must* attend. **FOR IN THE REALM OF NEW TESTAMENT**

> **TEXTUAL CRITICISM AS WELL AS IN OTHER FIELDS THE PRESUPPOSITIONS OF MODERN THOUGHT ARE HOSTILE TO THE HISTORIC CHRISTIAN FAITH AND WILL DESTROY IT IF THEIR FATAL OPERATION IS NOT CHECKED. If faithful Christians, therefore, would defend their sacred religion against this danger, they must forsake the foundations of unbelieving thought and build upon their faith, a faith that rests entirely on the solid rock of holy Scripture. And when they do this in the sphere of New Testament textual criticism, they will find themselves led back step by step (perhaps, at first, against their wills) to the text of the Protestant Reformation, namely, that form of New Testament text which underlies the King James Version and the other early Protestant translations** *(The King James Version Defended*, "Introduction," p. 1).

Hills' emphasis was the preeminence of faith above human reason. He believed God's promises of biblical preservation. One of Hills' books is entitled *Believing Bible study*. Note the keyword *BELIEVING*. Though trained in textual criticism at the highest level, Hills boldly challenged the unbelieving attitude that permeates this entire field:

> **Of all the English Bibles now in print only the King James Version is founded on the logic of faith**. Therefore only the King James Version can be preached authoritatively and studied believingly. Many conservative Christian scholars deny this. **THEY TRY TO USE THEIR MODERN ENGLISH VERSIONS IN THE SAME WAY THAT BELIEVING BIBLE STUDENTS USE THE KING JAMES VERSION. BUT THE LOGIC OF THE SITUATION SOON ASSERTS ITSELF AND MAKES THIS IMPOSSIBLE. FOR ALL THESE MODERN VERSIONS ARE FOUNDED ON A NATURALISTIC NEW TESTAMENT TEXTUAL CRITICISM WHICH IGNORES OR DENIES THE SPECIAL, PROVIDENTIAL PRESERVATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES**. Hence if you use these modern versions, you never can be sure that you have the true New Testament text. Even worse, you cannot be sure that the original New Testament Scriptures were infallibly inspired. For if God has not preserved these Scriptures down through the ages by His special providence, why would He have infallibly inspired them in the first place?
>
> ... **the Bible is God's infallibly inspired Word which has been preserved by God's special providence down through the ages**. ... And the providential preservation of the Scriptures did not cease with the invention of printing. For why would God watch over the New Testament text at one time and not at another time, before the invention of printing but not afterward? Hence **the formation of the Textus Receptus was God-guided. THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS, THEREFORE, IS A TRUSTWORTHY REPRODUCTION OF THE INFALLIBLY INSPIRED ORIGINAL NEW TESTAMENT TEXT AND IS AUTHORITATIVE. AND SO IS THE KING JAMES VERSION AND ALL OTHER FAITHFUL TRANSLATIONS OF THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS** (Hills, *Believing Bible Study*, p. 87).
>
> It was this common faith which guided Erasmus providentially in his task of editing the first printed Greek New Testament (1516). Although he was not himself outstanding as a man of faith, yet in his editing of the New Testament text he was guided by the faith of others. He was desirous of publishing an

edition of the New Testament which would be well received and offend no one. Hence in his labors on the New Testament text Erasmus was probably expressing not so much his own views as the views of his contemporaries, views with which he would have become very well acquainted through his correspondence and his travels. **In short, as editor of the first printed Greek New Testament, Erasmus was providentially controlled by the common faith in the providential preservation of the Scriptures. Luther, Melanchton, Stephanus, Calvin, Beza, and the other scholars of the Reformation Period who labored on the New Testament text were similarly guided by God's special providence**. These scholars had received humanistic training in their youth, and in their notes and comments they sometimes reveal traces of this early education. But in their actual dealings with the biblical text these humanistic tendencies were restrained by the common faith in the providential preservation of Scripture, a faith which they themselves professed along with their followers. Hence in the Reformation Period the textual criticism of the New Testament was different from the textual criticism of any other book. The humanistic methods used on other books were not applied to the New Testament. In their editions of the New Testament Erasmus and his successors were providentially guided by the common faith to adopt the current text, primarily the current Greek text and secondarily the current Latin text. ... **THUS THE LOGIC OF FAITH LED TRUE BELIEVERS OF THAT DAY, JUST AS IT LEADS TRUE BELIEVERS TODAY, TO THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS AS THE GOD-GUIDED NEW TESTAMENT TEXT** *(*Hills*, Believing Bible Study*, p. 63).

It is customary for naturalistic critics to make the most of human imperfections in the Textus Receptus and to sneer at it as a mean and almost sordid thing. ... But **THOSE WHO CONCENTRATE IN THIS WAY ON THE HUMAN FACTORS INVOLVED IN THE PRODUCTION OF THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS ARE UTTERLY UNMINDFUL OF THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD**. For in the very next year, in the plan of God, the Reformation was to break out in Wittenberg, and it was important that the Greek New Testament should be published first in one of the future strongholds of Protestantism by a book seller who was eager to place it in the hands of the people and not in Spain, the land of the Inquisition, by the Roman Church, which was intent on keeping the Bible from the people (Hills, *The King James Version Defended*, p. 203).

Hills did not see merely a bumbling Erasmus or a pompous King James or a sectarian Authorized Version translation committee, he saw God; he believed God's promises to preserve His Word. Detractors of the "King James Only" position tend to scoff at or make light of this, but the very fact that they scoff is frightful. It is a very dangerous thing to scoff at faith that is founded upon the Word of God.

Hills presented an excellent overview of the history of the Received Text, including a description of the various editions of the TR that were published from Erasmus to the Elzevirs. Hills also pointed out that the King James Bible represents a unique form of the Received Text, and he believed it was this form that should be followed:

... **THE KING JAMES VERSION OUGHT TO BE REGARDED NOT MERELY**

> **AS A TRANSLATION OF THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS BUT ALSO AS AN INDEPENDENT VARIETY OF THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS**. ... But what do we do in these few places in which the several editions of the Textus Receptus disagree with one another? Which text do we follow? The answer to this question is easy. We are guided by the common faith. **HENCE WE FAVOR THAT FORM OF THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS UPON WHICH MORE THAN ANY OTHER GOD, WORKING PROVIDENTIALLY, HAS PLACED THE STAMP OF HIS APPROVAL, NAMELY, THE KING JAMES VERSION**, or, more precisely, the Greek text underlying the King James Version (Hills, *The King James Version Defended*, pp. 220, 223).

As an interesting sideline, the following comments by Jay Green, who knew Dr. Hills, offer a window into the way Hills was treated by modern Bible proponents:

> Ed Hills was treated shamefully. He was ridiculed, blacklisted among fellow scholars (many of whom were unworthy to unlatch the thongs of his sandals). He counted some of his old professors as friends, but William Hendriksen wrote him a sharp letter taking him to task for defending 1 John 5:7, calling it the nadir, the lowest point in textual criticism (Letter from Jay Green, March 15, 1995).

We would quote Hills' books extensively if we had space, because they are filled with important information.

ALFRED MARTIN (1916-96)

Alfred Martin, in May 1951, presented a doctoral dissertation to the faculty of Dallas Theological Seminary's Graduate School entitled "A Critical Examination of the Westcott-Hort Textual Theory." Martin was vice president of Moody Bible Institute at the time. He wrote many Bible studies that were published by Moody, including *What the Bible Says about Itself* (1961) and *Survey of the Scriptures* (1962). and commentaries on Genesis, Exodus, Joshua, Isaiah, John, and other books. Dr. D.O. Fuller published a portion of Martin's doctoral thesis in his book *Which Bible?* in 1970. The paper follows Burgon's devastating analysis of the Westcott-Hort theories of textual criticism. Fuller says, "Dr. Martin has administered the *coup de grace* to the Westcott and Hort textual theory." Through the gracious help of Dr. Thomas Strouse, this author has obtained a complete copy of Martin's thesis. It is 8.5 X 11-inch format, 210 pages. The following excerpts are from the original dissertation.

That Martin had a heart-felt concern for his subject that went beyond mere scholarly wranglings is evident from these excerpts:

> Most work in textual criticism today has at least a Hortian foundation; nevertheless there are fashions in criticism as in women's clothing, and the trend of scholars in more recent years has been away from the original Westcott-Hort position, as will be shown in a later chapter of this work. **An amusing and amazing spectacle presents itself: many of the textbooks, books of Bible interpretation, and innumerable secondary works go on repeating the Westcott-Hort dicta although the foundations have been seriously shaken**

even in the opinion of former Hortians and those who would logically be expected to be Hortians (pp. 2, 3).

It is commonly said that the older controversy around the Textus Receptus is dead, but this cannot be true; for if it can be shown that Westcott and Hort were wrong in their basic premises, then it will be necessary to go back before Westcott and Hort and to take up the study afresh. If the direction is wrong, further supposed progress only leads farther from the truth (p. 5).

The writer is soundly convinced from years of reading and thinking upon this question that the Westcott-Hort theory is false and misleading (p. 14).

A Bible-believing Christian had better be careful what he says about the Textus Receptus, for the question is not at all the precise wording of that text, **but rather a choice between two different kinds of texts, a fuller one and a shorter one**. One need not believe in the infallibility of Erasmus, or his sanctity, or even his honesty; because he merely followed the type of text which was dominant in the manuscripts ... (pp. 24, 25).

In spite of the notable work of Burgon, Hoskier, and others who supported them, the opponents of the Westcott-Hort theory have never had the hearing which they deserve. How many present-day students of the Greek New Testament ever heard of the two men just mentioned, and how many ever saw a copy of *The Revision Revised* or *Codex B and Its Allies*, to say nothing of actually reading these works? ... THE PRESENT GENERATION OF BIBLE STUDENTS, HAVING BEEN REARED ON WESTCOTT AND HORT, HAVE FOR THE MOST PART ACCEPTED THE THEORY WITHOUT INDEPENDENT OR CRITICAL EXAMINATION. To the average student of the Greek New Testament today it is unthinkable to question the theory at least in its basic premises. Even to imply that one believes the Textus Receptus to be nearer the original text than the Westcott-Hort text is, lays one open to the suspicion of gross ignorance or unmitigated bigotry. That is why this controversy needs to be aired again among Bible-believing Christians**. There is little hope of convincing those who are unbelieving textual critics, but IF BELIEVING BIBLE STUDENTS HAD THE EVIDENCE OF BOTH SIDES PUT BEFORE THEM, INSTEAD OF ONE SIDE ONLY, THERE WOULD NOT BE SO MUCH BLIND FOLLOWING OF WESTCOTT AND HORT** (pp. 4, 46, 47).

This is not to say that Burgon's theological views automatically make him right in textual criticism and that Westcott and Hort's theological views automatically make them wrong. ... It would be wrong and foolish to say that everyone who holds the Westcott-Hort textual theory is liberal in theology. The godly Tregelles, who held in the main to the basic position later put forth in such detail by Westcott and Hort, believed as firmly as Burgon or anyone else in the verbal inspiration of the Word of God, and there have been many godly scholars since 1881 who have held the Westcott-Hort textual theory. In fact, at the present time the majority of conservative Christian scholars hold it, at least in part. **BUT IT IS INTERESTING TO OBSERVE THAT, WHILE ONE WILL FIND BELIEVERS ON THE SIDE OF WESTCOTT AND HORT, ONE WILL HARDLY FIND UNBELIEVERS ON THE SIDE OF BURGON**. **THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THEOLOGY AND TEXTUAL CRITICISM HAS NOT BEEN PERCEIVED CLEARLY ENOUGH BY MOST. AT PRECISELY THE TIME WHEN**

LIBERALISM WAS CARRYING THE FIELD IN THE ENGLISH CHURCHES THE THEORY OF WESTCOTT AND HORT RECEIVED WIDE ACCLAIM. THESE ARE NOT ISOLATED FACTS.

Recent contributions on the subject—that is, in the present century—following mainly the Westcott-Hort principles and method, have been made largely by men who deny the inspiration of the Bible. ... **Textual criticism cannot be divorced entirely from theology**. No matter how great a Greek scholar a man may be, or no matter how great an authority on the textual evidence, his conclusions must always be open to suspicion if he does not accept the Bible as the very Word of God (pp. 69, 70).

At the outset the whole inquiry [by Westcott and Hort] is turned into a wrong direction by this amazing statement: 'The leading principles of textual criticism are identical for all writings whatever' (Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, p. 19). This makes the textual criticism of the New Testament merely a literary problem, and does not take into account the fact that the text of the New Testament, as the verbally inspired Word of God, faced attacks and exigencies which would never touch the text of any ordinary document.

Insufficient attention is given by Hort to the fact that intentional variations in the text are more serious and more widespread in their influence than mere transcriptional errors, which are often easy to detect. It is generally agreed among all kinds of textual critics, furthermore, that the worst corruptions of the text took place at a very early time in its history. In their *Causes of Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels* Burgon and Miller list and discuss at length with numerous examples ten different kinds of intentional variations: harmonistic influence, assimilation of one record to another, attraction, omission, transposition, substitution, addition, glosses, corruption by heretics and corruption by the orthodox. It is not claimed that all changes from these causes were intentional, but that there were many intentional changes from these causes. This is in addition to accidental causes, such as pure accident of copying, homoioteleuton, accident from writing in uncials, itacism, and liturgical influence. Westcott and Hort scarcely touch on this subject, especially intentional causes. ...

The New Testament is different from other documents ... in that it is the infallible Word of God. This entails the fact that God will preserve the text against permanent or destructive error, although He does not guarantee the accuracy of any one manuscript. It means also that Satan will do everything in his power to corrupt the text; he put forth a series of mighty efforts almost at the very beginning through Marcion, Basilides, the Ebionites, the Valentinians, and many others (pp. 77-79).

In all of this discussion [by Westcott and Hort] one is struck by that which has been mentioned earlier: the entire lack of consideration for the supernatural element in the Scripture. There is nothing of verbal inspiration; indeed there could not be, since Westcott and Hort disavowed that doctrine. There is no sense of the divine preservation of the text, which one ought to find in a discussion of this type by Christians (p. 145).

The methods of Westcott and Hort sound plausible at first hearing, largely because of the persuasive and dogmatic presentation which Hort gives to them.

Their application reveals their baselessness. 'Conflation,' the 'Syrian recensions,' the 'Neutral text,' all are seen to be figments of the imagination of the two distinguished Cambridge professors. **The whole genealogical method which they built up so elaborately over a period of almost thirty years is now called in question and the Neutral text is no longer believed to be neutral** (pp. 146, 147).

The trend in New Testament textual criticism at the present time is to go farther and farther away from Westcott and Hort while clinging tenaciously to their basic principles. The attitude of many critics seems to be one of perplexity. ... The great difficulty in New Testament textual criticism today, which makes it impossible for Bible-believing Christians to be sanguine about the results of present research, is the almost universally held view among critics of the relative nature of truth. **TEXTUAL CRITICISM HAS BECOME MORE AND MORE SUBJECTIVE SINCE WESTCOTT AND HORT OPENED THE DOOR OF SUBJECTIVISM WIDE** (p. 156, 159).

Since most of the work today [in textual research] has a Hortian foundation, it can be no stronger than the theory on which it relies. **If textual criticism took a wrong road with Griesbach, or with Lachmann, or with Westcott and Hort, then any supposed progress which is made along that road only leads farther away from the truth** (p. 160).

The Westcott-Hort theory has been examined and found wanting. The whole arrogant scheme of putting this study on a purely literary basis, without any acknowledgment of the corruption brought into the text in early days by willful and wicked men, and without any perception of God's providential preservation of His Word down through the centuries, collapses when subjected to close scrutiny**. Men would have seen this in the years immediately after 1881 if they had not been so committed to the liberal trends which were then gathering momentum.** ...

In light of what has been shown in the preceding chapters, Burgon's statement of the case in his famous reply to Bishop Ellicott was hardly too strong: '**Such builders are Drs. Westcott and Hort** ... I repeat, (for I wish it to be distinctly understood and remembered,) that what I assert concerning those Critics is,**—*not* that their superstructure rests upon an insecure foundation; but that it rests on *no foundation at all*.** My complaint is,**—**not that they are somewhat and *frequently* mistaken; but that they are mistaken *entirely*, and that they are mistaken *throughout*. ...' (*The Revision Revised*, pp. 518, 19).

IT WILL NOT DO TO MODIFY WESTCOTT AND HORT AND TO PROCEED FROM THERE. THE ONLY ROAD TO PROGRESS IN NEW TESTAMENT TEXTUAL CRITICISM IS REPUDIATION OF THEIR THEORY AND ALL ITS FRUITS. Most contemporary criticism is bankrupt and confused, the result of its liaison with liberal theology. A Bible-believing Christian can never be content to follow the leadership of those who do not recognize the Bible as the verbally inspired Word of God (pp. 193, 196, 197).

Christian students who accept the Bible as the verbally inspired Word of God need to interest themselves in the questions of textual criticism. This is not merely an academic matter which is only of passing interest to a few scholarly recluses (p. 204).

(Alfred Martin, *A Critical Examination of the Westcott-Hort Textual Theory*, Th.D. Thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, May 1951).

Martin observes that most theological schools do not give the full picture in the matter of texts and versions. He describes the scholarly pride that immediately looks down upon anyone who defends the Received Text and the King James Bible. He observes the association between the spread of theological modernism and the success of the new texts and versions. He states that this issue is not merely theoretical but is crucial to Christian life and faith. He says that modern textual criticism is founded upon rationalism and relativism and has resulted in uncertainty and perplexity.

Though Dr. Martin did stand against Westcott-Hortism and the modern texts and versions in this thesis, he does not accept the Received Text or the King James Bible as perfect. His position was that they are superior to the Critical Greek text and the modern versions. He concluded his thesis with these words:

> A Bible-believing Christian can never be content to follow the leadership of those who do not recognize the Bible as the verbally inspired Word of God. The Textus Receptus is the *starting-point* for future research, because it embodies substantially and in a convenient form the traditional text. Admitted, it will have to undergo *extensive revision* (emphasis added).

We don't agree with this, for a moment. If we don't have a perfect Bible at this time in history, we never will. You can have the shifting sands of "science." I prefer the rock of biblical faith. I know that some will take hold of this and charge me with laying claim to a kinship with men who are actually outside of my camp. This does not bother me, for these same complainers, as I know from past experience, will make all sorts of unsubstantiated and inconsequential charges against this work. I included Martin for two reasons. First, he boldly opposed the Westcott-Hort Greek text and the entire foundation upon which the modern versions are built. His scholarly treatise refuted the Westcott-Hort theories. His inconsistency in applying the standard of faith to the Received Text and the King James Bible is a secondary concern, as far as it relates to this history. Second, he illustrates the fact that the defense of the Traditional Text and the opposition of the critical text was still found to some extent in various citadels of higher education in the 1950s. Martin's position can be traced directly to the men we discussed under the nineteenth-century era. In particular he quotes Burgon, Miller, Scrivener, and Hoskier.

Alfred Martin was listed as one of the editors of the Hodges-Farstad Majority Text (published by Thomas Nelson in 1982). Thus we see that he joined forces with those who are pursuing a never-settled, always tentative "majority text." Jack Moorman has written a fine critique of the Hodges-Farstad work. See section on Moorman in chapter five of this book for a review of Moorman's book on the Majority Text. Moorman's books are available from The Bible for Today.

ZANE HODGES (b. 1932)

Zane Hodges is another man associated with Dallas Seminary who has taken much the same position as Alfred Martin. Hodges taught New Testament Greek and Exegesis at Dallas from 1959 to 1987, though his view of the Majority Text was a minority position among the teaching staff. Hodges continues to teach a module entitled "New Testament Textual Criticism Majority Text Theory. He was scheduled to teach this at Chafter Theological Seminary, Orange, California, May 10-28, 2004. In a number of articles that have appeared in Dallas Seminary's *Bibliothec Sacra*, Hodges has taken apart the Westcott-Hort theories and has taken a stand, in general, for the Traditional Text and in opposition to the Critical text. The April 1961 *Bibliotheca Sacra* carried an article by Hodges entitled "The Ecclesiastical Text of Revelation—Does It Exist?" In this he shows the fallacy of the Westcott-Hort theory of a Syrian ascension that supposedly emerged in the fourth century and swept away its rivals, thus artificially creating a "majority text." This is how Westcott and Hort explained the fact that most manuscripts represent the Received Text. The April 1962 *Bibliotheca Sacra* carried "The Critical Text and the Alexandrian Family of Revelation." The October-December 1968 issue carried "The Greek Text of the King James Version." The January 1971 issue carried "Rationalism and Contemporary New Testament Textual Criticism. An excerpt from the latter gives a window into Hodges' approach to this subject:

> In a previous article, it was pointed out that, although the kind of Greek text which underlies our Authorized King James Version is rejected by modern textual critics, this rejection is wholly unconvincing. **The acceptance of the newer critical editions of the New Testament does not, therefore, rest on factual data which can be objectively verified, but rather upon a prevailing consensus of critical thought. It will be the purpose of this discussion to show that contemporary critical texts are, in fact, the fruit of a rationalistic approach to New Testament textual criticism**. ...
>
> The charge of rationalism is easily substantiated for Westcott and Hort and may be demonstrated from direct statements found in their introduction to *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. To begin with, Westcott and Hort are clearly unwilling to commit themselves to the inerrancy of the original Scriptures. ... Hort writes: '... For ourselves we dare not introduce considerations which could not reasonably be applied to other ancient texts, supposing them to have documentary attestation of equal amount, variety, and antiquity.' This last assertion ... is as sweeping an affirmation of a rationalistic premise as one can find anywhere in textual literature. To put it bluntly, the New Testament is to be treated in textual study like any other book. ...
>
> ... the logic of faith demands that documents so unique cannot have had a history wholly like that of secular writings. As they cannot have avoided the attack of supernatural principalities and powers of evil, so they cannot have lacked the superintending providence of the God who authored them. ...

> The author is, of course, well aware how uncongenial such an argument is to contemporary perspectives. **THE TRAGEDY LIES RATHER IN THE FACT THAT CONSERVATIVE SCHOLARS AND STUDENTS OF THE TEXT HAVE SO OFTEN FAILED TO DETECT THIS RATIONALISTIC FRAME OF REFERENCE AND THUS HAVE NEVER STEPPED OUTSIDE OF IT TO EXAMINE THE TEXTUAL QUESTION FROM THE VANTAGE POINT OF FAITH**. ...
>
> **Modern textual criticism is psychologically 'addicted' to Westcott and Hort. Westcott and Hort, in turn, were rationalists in their approach to the textual problem in the New Testament and employed techniques within which rationalism and every other kind of bias are free to operate**. The result of it all is a methodological quagmire where objective controls on the conclusions of critics are nearly nonexistent. It goes without saying that **NO BIBLE-BELIEVING CHRISTIAN WHO IS WILLING TO EXTEND THE IMPLICATIONS OF HIS FAITH TO TEXTUAL MATTERS CAN HAVE THE SLIGHTEST GROUNDS FOR CONFIDENCE IN CONTEMPORARY CRITICAL TEXTS** (Zane C. Hodges, "Rationalism and Contemporary New Testament Textual Criticism," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January 1971, pp. 27-35).

I don't agree with some of Hodges' conclusions as to precisely where the perfect Word of God is today. Like Martin, he is not content to accept the Received Text as the inerrant Word of God. He has a keen understanding of the rationalism that underlies the modern texts and versions, though, and there is evidence that his writings have encouraged men to take a closer look at this subject. James Qurollo's testimony is an example of this. See chapter five: "From 1970 to Present."

Martin and Hodges are proponents of the *Hodges-Farstad Majority Text* which was first printed in 1982 by Thomas Nelson Publishers in conjunction with the New King James Version and which is in perpetual flux. The Hodges-Farstad Text is an attempt to produce a Greek text that would reflect a majority reading of all extant Greek manuscripts. The Hodges-Farstad Majority text contains roughly 1,800 variants from the Received Text underlying the King James. 1 John 5:7 is removed, for example. Thus, while the Hodges-Farstad Majority Text is superior to the Westcott-Hort line of texts in that it is a variant of the Received Text, it leaves one with a similar problem: No settled text; no perfect Bible.

I believe it is possible to trace the hand of God in past centuries perfecting the Bible through inspiration, canonicity, and preservation. I believe one can see this in the line of English Bibles leading up to the King James Version. From Tyndale to the KJV the English Bible was undergoing a process of revision and purification, but with the publication of the KJV, God's stamp of approval is evident in a singular way. The KJV became the Word of God to the nations in a way unequaled by any text or version in history. I refuse to believe that at this point in history we still have to scratch around in an attempt to "recover" or revise or purify the Word of God.

I realize that many men have an answer for this, and they claim they can reject the Received Text and still have faith in God's promises to preserve His Word, but I don't accept that. If you reject the Received Text in Greek and the King James Bible in English you reject the Bible that was plainly preserved. You say, "I don't believe that; that's too simplistic." Be that as it may. The simplicity of it thrills my soul. I don't believe the Lord has made these life and death issues overly complicated. The Bible says God has chosen the poor and the weak and the lowly for salvation (Luke 10:21; 1 Corinthians 1:25-29; James 2:5). If a doctorate in textual criticism were required to know where the Bible is today, we would be left to the mercy of the contradictory whims of the "scholars." I want something more solid that that, and God has promised something more (1 John 2:20,27). The history of the KJV is fact, and I see the hand of God at work here in the preservation of His Word.

M.R. DEHAAN (1891-1964)

M.R. DEHAAN, M.D, was the well-known and very popular founder of the Radio Bible Class. In 1962, two years before his death at age 73, he published a little broadside against the modern versions suitably entitled *Bible Versions and Perversions*. It is a very interesting little book. Dr. DeHaan did not deal with the underlying texts of the versions, nor did he approach the versions on any type of scholarly level. *His concern was the breakdown in biblical authority, the confusion wrought by the multiplicity of versions, the profaning of the Word of God by its translation into modern idiom, the modernism of many of the new versions*. Though he felt that some of the new versions could be used with benefit in private study, he was adamant that the King James Bible should be the sole standard of biblical authority. We include DeHaan in our history of the defense of the KJV because he did defend it and because he defended it with great feeling and conviction. We will see that DeHaan had felt the sting of the wrath and mockery of the modern version proponents, but there was a burden in his heart on this issue that he did not resist. We will see that DeHaan was much more plainspoken than today's generation of evangelicals. Let us hear the man in his own words.

> **CONFUSION OF TONGUES IS PROBABLY THE BEST WAY TO DESCRIBE THE LATEST BIBLE GAME, IN WHICH HUNDREDS OF COMPETITORS PLAY FAST AND LOOSE WITH THE HOLY SCRIPTURES IN ISSUING BY THE SCORES, NEW AND DUBIOUS TRANSLATIONS, VERSIONS, 'PERVERSIONS,' AND REVISIONS OF OUR ENGLISH BIBLE.** One of the reasons given for the need of a new translation is the need of a Bible in modern English. ... But from some of the more recent attempts at giving us a Bible in modern English, it becomes apparent the real purpose was to sell us on a modernistic Bible—not a modern one. It appears from two recent so-called translations (the Revised Standard Version and The New English Bible) that the real purpose is to DESTROY the Bible as the Word of God. Leading up to this climax of infamy are a long line of lesser versions (pp. 6, 7).

It was in 1611 that the best-known and time-tested translation of the English Bible was published, meeting a crying need for an authentic translation. It was written in the most impressive and dignified English and has after 350 years remained the one English translation which meets the requirements of a necessary, Holy Spirit-guided translation. Since then, numerous (several hundred) attempts at improvement upon this authorized translation have been tried. A veritable flood of versions, revisions and translations have been issued. With a few exceptions they have all become obsolete and forgotten, discarded and happily buried (may they rest in peace and never be resurrected again). Less than fifty of these translations have lasted beyond a single generation (p. 9).

... we look with alarm upon the abuse of this trend into a growing evil. **THE INFLUENCE OF ALL OF THEM TOGETHER IS DEFINITELY BAD, AND HAS RESULTED IN CONFUSION, FRUSTRATION AND DOUBT AMONG SINCERE SEARCHERS**, and has given occasion to doubters to ask, 'Who is right?' Moreover, **it has given ammunition to the enemy to say that nobody knows what is correct** (p. 10).

I am keenly aware of the fact that I am dealing with a very delicate and touchy subject on which many sincere folks differ. I also realize that by discussing this subject and stating my honest, irrepressible convictions I shall invoke and provoke the untempered condemnation of some who violently disagree; but I have no choice in the matter, for **I AM OVERWHELMINGLY CONVINCED THAT THIS OBSESSION, THIS CRAZE FOR ISSUING NEW VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE CONTAINS POTENTIALITIES FOR EVIL WHICH MUST BE EXPOSED** (p. 11).

I resent the accusation that I am a scriptural crank, and a hair-splitting critic of the numerous so-called new translations, versions and revisions of the Bible. Neither am I riding a hobby or developing a translation phobia or getting into a rut on a pet subject. ... **I WANT TO CLEAR MY CONSCIENCE IN THE DEEP CONVICTION THAT I MUST ISSUE THIS WARNING AND ALARM CONCERNING THE PRESENT TREND OF TRANSLATIONS INTO MODERN ENGLISH** (pp. 12, 13).

There are times in one's life when silence is not a virtue, and failure to speak out against an evil becomes a sin. When one is convinced of something which is having an evil effect upon men, and neglects to sound a warning and an alarm, he becomes an accessory to the crime. This has somewhat been my position. For a long time I have watched with alarm and increasing misgivings the rash of new versions, translations, and editions of the Bible being dumped on the market and recommended to the unsuspecting Christian public as a great step forward, and an almost indispensable aid to the correct understanding of the Scriptures. I had hoped that this epidemic might subside, but instead it has increased until I can no longer keep silence; I MUST SPEAK OUT AGAINST WHAT TO ME HAS BECOME A MOST DANGEROUS TREND, AND THREATENS THE SANCTITY, THE AUTHORITY AND THE POWER OF THE WORD OF GOD ITSELF. I am speaking of the veritable rash of new Bible translations (so called), versions and interpretations. ... This trend has finally blossomed forth in

two of the most infamous efforts to discredit the Word of God ever tried in all history. The publication of two recent translations (the Revised Standard Version and The New English Bible), one in this country and the other overseas**, has so convicted and disturbed me that to keep silence would be a betrayal of my trust. The gravity of the danger lurking in this growing evil will not let me rest until I have unburdened my heart on this babel of the versions and translations**. **Let the chips fall where they may, I DARE NOT BETRAY THE BOOK ANY LONGER BY KEEPING SILENT WHEN IT IS BEING THREATENED**. I have carefully examined a good number of the new translations which have been published recently ... We have no quarrel with some of these versions of earlier years which should be considered as helpful commentaries, **but should not be designated or elevated to a place equal with the Bible** (pp. 18, 19).

We want to make ourselves definitely clear, and so we repeat. What we have said, does not imply that there is no merit at all in any of the so-called translations. We admit that they can be exceedingly helpful to the student for personal study, and for critical examination, but most of them should be considered as commentaries rather than translations. Used as reference books for study, some of them have their value; but for the public ministry and pulpit use, they only add to confusion and frustration for the average believer. It is the end result of this irresponsible handling of the Scriptures which we fear the most. **We sometimes wonder if all of this is not laying the groundwork for the Devil's own end-time translation and version**, when the Antichrist, the false christ, the Devil-man appears on earth. ... In the October 18, 1960, edition of the Springfield, Massachusetts, *Union*, we read the following alarming bit of news: 'Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish scholars working as a team have begun a new translation of the Scriptures...' Can this be a sign of the times, getting ready for the final translation of the Scriptures by the one who offered Eve the first revised version? (pp. 24, 25).

... of the many dozens currently in print, one translation still outsells them all: the miscalled but **GREATLY LOVED KING JAMES OR AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE**, now celebrating its 350th anniversary. **INCOMPARABLE IN ITS FAITHFULNESS**, majestic in its language, and inexhaustible in its spiritual fruitfulness, this time-honored version continues to reveal to millions the matchless grace of Him whose name is THE WORD OF GOD, and who is crowned with glory and honor (p. 25).

Thousands of people go 'daffy' about some modern translation, who have never even read half of their father's Bible through. **Well, but we can hear some of you say, The new version is so much clearer and easier to understand. I would like to ask you, How do you know that it is easier and clearer, when you haven't even read your old Bible?** ... **TO AVOID CONFUSION, THE CHURCH SHOULD BE UNITED ON ONE DEPENDABLE TRANSLATION. WE DO NOT NEED MORE NEW TRANSLATIONS, BUT A MORE THOROUGH KNOWLEDGE OF THE ONE WHICH WE ALREADY HAVE** (p. 26).

When there is poison in a cake, one does not spend time praising the good fruit and other ingredients which the cake contains; rather one warns against the poison**—**and rightly so! The perversions of some of these newer translations which we have pointed out are more dangerous to your soul than

poison to your body. **TURN FROM THOSE WHICH ARE THE PRODUCTION OF AN AGE OF DOUBT, AND TURN TO THE AUTHORIZED VERSION WHICH IS THE PRODUCTION OF AN AGE OF FAITH. THE AUTHORIZED VERSION IS RELIABLE BECAUSE IT TELLS US AS ACCURATELY AS POSSIBLE WHAT THE BIBLE SAYS**, and not what some galaxy of scholars (who, however learned, are but mortals like ourselves) think it ought to say (p. 26).

The argument that the language of the Authorized Version is archaic and outdated might carry some weight if the new translations were really an improvement in clarity and easier to understand. However the very opposite is the case in most instances (p. 27).

For public use in worship one version should be made the standard and all the rest of the worthwhile ones used only for reference. If this could be done, there is no question about the uniform choice of the acknowledged Authorized Version. ... **No other translation can approach its accuracy, dignity, and clarity**. **LET THE EVANGELICALS TAKE AS THE BIBLE OF ORTHODOXY THE AUTHORIZED VERSION; LET THE MODERNISTS AND THE LIBERALS HAVE THE REVISED STANDARD VERSION, and The New English Bible** ... Most evangelicals think of the Authorized Version as the Bible of the English-speaking Church. We have been taught from it from childhood, and, recognizing the need of 'hiding the Word in our heart,' we have memorized all the Scriptures we know from this version (pp. 30, 31).

We shall never all agree perfectly here below in every detail, but when men threaten the honor and purity of the Scriptures, we simply cannot agree. **If we must take one of two positions, I for one would rather be guilty of overzealousness in defense of the Book**, than to condone violence to the Scriptures and to countenance unchallenged those who handle the Word of God 'deceitfully' (II Corinthians 4:2)**—**all under the guise of tolerance and charity. **I WOULD MUCH RATHER BE GUILTY OF BEING OVERAMBITIOUS IN EARNESTLY 'CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH' (JUDE 3) THAN TO BE GUILTY OF COMPROMISE FOR FEAR OF OFFENDING OTHERS** (p. 31).

SAMUEL H. SUTHERLAND (1900-1994)

Samuel H. Sutherland, President of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, spoke out for the King James Bible in the September 1961 issue of the *King's Business*. He sets the tone of his message in the first sentence:

We do not appreciate in the least the tendency to downgrade the King James Version. These translators of the 'contemporary English' versions have not strengthened the significance of the Word of God in their translations in the least. Rather they themselves have produced an inferior translation both in type of expression and certainly in doctrinal content. ...

One must always consider the theological position of the translators. Those who believe the Bible is verbally and fully inspired of God will produce one type of translation; those who do not believe that it is the inspired Word of God will produce an entirely different type of translation. The historic position of

the Church of Jesus Christ is that the Bible is the Word of God. The translators of the King James Version believed exactly that. These 'contemporary English' translations reveal the fact that their committees do not believe in the verbal and full inspiration of the Scriptures. Therefore, regardless of how interesting any given verse may be in the modern translations, the reader must be constantly on guard lest he find himself being led astray in what he erroneously considers to be the 'Word of God.'

For one who is desirous of obtaining a new Bible, either for personal use or as a gift, **we would strongly recommend the King James Version** with the [Old] Scofield Notes.

Sutherland had changed his position by 1968 when he became a member of the editorial board of the Lockman Foundation, publisher of the New American Standard Bible.

DAVID MARTYN LLOYD-JONES (1899-1981)

David Martyn Lloyd-Jones also spoke out for the King James Bible in 1961. At a rally at the Royal Albert Hall that year he made the following statements:

I suppose that the most popular of all the proposals at the present moment is to have a new translation of the Bible. ... The argument is that people are not reading the Bible any longer because they do not understand its language—particularly the archaic terms—what does your modern man ... know about justification, sanctification, and all these Biblical terms? And so we are told the one thing that is necessary is to have a translation that Tom, Dick and Harry will understand, and I began to feel about six months ago that we had almost reached the stage in which the Authorised Version was being dismissed, to be thrown into the limbo of things forgotten, no longer of any value. **Need I apologise for saying a word in favour of the Authorised Version in this gathering?** ...

It is a basic proposition laid down by the Protestant Reformers, that we must have a Bible 'understanded of the people.' That is common sense ... we must never be obscurantists. We must never approach the Bible in a mere antiquarian spirit ... but it does seem to me that there is a very grave danger incipient in so much of the argument that is being presented today for these new translations. **There is a danger, I say, of our surrendering something that is vital and essential** ...

Take this argument that the modern man does not understand such terms as justification, sanctification and so on. I want to ask a question. When did the ordinary man ever understand those terms? ... Did the colliers to whom John Wesley and George Whitefield preached in the 18th century understand? They had not even been to a day school ... they could not read, they could not write. Yet these were the terms that were used. This was the version that was used—Authorised Version. The common people have never understood these terms. ... **We are concerned here with something that is spiritual; something which does not belong to this world at all;** which, as the Apostle Paul reminds us, the princes of this world do not know. Human wisdom is of no value

here—it is a spiritual truth. This is truth about God primarily, and because of that it is a mystery. ...

Yet we are told—it must be put in such simple terms and language that anybody taking it up and reading it is going to understand all about it. My friends, this is 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 today is that everything is being brought down to the same level, everything is cheapened. The common man is made the standard of authority; he decides everything, and everything has to be brought down to him....

Are we to do that with the Word of God? I say No! What has happened in the past has been this—ignorant, illiterate people, in this country and in foreign countries, coming into salvation have been educated up to the Book and have begun to understand it, to glory in it, and to praise God for it, and I say that we need to do the same at this present time. **What we need is therefore, not to replace the Authorised Version ... we need rather to reach and train people up to the standard and the language, the dignity and the glory of the old Authorised Version** (Martyn Lloyd-Jones, cited by Alfred Levell, *The Old Is Better*, pp. 49-51).

EVERETT FOWLER (1906-90)

Everett Fowler was a deacon in the famous First Baptist Church of New York City. He sat under the ministry of and served with the respected fundamentalist leader Dr. Isaac M. Haldeman (1845-1933), who pastored First Baptist from 1884 to 1933. By profession Fowler was an engineer, with a degree from Worcester Polytechnic Institute. Mr. Fowler's heart for Christ was witnessed by a long life of faithful service in this church—deacon (over 45 years), Sunday School teacher (more than 40 years), trustee (37 years), church treasurer (more than 21 years), church clerk (25 years). As a young man Fowler made a commitment to the Lord to rise before breakfast for personal devotions. As a result he read the Bible through twice a year in English for some 40 years. This was in addition to his study of the Greek New Testament.

Fowler's concern for the issue of texts and versions began in 1953, when he enrolled in the New Testament class at his church with the goal of reading the Greek New Testament. The first book he read was the Gospel of John, which was accomplished in the place of reading the newspaper while he commuted on the morning train. Upon completion of the class, he owned a Greek Gospel of John, an interlinear, and a Greek-English New Testament. Desirous of reading the entire New Testament in Greek without an English translation alongside, he purchased a Nestle's Greek New Testament, not knowing that Greek texts differ and not knowing it mattered. Through diligent work he learned to read the entire Greek New Testament, which he did several times. As his study progressed he became increasingly concerned about the differences he was seeing between the modern critical Greek text and the Received Text underlying his King James Bible. He

began a diligent comparative study of the two, noting the exact differences between the various editions of the critical Greek text and the Received Text, as well as the differences between the modern English versions and the King James Bible. The fruit of this prodigious labor was his book *Evaluating Versions of the New Testament*, which has enlightened the eyes of thousands of God's people to the danger of the modern versions. Fowler's work does not lean on Burgon, Wilkinson, Ray, Fuller, or any man. It is a diligent firsthand comparison of the texts and versions.

Evaluating Versions was distributed in mimeographed form for a number of years before being published by The Bible for Today in 1971. It was produced in a perfect-bound edition by the Maranatha Baptist Bible College in 1981. Since then it has appeared in at least one other edition. Its chief feature is a series of charts showing the significant theological differences between the texts and versions. Table I lists the whole verses omitted or enclosed in brackets in the new versions. Table II lists significant portions of verses omitted. Table III lists the omissions of names of Jesus Christ omitted. Table IV lists other differences that have a substantial effect on the meaning. Table V lists the total word differences between the United Bible Societies text and the Received Text. Table VI is a summary of the differences which affect translation.

God's "Common" Men

I include Everett Fowler as an example of those countless "ordinary men" who have quietly stood in defense of the Traditional Text and the King James Bible. The issue of textual criticism reminds me of what the Bible says about Jesus Christ. While the scholars and religious elite of that day rejected Him and scoffed at His words and spent their time trying to catch Him in some error, the common people heard Him gladly (Mark 12:37). In light of man's perverted nature, not to speak of the reality of end-time apostasy, it is no marvel that the scholarly elite today are blinded by their pride and refuse to take the position of simple faith.

Thousands of "common" believers have diligently and prayerfully looked at the issue of Bible versions and have taken the time to compare the various texts and versions for themselves. Though not textual scholars, these are men of sound mind and reasonable intelligence, born again men who have the Spirit of God and who believe the Word of God explicitly, men who have been trained in sound doctrine, men ordained for the ministry and for leadership in the churches, men who have earnestly sought the face of God in this business of where God's words are today. Thousands of men like this have reached the independent conclusion in the privacy of their studies before God that the Greek Received Text is the preserved Word of God and that the King James Bible is an amazing, lovely, dependable translation thereof.

To overlook and ridicule the testimony of such men is to scoff at the way God works. The prophets of old were not, for the most part, scholars or members of

the religious elite. They were farmers, shepherds, soldiers, herdsmen, boat builders, wanderers. The apostles were not scholars, for the most part. Paul was the exception. They were tax collectors, fishermen, ordinary fellows; one was a medical doctor. The apostles did not establish seminaries; they built churches. They did not bestow degrees; they ordained pastors. Did God call the religious elite to pastor His churches? Was it not the common man, for the most part, that was called to preach? God's qualifications for pastors and teachers mention nothing about scholarship. The requirement, rather, is regeneration, holiness of life, explicit faith, humility, knowledge of and zeal for God's Word, and the call of God as recognized by the churches. If the apostolic churches did not need ivory tower scholarship, the churches of today do not either. Do not be deceived by the proud who belittle the common preacher and who erroneously suggest that a man must be a trained textual critic to understand where God's Word is today.

While we praise the Lord for Bible-believing scholarship, and while we put no premium on ignorance, we are not deluded into thinking that wisdom comes through graduate studies.

CHAPTER FIVE

1970 TO PRESENT

The Battle Against the NIV and an Incredible Multiplicity of Versions

The multiplication of new English translations since the twentieth century has been incredible to behold. Practically each one has proclaimed that the King James Bible is hopelessly antiquated. The translators of these new versions often pay lip service to the glories of the old English Bible, but the insincerity of these professions is evident in the work. How much respect can a wise man have for one who hurries to put a coat of whitewash on a golden edifice or who rushes madly to shore up a wall that has stood rock solid for four centuries and shows no evidence of falling? Consider the following list (the most influential versions are listed in bold) of versions that have done precisely this:

English Revised Version (1881)
Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament (1881)
The Englishman's Bible (1884)
Darby's New Testament (1871)
American Standard Version (1901)
Ballentin's Modern American Bible (1901)
Moffatt's Historical New Testament (1901)
Twentieth Century New Testament (1902)
Rotherham's Emphasized Bible (1902)
Weymouth's New Testament in Modern Speech (1903)
Worrell's New Testament Revised (1904)
Moulton's Modern Reader's Bible (1907)
Ballentine's Modern American Bible Revised (1909)
American Bible Union Improved Edition (1912)
Anderson's New Testament (1918)
Kent's Shorter Bible (1921)
Ballentine's Modern American Bible Revised Again (1923)
Montgomery's New Testament in Modern English (1924)
Sheldon's Everyday Bible (1924)
Moffatt's New Translation (1926)
Knoch's Concordant Version (1926)
LeFevre's New Testament (1928)
Hall's Living Bible (1929)
Goodspeed's American Translation (1931)

The Junior Bible by Goodspeed (1936)
Charles B. Williams' New Testament in the Language of the People (1937)
Phillips New Testament in Modern English (1947)
Ogden's Bible in Basic English (1949)
The Dartmouth New Testament (1950)
The Authentic Version New Testament (1951)
The Revised Standard Version (1952)
Charles K. Williams' New Testament in Plain English (1952)
Moore's New, Independent, Individual Translation (1953)
Kleist-Lilly New Testament (1954)
Schonfield's Authentic New Testament (1955)
Berkeley Version in Modern English (1945)
Wuest's Expanded New Testament (1961)
Norlie's Simplified New Testament in Plain English (1962)
New World Translation (1960)
Green's Teen-age Version (1962)
Beck's New Testament in the Language of Today (1963)
The Bible in Basic English (1965)
The Amplified New Testament (1965)
United Bible Societies Greek New Testament (1966)
The Jerusalem Bible (1966)
New Scofield Reference Bible (1967)
Berkeley Version Modern Language Bible New Edition (1969)
Barclay's New Testament (1969)
Ledyard's Children's New Testament (1969)
New English Bible (1970)
New American Bible (1970)
King James II Version (1970)
Living Bible (1971)
New American Standard Bible (1971)
Byington's Bible in Living English (1972)
Translator's New Testament (1973)
Cotton Patch Version (1973)
Revised Standard Version Common Bible (1973)
Klingensmith's New Testament in Everyday English (1974)
United Bible Societies Greek New Testament Third Edition (1975)
Today's English Version (1976)
Adam's Christian Counselor's New Testament (1977)
Simple English Bible (1978)
New International Version (1978)
Adam's New Testament in Everyday English (1979)
New King James Version (1982)
Hodges-Farstad Majority Text Greek New Testament (1982)
New Jerusalem Bible (1985)
Recovery Version New Testament (1985)
International Children's Bible (1986)
New Life Version (1986]
Easy-to-Read Version (1987)
Everyday Bible (1987)
Green's Literal Translation of the Bible (1987)
New Evangelical Translation (1988)

God's New Covenant New Testament (1989)
Revised English Bible (1989)
New Revised Standard Version (1989)
Green's Modern King James Version (1990)
Contemporary English Version (1991)
21st Century King James Version (1991)
New Century Version (1991)
The New Testament in Contemporary Language (1993)
The Clear Word Bible (1994)
Contemporary English Version (1995)
God's Word: Today's Bible Translation (1995)
New International Inclusive Language Version (1996)
New International Reader's Version (1996)
New Living Bible (1996)
International Standard Version (1998)
English Standard Version (2001)
Today's New International Version (2002)
The Message (2002)
Holman Christian Standard Bible (2004)

We can see that the question of "Which Bible" has become increasingly difficult as the century has progressed. For most fundamentalist churches the Bible version issue did not become focused until after the publication of the New International Version. Prior to this the textual issue was there, but it was one or two steps removed from having much of an impact upon the average Bible-believing church. The King James Bible held dominance all through the first half of the twentieth century, in spite of the publication of the American Standard Version (1901), the New American Standard Version (1963), the Revised Standard Version (1952), and others we have listed above. This began to change with the publication of the New International Version in 1978. (The NIV New Testament came out in 1973.) The modern versions began to make real inroads into the old-line evangelical churches, and, to a much lesser degree, into some fundamentalist churches. Within one decade after its completion, the NIV had surpassed the KJV in sales through certain bookstore outlets. By 1986 it was widely reported that the NIV had topped the KJB sales for the first time to become the best-selling English version (*Bookstore Journal*, November 1986). In eight years, more than 20 million copies of the full NIV had been sold.

While these statistics illustrate the increasing popularity of the modern English versions, it is not true that the King James Bible has fallen to second place in overall Bible sales in the United States. In doing research for this book I learned that the previous figures are misleading. Thomas Nelson, in the Publisher's Preface to a book produced in 1994, said, "Despite the availability of many new translations and paraphrases of God's word, THE VENERABLE KING JAMES VERSION STILL POSTS MORE SALE EACH YEAR THAN ANY OTHER" (emphasis added) (*The King James Bible Word Book*, Preface, 1994, p. iii).

In following up this statement with Thomas Nelson, I received the following fax message (April 4, 1995) from Philip Stoner, Vice President, Biblical & Religious Reference Publishing:

> In your fax dated March 27th, you mentioned a statistic that the 'NIV version leads the King James Version in sales since 1986.' This perspective is usually based on data reported by Spring Arbor Distributors which footnotes in their report that these figures are based on their distribution only. ALL GENERAL DISTRIBUTORS SELL MORE KJV THAN NIV. Unfortunately there is no industry -wide report available.

Thus, according to Thomas Nelson, the claim that the KJV had fallen behind the NIV in sales in the U.S. was not accurate in 1996. It can be noted further that none of the various estimates take into account the millions of copies of King James Scriptures that are produced by churches and organizations and that are not figured into any survey. More than 100 years after the Revisers of 1881 attempted to replace the King James Version, the old English Bible was still outselling its most popular modern contenders, at least in America, and that is without the vast advertising campaigns that drive the modern versions.

To return to our subject, though, we can see that it is no coincidence that the Bible version issue has become more hotly contested in Bible-believing churches since the 1970s. Pastors were forced to make decisions in this regard, and many men have come to the fore to carry the standard against the modern versions. In commenting on this Jack Moorman says: "Unfortunately, we do not generally take a stand on an issue until pushed, and the response is always belated. God's people should have been concerned for several generations. Yet prior to 1950 they did not feel so threatened, or seriously consider the implications of the emerging versions and the 'better rendering would be' syndrome" (Letter, January 18, 1994).

I believe David Otis Fuller, Edward F. Hills, D.A. Waite, and the hundreds of other men that have written books and taught in defense of the Received Text and the King James Bible in this present hour are God's instruments to help the churches focus on this crucial matter. Much of what these men have done is bring to light the arguments used by preachers a century ago in the battle against the ERV and the ASV.

The following is an overview of some of the men and institutions that have stood in defense of the King James Bible from 1970 to present. We must keep in mind, too, that some of those already mentioned, the Trinitarian Bible Society, for example, continue to have a large influence today.

We would emphasize, too, that there are significant differences today among those who defend the KJV and oppose the modern versions. There is no monolithic "King James Only" movement. Regardless of the precise position taken in defense of the KJV, though, the fact is that all of the following men and institutions defend it and oppose its modern contenders.

Please understand, too, that the following list is not exhaustive. Countless others hold the same position on the King James Bible as that maintained by the following men. While I know many of the key men in this battle personally and have read and discussed these things widely, I readily admit my lack of omniscience. In some cases I would have included a man or institution but I could not obtain sufficient information.

CHURCHES AND CHURCH SCHOOLS

The world looks to institutions of higher learning for wisdom, but the Word of God teaches us to look elsewhere. The Bible is the Christian's absolute and all-sufficient authority. The united testimony of all of the professors of all the schools in the world could not overthrow even one word of the Bible. Even the humblest child of God can know the truth on every important spiritual and moral issue. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Timothy 3:16-17). "But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him" (1 John 2:27). "At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes" (Mat. 11:25).

There is another authority spoken of in the New Testament, and that is the church. I do not speak of a papal-type of authority. The church has no legislative power; its authority is executive and judicial. Regardless of the abuse of power that has been usurped by many "churches" throughout history, the fact remains that the New Testament church is the institution ordained by God for His work in this present age. The apostles did not establish universities; they established churches. The book of Acts could be subtitled the "Record of the First Churches." The New Testament epistles were written, for the most part, to churches, and contain instructions for churches. The Pastoral Epistles (Timothy and Titus) were written to give instruction in church business. "But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Timothy 3:15). "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee" (Titus 1:5).

There is no record of New Testament believers serving Christ apart from the duly-constituted churches. Phebe was commended because she was a "servant of the church which is at Cenchrea" (Romans 16:1). Even those portions of the New Testament not written directly to churches, had the church in mind. James ends with instructions pertaining to praying for the sick in the churches. "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the church..." (James 5:14). The book of

Hebrews contains much practical instruction about the church (Heb. 10:25; 13:7, 17). The final chapter of the first epistle of Peter mentions the elders of the churches (1 Peter 5:1-5). Finally, the book of Revelation was written to seven specific churches in Asia. Jesus Christ was standing in their midst (Rev. 1:12, 13) and the Holy Spirit was speaking to them (Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 29; 3:6, 13, 22).

It is obvious that God has exalted the New Testament church.

This humble institution (from a worldly perspective) is what Christ established and what the apostles built, and it is the God-ordained means of preserving and promoting the truth. The church is "the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Timothy 3:15). It should be obvious that this is not some universal church, but is a local, New Testament assembly. The immediate context of 1 Timothy 3:15 deals with qualifications for pastors and deacons (1 Timothy 3:1-13). Timothy was being instructed in the practical matters of church life.

Where have the independent New Testament churches stood in reference to Bible texts and versions? The textual scholars and the ivory tower theologians have sported themselves with every sort of new thought and have been all too eager to toss aside the Old Bible. The Word of God has been preserved among the Bible-believing churches, and there can be no doubt that in the English-speaking world the humble New Testament churches for the past 400 years have stood almost exclusively for the Received Text and the King James Bible. The exceptions do not overthrow the rule. That this is the old landmark is beyond argument. Even since 1970, amidst the growing popularity of the New International Version, old-fashioned, independent, Bible-believing, separatist churches have, with few exceptions, continued to hold to the King James Bible.

These churches don't want new doctrine, and they don't want a new Bible. They are striving to carry out the Lord's program after the fashion of the early churches. The churches scattered across the land that train their own men for the ministry exemplify this attitude. These local-church Bible institutes are multiplying rapidly in a day in which compromise and apostasy are rampant in the established schools and in which pastors are seeing the need to train their own men.

An example of this are the churches which use the materials published by the **BIBLE BAPTIST CHURCH OF OAK HARBOR, WASHINGTON**. This church was started in 1974 by Pastor **Gary Prisk** (1947-2006) and was formally organized as an independent Baptist church in March of 1975. Soon after the church was started, Pastor Prisk began holding classes for those who wanted a systematic program of Bible training. For 20 years he conducted a three-year Bible institute, with a fourth year for those who are preparing for the ministry. In 1988 **Robert Sargent** (b. 1948) came to Bible Baptist from Perth, Australia to assume the position of Associate Pastor, and he took over part of the teaching of the Pastor's School. In 1989 the church began publishing the four-year

curriculum, and in the first six years the number of churches conducting their own Bible institutes with the Bible Baptist Church curriculum had grown to 97. Roughly 7,000 volumes of the various sections of this curriculum were distributed in 1993 and 1994. The philosophy behind this church-centered training is presented in a pamphlet called *Training Men for the Ministry*:

> "The responsibility for equipping men for the ministry rests Scripturally and squarely upon every New Testament Baptist church and its pastor. This fact is made clear from Ephesians 4:11-12—'And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.' Apart from a Bible-believing Baptist church, no other organization can adequately equip an individual for ministry—on any level!"

It is impossible to know how many independent churches overall have such programs. The fundamental Baptist churches that support independent missions, local church Bible training, and local church Bible publishing number in the thousands, and it is not uncommon for these churches to have a few hundred members.

The point is that these churches do exist as a major force in North America and with few exceptions they stand for the King James Bible. The position of the Bible Baptist Church of Oak Harbor, Washington, illustrates the position commonly held by this type of church.

> "The Old and New Testaments are a divine revelation and constitute the Word of God. ... Thus it is our sole authority in all matters of faith and practice. (The King James Version 1611 is an example of an honest and accurate translation of these manuscripts.) We believe it can be used with confidence and authority. ... The instruments of government shall be in the Holy Bible (the Authorized, King James Version) and the Articles of Faith (Instrument I), Constitution and By-Laws (Instrument II), and Church Policy (Instrument III)" (*Member Handbook*, Bible Baptist Church, Oak Harbor, Washington, January 1995 Edition).

One of the courses in the Bible Baptist Church curriculum is *Manuscript Evidence* by Robert Sargent. The textbook contains 323 pages (8.5X11 inch) of typeset notes plus 70 pages of appendices. The course contains 15 lectures providing "a detailed, objective study, proving beyond doubt that the Authorized, King James Version of 1611 A.D. is the preserved Word of God in the English language."

We could also mention **WAY OF LIFE LITERATURE'S ADVANCED BIBLE STUDIES SERIES**. We began publishing these in 2002 and currently there are 29 titles. Many churches use this as a Bible-training curriculum, and one of the titles is *The Bible Version Issue: A Course on Bible Texts and Versions and a Defense of the King James Bible.* In this course we examine five reasons for holding to the KJV: (1) because of the doctrine of divine preservation, which authenticates the Traditional Greek Text underlying the King James Bible, (2) because the theories

of textual criticism supporting the Modern Greek Text are heretical, (3) because the modern texts and versions are a product of end-time apostasy, (4) because of the King James Bible's superior doctrine, and (5) because of its unmatched heritage. The course concludes with an exciting study on the history of the English Bible from Wycliffe to the 1611 KJV.

BIBLE COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

I have tried to verify all of the information contained in the following section. It is my intention not to include schools that have a mere preference for the King James Bible without solid convictions in this area, though I cannot guarantee that I have achieved perfect success. My criteria in including a school is that it must hold a public position that the Traditional Greek and Hebrew text is the preserved Word of God, that the King James Bible is an accurate translation thereof, and that the modern versions are based upon corrupted texts.

Since I do not have a full personal knowledge of the inner workings of all of the institutions mentioned, it is entirely possible, of course, that I have overlooked significant facts. A school can have a fine-sounding position on paper without implementing it consistently throughout the training program. Some schools that say they stand for the King James Bible do no such thing. They bring in teachers that have no clear understanding of the issues and who lack personal convictions in this important matter. Or worse, they bring in teachers who privately support or sympathize with the critical text and the modern versions, or who think there is no significant difference between the texts and versions. Or they allow teachers to undermine the King James Bible with their private translations and "better renderings." It is one thing to interpret and explain the King James Bible; it is quite another thing to correct it and undermine it. Also, schools can change position quickly in this day of compromise.

Please understand that the inclusion of an institution in this book is not our stamp of approval upon it. We have only made this list for the purpose of documenting the defense of the King James Bible.

If a reader has plain information that any of the institutions listed do not truly stand for the King James Bible and the Received Text, we would like to hear from you. I want to correct any real mistakes in this book. On the other hand, if you have a bone to pick with any of these, write to them, not to me.

If any reader knows of other schools that stand for the King James Bible we would like to know so we can include them in a future edition of the book.

The schools are listed in alphabetical order.

AMBASSADOR BAPTIST COLLEGE

Ambassador Baptist College (Lattimore, North Carolina, was founded by **Evangelist Ron Comfort** (b. 1938) with the primary goal of training fundamental Baptist preachers. It stands without hesitation for the Received Text and the King James Bible as the only accurate English translation thereof. **Dr. James Qurollo** (b. 1942, former Academic Dean and Greek professor, explained the position of the school:

> "We do not believe there are mistakes in the King James Version, and our staff does not do any correcting of the King James Version. The only English version of the Bible we use is the King James Version, and the only Greek text we use is the Greek text produced by the Trinitarian Bible Society, which is the Greek text underlying the English Authorized Version of 1611. Faculty members are not hired who do not hold to this position."

Qurollo's testimony in the matter of Bible texts is interesting:

> I graduated from Wheaton College in 1964 with my Bachelor's Degree with a major in Greek and I graduated in January of 1966 with my Master's Degree with a major in New Testament. I was taught the Westcott-Hort position during my days at Wheaton, and I accepted it without questioning it. As a matter of fact, I used the R.S.V in my master's degree thesis. In 1967 I became convinced that I was a separatist and a Baptist, and I withdrew from the Wheaton crowd, from interdenominationalism, and from New Evangelicalism.
>
> I subscribed for a number of years to *Bibliothec Sacra* which was produced by the faculty of Dallas Theological Seminary. In October 1968 *Bibliotheca Sacra* contained an article by Dr. Zane C. Hodges entitled 'The Greek Text of the King James Version.' **THIS ARTICLE WAS MY FIRST INTRODUCTION TO THE FACT THAT THERE WAS A TEXTUAL CONTROVERSY. PRIOR TO THIS ARTICLE I HAD NOT EVEN REALIZED THAT THE MATTER WAS NOT COMPLETELY SETTLED AND ACCEPTED BY EVERYONE.** I did not understand the article at all, but I also never forgot about it. In their January 1971 issue *Bibliotheca Sacra* published a second article by Dr. Zane Hodges entitled 'Rationalism and Contemporary New Testament Criticism.' I also did not understand this article, but I made a mental note of it. The idea made no sense to me, but I remember it.
>
> In the late 1970's I enrolled in the Doctor of Theology program at Luther Rice Seminary. As my major work I wanted to do a study on the principles and praxis of exegesis using the Greek text of Romans as my praxis. For my dissertation I wanted to do a commentary on Romans written on the level of laymen in my church. Meanwhile, the Dean Burgon Society came into existence. Maranatha Baptist Bible College hosted a meeting, and one of my deacons brought a book back from that conference written by Edward Miller and titled *A Guide to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. I was not particularly interested in reading the book; yet, the memory of Zane Hodges' two articles in *Bibliotheca Sacra* haunted me just enough that I determined to figure this thing out. Somehow along the way I had learned that S. Franklin Logsdon had been a part of the New American Standard Committee and then had to go into print to

> apologize for it. Inasmuch as I desired to write and publish New Testament commentaries, inasmuch as I had no interest in changing my position after I had published several, and inasmuch as I respected the ability of a Dallas professor whom I do not know and whom I have never met, I determined it wise to study the matter once and for all and to come to a conclusion before I went out and embarrassed myself. At the same time I read some publications and/or pamphlets written by well-intentioned individuals who made a lot of noise in their defense of the King James but who also made statements which could never be defended. They almost drove me to the Westcott-Hort position, just as they may have driven others to that position. I remembered my battle to come out of New Evangelicalism and how that some fundamentalists wrote and said things which were not at all Scriptural. I remembered that it was the correctness of the position rather than the obnoxiousness of some who held it which had to be considered.
>
> Edward Miller's book was the first thing that made sense to me about Textual Criticism. I had already studied Bruce Metzger's book on textual criticism and Vincent Taylor's book on textual criticism when I was a student at Wheaton, but their methodology never set well with me. Edward Miller's book did. It wasn't long before I was reading Burgon's books, Wilbur Pickering's *Identity of the New Testament Text*, and all the rest I could get my hands on. I became convinced that the manuscripts of the Textus Receptus tradition were more reliable than the manuscripts of the Westcott-Hort textual position. This was approximately 1980.
>
> I went on to complete my Doctor of Theology degree using the Trinitarian Bible Society's Greek New Testament as my basis (Letter, March 5, 1995).

Since the late 1990s, **Dr. Charles Surrett** has been the Dean of Ambassador Baptist College. Dr. Surrett is Pastor of Emmanuel Baptist Church, Kings Mountain, North Carolina. He has a B.A. from Pillsbury Baptist Bible College and an M.R.E., M.Div., and D.Min. from Central Baptist Seminary.

Dr. Surrett's book *Which Greek Text: The Debate Among Fundamentalists* (1999) defends the Received Text against the critical text. He states that the doctrine of bibilical preservation is the watershed issue in this debate and he documents the association between modern textual criticism and theological modernism. He writes:

> There seems to be a parallel between the integration of Darwinian evolutionary thought into the theology of committed Bible-believers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with that of the acceptance of Westcott-Hort at the same period in history. The mood, especially in Europe and North America, favored scientific investigation as an ultimate source of truth. The Liberals capitalized on this 'modern' way of thinking to produce what has become known as Higher Criticism. Fundamentalists rejected those Liberal conclusions, but still felt the need to accommodate what they thought were the findings of science (*Which Greek Text*, p. 13).

Dr. Surrett is a Christian gentleman and he calls for men on all sides of this issue to exercise a spiritual demeanor.

> Nor should the debate rage at the level of name-calling and character assassination. The mere fact that a preacher or an author can string together a

> long list of derogatory adjectives to describe his opponents should not be taken as proof of his position. The sin nature of man is such that he seldom listens to the logic of an opponent who has insulted him. . . . If one truly desires to edify and persuade others to agree with him, he must use Biblical constraint in the manner of his presentation. The admonition of II Tim. 2:24-25 is appropriate here. . . . Rather than erecting theological 'straw men' and then blowing them down, it would seem far more profitable to discuss real issues like real Christians should (*Which Greek Text*, pp. 9, 10).

BAPTIST COLLEGE OF AMERICA

Baptist College of America is a ministry of Temple Baptist Church of Kokomo, Indian. The church was founded in 1963. Mike Holloway, who has been the pastor of the church since 1988, founded the college. The school's statement of faith says: "We believe in the verbal, plenary inspiration of the entire Bible, both Old and New Testaments. We further accept the Textus Receptus manuscripts from which came the King James Bible and accept the King James Bible as the divinely preserved Word of God in the English language."

BETHANY DIVINITY COLLEGE AND SEMINARY

Bethany Divinity College and Seminary was founded in 1973 as North Georgia Bible College and Seminary. In 1982 the school moved to Dothan, Alabama, and the name was changed to Bethany Bible College and Theological Seminary. In 2003 the name was again changed to Bethany Divinity College and Seminary, largely to distinguish itself from other schools that are named Bethany. It identifies itself as an "independent, conservative, Bible based school, Baptist in identification, but trans-denominational in its student body." The Chancellor is **H.D. Shuemake**. The school's doctrinal statement says, "We accept the Authorized Version (King James) of the Bible to be the preserved Word of God and use no other translation in our classroom."

CALVARY BAPTIST BIBLE COLLEGE

Calvary Baptist Bible College is a ministry of the Calvary Baptist Church of King, North Carolina, in the foothills of the Smoky Mountains. The church started in 1969 and the school in 1988. **Roger Baker** (b. 1950), who was the pastor of Calvary from 1976 to 2008, founded the school. **Kevin Broyhill** is the senior pastor today. It takes a stand for the King James Bible and uses only the Received Text in the Greek department. The doctrinal statement says: "We believe that God has preserved His word for all generations. We further believe the KJV is an accurate and faithful English translation of the original manuscripts. For this reason, the King James Version of the Bible shall be the official and only translation used by this church in all of its public ministries." In May 2001 there were 17 students enrolled in the Bible college. It operates on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. Pastors in the area help with the teaching, and the faculty averages 15 years of experience in the ministry. I talked with Scott

Barney on a visit to the church on May 15, 2001. He was one of the first four students to enroll in the school, and today he is the associate pastor of Calvary Baptist Church. He told me that several graduates of the school have gone on to be pastors and missionaries.

CANADIAN BAPTIST BIBLE COLLEGE

Canadian Bible College is a ministry of Pembina Valley Baptist Church, Winkler, Manitoba. **Michael Sullivant** (b. 1957) is the pastor and president. The church was started in December 1988 and the school in 1996. The statement of faith says: "We believe that the Holy Bible, consisting of sixty-six books of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, was written by men divinely inspired and It is a perfect treasure of Heavenly instruction; that It has God for It's Author, salvation for Its end, and truth without any mixture of error for Its matter; that It reveals the principles by which God will judge us; and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the world, the true center of Christian union, and the supreme Standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and opinions should be tried. We believe that the preserved Word of God for the English speaking people is the King James Version of the Bible. II Tim. 3:16-17; II Peter 1:21; II Sam. 23:2; Acts 1:16; Acts 3:21; John 10:35; Luke 16:29-31; Prov. 30:5-6; John 17:17; Rev. 22:18, 19; Rom. 3:4; 2:12; John 12:47, 48."

In an e-mail to me dated September 18, 2008, Pastor Sullivant said: "In 1996 I had 'Uncle Mel Rutter' for a mission's conference and had five of our married men surrender to preach. I started meeting with them on Saturday mornings from 9 am to noon and went verse by verse through the Pastoral Epistles. We determined to start a Bible Institute and soon after went to a three-year diploma program and a four-year degree program. We have 49 students this fall. Our main thrust and desire is to train people for ministry. As for how I came to the conviction about the TR/KJV, my background is not a strong King James one so I have reached this by study and, of course, the Spirit of God and the simplicity that is in Christ. I am a simple man and take God at His Word. God said that he would preserve His word and I believe Him. In studying the issue I came to my conviction that the King James Bible is the Word of God and is without error. Any difficulty is with my understanding, not with God's Word. On the flip side, when reading the material of those who defend the modern versions I find they really have no credible argument and they spend their time trying to discredit the King James Bible believers and are very divisive. They put themselves in the place of authority rather than allowing God through His Word be the authority."

CHAMPION BAPTIST COLLEGE

Champion Baptist College is a ministry of Gospel Light Baptist Church in Hot Springs, Arkansas. Pastor **Eric Capaci** is Chancellor, and **Judson Mitchell** is President. The church was founded in 1992. Its statement of faith says: "We

believe that the Bible is the inerrant, inspired Word of God and that it is our final authority in all matters of faith and practice. For reasons of textual reliability, we believe that God has preserved His Word for the English speaking people in the King James Version of the Bible."

CROWN COLLEGE

Crown College is a ministry of Temple Baptist Church, Powell, Tennessee. **Clarence Sexton**, senior pastor, is President. **David Rosser** is Executive Vice President and **Loyd Ewing** is Academic Dean. The school's statement of faith says: "We believe in verbal, plenary inspiration in the original writings, and God's preservation of His pure words to every generation (II Timothy 3:16, Psalms 12:6-8). The Masoretic Text of the Old Testament and the Received Text of the New Testament (Textus Receptus) are those texts of the original languages we accept and use; the King James Version of the Bible is the only English version we accept and use."

EMMANUEL BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Emmanuel Baptist Theological Seminary of Newington, Connecticut, was founded in January 2000. It is a ministry of Emmanuel Baptist Church and **Thomas Strouse** is the Dean. The school's literature emphasizes that "Emmanuel Baptist Theological Seminary is an independent, local-church, Baptist seminary which stands without apology for the Word of God (Textus Receptus/KJV), for our Baptist heritage, for a balance between biblical scholarship and practical application, and for the primacy of preaching." The school will not seek accreditation with the state of Connecticut or with any secular accrediting association. The seminary offers three degree programs: Master of Biblical Studies (32 hours), Master of Divinity (96 hours), and Doctor of Ministry (32 hours). The Master of Divinity requires 12 hours of Greek and 12 of Hebrew.

The following is from the school's doctrinal statement: "We believe in the verbal, plenary inspiration of the Old and New Testaments and the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice. We believe that the process of inspiration ceased with the *autographa*. The Textus Receptus is essentially the preserved *autographa* and the Authorized Version (KJV) is an accurate and trustworthy translation of the TR. Consequently, the Authorized Version is the Word of God in the English language."

Michael Bates, former president of the school, authored the 346-page *Syllabus on Inspiration, Preservation, and the KJV* (2000). It covers the nature and transmission of the biblical text from a viewpoint of confidence in God's promises.

Dr. Strouse has authored many publications dealing with Bible defense. His 1992 book "The Lord God Hath Spoken: A Guide to Bibliology deals with revelation,

inspiration, canonicity, illumination, and interpretation. A 1996 publication is entitled "Fundamentalism and the Authorized Version." In 2001, Dr. Strouse published an excellent book on preservation entitled "But My Words Shall Not Pass Away: The Biblical Defense of the Doctrine of the Preservation of Scripture." He compares the faith position with that of modern textual criticism, which assumes that God's Word was not divinely kept. Dr. Strouse has also authored an effective reply to the book *From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man*.

See the section on Tabernacle Baptist Seminary of Virginia Beach, Virginia, for more about Dr. Strouse.

FAIRHAVEN BAPTIST COLLEGE

Fairhaven Baptist College of Chesterton, Indian, was founded in 1977 by **Roger Voegtlin** (1943- . It is a ministry of the Fairhaven Baptist Church. In a letter dated March 20, 1995, Pastor Voegtlin gave the following testimony:

> We started Fairhaven Baptist Church with one family in 1970 using the Authorized King James Version from the beginning. Fairhaven Baptist College was begun in 1977 with 13 students. The school has grown slowly but steadily with 220 this school year and 41 graduating in May. Because we really started to flourish in the past five or six years, we only have approximately 250 graduates; however, over 90% are in full-time service today.
>
> After attending secular schools for three years, I enrolled in Bob Jones University. There I had a tremendous battle with professors' teachings pertaining to the inspiration and preservation of God's Word. When we were taught that portions of the Scriptures we held were not actually inspired, I, as a logical person, began to doubt the entire Bible and even the existence of God. After much prayer and the study of what God had to say, I rejected what the professors said and held to my King James Version of the Bible as being preserved by God. Our high esteem for God's Word permeates all courses at Fairhaven; however, Bible texts and versions are taught in depth by **Chris McNeill** in Biblical Studies.

FAITHWAY BAPTIST COLLEGE

Faithway Baptist College is a ministry of Faithway Baptist Church in Ajax, Ontario, Canada. It is located on the outskirts of metropolitan Toronto. This fundamental Baptist school was founded by Bob Kirkland in 1983. James O. Phillips, the first President, died of cancer in 1984. **Gregory Baker** (b. 1958), who became pastor of Faithway in May 1987, is the college President. During the early years, the Nestle's Text was used in the Greek classes. The switch was made, though, to the Received Text and today the school is committed to this position. In a letter dated March 13, 1995, Pastor Baker told me, "A new catalogue is being prepared for September of this year, and it will have a more detailed statement concerning the Bible. ... Our new catalog will state that we

use only the Received Text in our Greek studies, and that we believe this is the preserved Word of God." Faithway conducted a Bible seminar in February 1995, to defend the King James Bible and the Received Text.

FUNDAMENTAL BAPTIST BIBLE COLLEGE

Fundamental Baptist Bible College of Perth, Australia, began in 1981 as a ministry of missionary Ken Burdett. In 1983 **Robert Sargent** (b. 1948) became pastor of the church and assumed the directorship of the school until 1988 when he moved to Bible Baptist Church of Oak Harbor, Washington. **James Manning** has been the head of the school since then. The college has been a cooperative ministry of Independent Baptist churches in Perth, and though relatively small (as are most church ministries in Australia), it has always stood for the King James Bible and has graduated many men who have gone on to stand in defense of the Old Bible.

GEORGIA BAPTIST COLLEGE

Georgia Baptist College is a ministry of Peachtree Baptist Church of Senoia, Georgia. **David Dickerson** is the pastor and president. The church, which started in 1999, was formerly Mt. Pisgah Baptist Church of south Fulton County. Because of a fire that destroyed the church property, it moved to Senoia. The college began in 1999. In 2008 Pete Van Kleeck taught a series of lectures on the Bible version issue.

GOLDEN STATE BAPTIST COLLEGE

Golden State Baptist College is a ministry of North Valley Baptist Church of Santa Clara, California. It started in 1975 and **Jack Trieber** was called as pastor in 1976. An institute was established in 1992 and the college in 1996. The school's doctrinal statement says: "The King James Version of the Bible shall be the official and only English-language translation used by Golden State Baptist College."

GRACE AND TRUTH FELLOWSHIP BAPTIST COLLEGE

Grace And Truth Fellowship Baptist College of Gary, Indiana, is a tuition-free school, training Christians for full-time service. Pastor **R.J. Bruno** is in charge. In a letter to me dated March 25, 1995, he said, "We have been training our men and their sons freely since April 1985, word by word, verse by verse through the entire King James Bible (1611) since our church and schools began, using the Textus Receptus. We do teach and show the difference between many of the new perverted versions of God's Word in our schools, and all our teachers must hold to and believe God's Word as the KJV-1611 to teach here in any of our three schools, in addition to being a daily soul winner for Jesus! Our K3-12th grade Christian school began July 1989, and is tuition free for the children of our families. We use a 90% passing-grade standard in our Christian school and college since God

expects our best. Our 36-month college began September 1989, and is for freely training men, women, and teenagers to be elementary and secondary Christian school teachers. We operate all three of our schools Monday through Friday, 52 weeks per year, thus enabling our students to graduate in three calendar years instead of the usual four."

GREAT PLAINS BAPTIST COLLEGE

Great Plains Baptist College of Sioux Falls, South Dakota, was established as a Bible institute in 1977 and a college in 1979. A seminary was added in 1986. Pastor **Ron Tottingham** (b. 1945) founded the school in his church, the Empire Baptist Temple. The school has defended the King James Bible since its inception. In a letter to me dated March 9, 1995, he said, "We got into the version battle in 1975 after reading something by Dr. David Otis Fuller. I wasn't aware of the issue prior to 1975. We began this church in April of 1974."

HEARTLAND BAPTIST COLLEGE

Heartland Baptist College, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, was founded in 1998. It is the new incarnation of the Pacific Coast Baptist College of California. **Sam Davison**, pastor of Southwest Baptist Church in Oklahoma City, is the president. **Jeff Copes** is Executive Vice President, and **Roger Howse** is Academic Dean.

The school's doctrinal statement says: "We believe the Authorized (King James) Version Old and New Testaments are the Word of God kept intact for English-speaking peoples by way of God's divine providence and work of preservation; and that the Authorized Version translators were not 'inspired,' but were merely God's instruments used to preserve His words for English-speaking peoples."

HERITAGE BAPTIST UNIVERSITY

Heritage Baptist University of Greenwood, Indiana, was founded in 1955 by Ford Porter, author of the widely-used gospel tract *God's Simple Plan of Salvation*. The school was called the Berean Bible Institute at first. In 1967 it was named Indiana Baptist College. Leon Maurer was president during that time. From the beginning, Porter used and defended the KJV. In 1975, the college was moved from the downtown area of Indianapolis to the south suburban area under **Dr. Clinton Brainine** (b. 1926, who led the school for ten years. At that time, with the matter of Bible texts becoming more of an issue, the school took the position of the Dean Burgon Society. This remains the position of the school today under the direction of Russell Dennis, Jr., the son of the late **Dr. Russell Dennis** (1932-1998, who was president from 1985, when the Indiana Baptist College was merged with the Heritage Baptist University, until his death

in 1998. Russell Dennis, Jr., Dr. Branine, and Greek teacher **John Krinke** (b. 1942) are all involved with the Dean Burgon Society. Dr. Branine has prepared a class syllabus teaching this view (*The History of Bible Families and the English Bible*) and has written several position papers on the text issue in support of the Traditional Text and the King James Version.

The late Russell Dennis, who had a Ph.D. from Bob Jones University, gave the following testimony in a letter to me dated March 13, 1995:

> My story is similar to many others who have always held to the KJV before it was an issue. When it became an issue in the 1970's, I studied what I could find and deepened my convictions on the TR and KJV. ... In the early 1980's we came to the conviction that we must defend what we hold dear and precious. We cannot understand how any Bible teaching institution can state that they use the KJV and do not defend it. To us, the KJV is clearly the Word of God and should be the text in college classrooms and in local churches. We invited the Dean Burgon Society to hold their Fifteenth Annual Meeting at HBU in July of 1993, to show our agreement with them.

In April 1998, the Heritage Baptist University hosted a "Disproving the Myths" conference, the goal of which was "to present information that strengthens believers in the biblical conviction that God has given us His Word." The speakers addressed such questions as "What difference does the Bible version issue make?" and "Is Lower Criticism our friend?" Speakers included Clinton Branine, John Krinke, Ed Egbert (D.D.), and Kirk DiVietro (Ph.D.).

While attending that conference, I had the following interview with Dr. Branine:

> Cloud: Could you tell me, Dr. Branine, when you were born?
>
> Branine: June 12, 1926.
>
> Cloud: And when were you saved?
>
> Branine: Seven years later in the month of July.
>
> Cloud: Was that a Baptist church you were saved in?
>
> Branine: No, my mother was led to the Lord by some old-fashioned Pentecostalists. They knocked on the door and led her to the Lord. And so it was about four or five years before we went to a Baptist church. That whole group went to the Baptist church.
>
> Cloud: So you were saved when you were a child?
>
> Branine: Yes, seven years old.
>
> Cloud: Where were you educated theologically?
>
> Branine: I was educated in Denver, CO, at the Rockmont College, which today is called Colorado Christian University. Then I attended the Denver Conservative Baptist Seminary when it was first started and graduated from there in 1951.

Cloud: And you took Greek, of course?

Branine: Yes, twelve hours of Greek.

Cloud: How long have you taught here at Heritage Baptist University?

Branine: About 28 years. While I was pastoring, I taught a class or two. I'd go in on a Thursday about 7:30, early in the morning, and speak two hours or so. Seven years ago, I came over full time.

Cloud: Have you been involved with a mission board?

Branine: Yes, Baptist World Mission. I was on the board soon after it was started.

Cloud: Who founded that board?

Branine: He came out of the old Conservative Baptist Fellowship of churches. It was a hardcore fundamentalist group that pulled out of the CBHMS background.

Cloud: Are you still associated with the mission board?

Branine: Yes, I'm still on the board.

Cloud: Were you educated to respect the Received Text and the King James Bible as the Word of God?

Branine: Well, we did respect that Bible. When I was educated, there was not a real battle over the Bible. They did herald the old American Standard Version in the schools, but it never caught on, so nobody really got excited about it. The scholars thought it was all right. We used it for class when we had to and that was about the extent of it.

Cloud: What about Greek? What kind of Greek text were you trained in?

Branine: We used the Nestles' Greek text. We didn't know there was anything else. That was all we had.

Cloud: When did you first come across the fact that there was another Greek text and that it was different?

Branine: It was down the road a long time. I was in Rockford, Illinois, and I finally woke up that there was another Greek text. I was given Dr. Wilbur Pickering's book *The Identity of the New Testament Text* and books edited by David Otis Fuller. After a few years, I began to delve into those somewhat and began to realize there were problems and difficulties. Then I began in earnest to get all the material I could on the subject. I had an interest in it, so I chased down material.

Cloud: You were first come in contact with the other positions in the early 70's, late 60's?

Branine: It would be in the 60's—mid 60's—when I first became aware there were a real differences.

Cloud: You said that you were in Scotland when you first came across Dr. Edward Hill's book *The King James Version Defended*, which first appeared in 1956.

Branine: My wife and I were in Scotland on a missionary tour. We had a young

couple from our church in Edinburgh. He took me to the bookstores. I had interest in books. I found Ed Hill's book on the text issue. I secured it and read it all the way back to Retick.

Cloud: What do you believe about the King James Bible today?

Branine: I hold that the King James Bible is the preserved Word of God in English. I hold that the originals were inspired and that good copies from good manuscripts was God's means of preservation. I feel that is what we have in the King James Bible. I do not hold that in regard to the new versions; I feel there is corruption involved.

Cloud: Do you believe this is an important issue today? Do you believe this is a divisive thing among Christians?

Branine: It is divisive, but I feel that it is one of the most important issues we are facing and the outcome of it will determine whether we remain fundamentalists or not.

Heritage Baptist University hosted the annual Dean Burgon Society meeting in July 1999. One of the speakers was Dr. Kirk DiVitro. The following is an interview I had with him:

Cloud: Dr. DiVitro, when were you born?

DiVitro: August 29, 1952.

Cloud: And when were you saved?

DiVitro: Palm Sunday, 1971

Cloud: Was that in the Baptist church?

DiVitro: When I went to church, I went to a Baptist church, but I got saved in my parents' living room. The Holy Spirit brought everything back to remembrance and made everything make sense.

Cloud: Amen. When did you become a Baptist? Were your parents Baptists?

DiVitro: Yes, after I got saved, I went to the church and made a profession of faith and joined the church.

Cloud: What about your education? Where were you educated in theology?

DiVitro: I spent a year and a half in a Wesleyen College in Allentown, Pennsylvania. From there I transferred to Liberty (today Liberty University, then Liberty Baptist College), and finished my bachelor's degree there. Then in 1986 or so, I attended a small school in Maryland, Baptist International School of Theology, and there earned a couple of degrees and did my work on the Greek New Testament for the computer.

Cloud: What did that involve?

DiVitro: We edited the computer codes that generate the Greek New Testament that the King James Bible came from. That's being used by *Logos Bible Software* and *Bible Works for Windows* now. And then, a few years ago, I enrolled in Liberty University external degree program and earned a Bachelor of Arts in

religion and a Master of Divinity.

Cloud: How much Greek did you take?

DiVitro: I had 14 hours of Greek back as a bachelor's program and I've continued with it all through the years.

Cloud: Were you trained that the Received Text and the King James Bible is the preserved Word of God?

DiVitro: No, Sir. We used the United Bible Societies' Third Edition in the college I went to. The way I came about it was as follows: I came home for Christmas break and wanted to try not to forget what I had learned. I took I John 5 and started to translate and when I got to verse 13, realized there were words missing. They had told me that if there were words taken out, there would be a footnote, but there was no footnote. I looked in the King James Bible and there were no italics, and I knew something was wrong. From there on I just started chasing it. I found a Berry's interlinear and found the words were there if you had the right Greek text. And just started doing statistical research until I found some sources.

Cloud: What do you believe about the King James Bible today?

DiVitro: I believe that what we have in the King James Bible is the preserved Word of God in the English language. I believe that the texts from which it came are the correct Hebrew and Greek texts. And I believe that the process of the King James Bible gave us an accurate translation that is reliable and is the derived Word of God.

Cloud: How long have you held that view?

DiVitro: I have held that view since my junior year in college, back to 1975.

Cloud: Do you believe this is an important issue?

DiVitro: Absolutely. I think if we don't have the preserved Word of God, then we have no Christianity. When someone tries to take my Bible away, whether they try to correct it or whether they try to tell me that it is inferior, they have taken away the foundation of my faith. I can't yield on even a word.

Heritage Baptist hosted another conference on the Bible version issue on April 3-4, 2000. The messages included the following: "Can Fundamentalists Follow the New Versions" by Dr. Clinton Brainine, "The Faith Imperative" by John Krinke, "Biblical Separation Applied to the Bible Version Issue" by David Cloud, and "Is the Septuagint Trustworthy?" by Kirk DiVietro. Krinke delivered an excellent message on the importance of basing one's position on the Bible on faith rather than human scholarship. As with the creation issue, we start with faith in God's own statements, then we analyze everything on that basis. One would think that this would be assumed by any Bible-believing Christian, but it is soundly denounced by most Christian scholars today, including evangelical. One of Krinke's Greek students graduated in 1999 and attended Grace Seminary in northern Indiana, in the fall. Sadly, he was already criticizing Krinke and Heritage for a "simplistic," "fidaistic (faith) approach to the Bible text subject. That is very

dangerous thinking in light of Hebrews 11:6 and Romans 14:23. We must never forget that human reasoning will never produce faith. Only God's Word produces faith (Romans 10:17; 1 Corinthians 2). Krinke gave several quotations from the writings of Donald Wallace, showing that Wallace holds the modernistic redaction theory and condemns those that believe that the Gospels were given simply by divine inspiration. The most frightful part of this is that Wallace is the head of the Greek department at Dallas Theological Seminary, where so many fundamental Baptist professors are going today to obtain their educational credentials. Wallace has written a Greek textbook that is used in many second year Greek classes at fundamental Baptist schools. It was the refusal to separate from modernism in education that helped destroy the New Evangelical 40 years ago, and it will do the same to today's fundamentalists if they continue to go down the same path. "Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners" (1 Cor. 15:33).

HISTORIC BAPTIST BIBLE COLLEGE AND SEMINARY

Historic Baptist Bible College and Seminary is a ministry of the Grace Missionary Baptist Church, Scarborough, Ontario. The school was founded in 1987 by Dr. **Gary La More**. In a letter of March 27, 1995, Dr. La More said, "We are a King James only school. Our sponsoring church is King James only. We make no apology for this. We not only educate our students in this regard but we also have trained our church family concerning the issues surrounding the text. Since I have personally studied most of the versions that have come out since 1611, I can see the influence of Satan on these new versions of the true word of God." An overview of Dr. La More's ministry is given under the section covering Maranatha Baptist Bible College.

HYLES-ANDERSON COLLEGE

Hyles-Anderson College is a ministry of First Baptist Church, Hammond, Indian. It was founded in 1972 by **Jack Hyles** (1926-2001) with funding from Christian businessman Russell Anderson. Since Hyles' death the school has been led by **Jack Schaap**, Hyles' son-in-law. The doctrinal statement says: "We believe in the verbal, plenary inspiration of the Bible. The Old and New Testament are definitely inspired word for word. We accept the Textus Receptus manuscripts from which came the King James Bible. The Scripture is the final authority in all matters of faith and practice." The 2008-2009 catalog says, "We stand for the King James Bible as the only Bible and the local New Testament church as the only true church."

LANDMARK BAPTIST COLLEGE

Landmark Baptist College of Haines City, Florida, is a ministry of the Landmark Baptist Church. In a letter to this author dated March 20, 1995, Pastor **Mickey P. Carter** (b. 1935), who founded the Landmark Baptist College, said, "I first became involved in the version battle 16 years ago when I noticed so many versions coming out. Our college began classes in 1979. From its conception, the college has always stood for the KJV." The written position of the school is as follows: "We believe the Bible to be the inspired, the only infallible, authoritative Word of God and that He has preserved it for the English-speaking world in the Authorized King James Bible." Landmark's philosophy of education is described in these words:

> We at Landmark Baptist College believe that God's program for service today is centered in the local, New Testament Baptist church. Therefore, we only graduate students that have committed themselves to a life of full-time Christian service as a member of a local, New Testament Baptist church. We are committed to training preachers, missionaries, evangelists, pastors, and second men, who will build King James Bible-believing, fundamental, separated, soul winning, Baptist churches. We also believe that an important arm of the local church is Christian education. Therefore, we also train administrators and teachers who are spiritually local-church oriented and professionally trained.

Dr. Carter has published a book entitled *Things That Are Different Are Not the Same: The Truth About the Battle for the Preserved King James Bible*, which contains material he has taught in a class at Landmark for more than 15 years. Carter understands the heart of the Bible version issue: Do we have an absolute biblical authority, or do we not?

> A Baptist preacher gets up to preach to his congregation, and the people are sitting there with their Bibles, thinking they have God's Word just like God wanted them to have it. Yet, the preacher tells them they cannot understand it on their own—they need someone to tell them what it really should have said or what it means instead of what it actually says. So, the preacher changes this or changes that and tells his people they do not really have the Word of God, that they need him to tell them what it really says. He tells them it is dangerous to interpret God's Word on their own; it is more important the way the church sees it, and the church's tradition surpasses the Word of God.
>
> If, because a preacher has had a little Greek or Hebrew, he becomes as a pope to his people, he has done them a great injustice. He will have sold out what the martyrs gave their very lives for: having the Bible in their own language. He is undermining what our forefathers fought for: putting the Bible in English so common men could read the Word of God for themselves (Carter, *Things That Are Different Are Not the Same*, p. 60).

As an interesting sideline, we note that Curtis Hutson, late editor of the *Sword of the Lord*, borrowed the title from Dr. Carter's book for a message he preached at the annual Southwide Baptist Fellowship meeting, October 3, 1994. This was the

last major sermon preached by Dr. Hutson, who had succeeded John R. Rice as editor of the *Sword* in 1980. Hutson died March 5, 1995. In his sermon "Things That Are Different Are not the Same," Hutson made five points: 1. Salvation by grace and salvation by works are not the same. 2. Lifestyle evangelism and soul winning are not the same. 3. The King James Bible and other English translations of the Bible are not the same. 4. Evangelicalism and fundamentalism are not the same. 5. Independent Baptists and Southern Baptists are not the same. It is point number three, of course, which touches the subject of this book, and we offer the following excerpt:

> The King James Bible was first printed in 1611, and for three hundred years it stood without a competitor. But since the turn of the century, we have had somewhere in the neighborhood of a hundred new English translations of the Bible.
>
> Why after three hundred years do men feel it necessary to come out with a new version every year? In nearly every case, if indeed not every case, these new Bibles are copyrighted, and someone makes money every time one is sold. I understand that the Revised Standard Version is copyrighted by the World Council of Churches and every time a copy is sold, money goes to the WCC.
>
> On the other hand, anyone who wishes to print a copy of the KJV can print it without having to pay a royalty to anyone. Someone has called it 'the people's Bible.' ...
>
> The King James Bible is the same Bible my father used, my grandfather used, my great grandfather used and my great-great grandfather used. No other Bible has been blessed of God as has the KJV. For three hundred years, 1611 until the turn of the century, great revivals were experienced using this Bible. Great churches were built, and multiplied thousands upon thousands of people were won to Christ with the KJV.
>
> **Why would God use it so mightily if there were something wrong with it?** We do not know of any other translation of the Bible that can claim such blessing from the Lord.
>
> It is not our intention here to argue manuscript evidence. We are simply saying, 'Things that are different are not the same.' When you walk across a parking lot and see one automobile with a name tag that says Lincoln and another that says Ford, you know immediately they are not the same.
>
> **And when you see a Bible with a different name, such as the Living Bible, the Revised Standard Version and many others, you know immediately that it is not the same as the old KJV that has been blessed by God for hundreds of years.**
>
> I was in a doctor's office a few weeks back, and the doctor brought in a preacher friend of his to meet me. We sat and talked for awhile, and his preacher friend quoted John 3:36. 'He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that OBEYETH not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.' I listened carefully, knowing that he did not quote the King James Bible.
>
> He proceeded, then, to tell me how one must obey Christ in order to be saved.

> And he presented a totally different plan of salvation than salvation by grace through faith.
>
> When he had finished, I asked, 'Exactly what degree of obedience is necessary in order for the wrath of God not to abide on an individual?'
>
> He thought a moment and then replied, 'Absolute obedience.'
>
> 'In that case,' I said, 'I'm not saved because there have been times I have not obeyed Christ. Now I wish I had obeyed Him a hundred percent of the time, but I must be honest and say at times I've been disobedient.' And then I added, 'I don't know anyone else who has obeyed Christ one hundred percent of the time.'
>
> Immediately he began to try to explain away his statement. I told him the reason he got into trouble was that he quoted the wrong version of the Bible. I recognized it as the American Standard Version because I had read enough sermons by Dr. R.A. Torrey to know.
>
> While we believe the King James Bible is the preserved Word of God, we do not make the extreme claims that some make—that is, we do not believe that you can use the English to correct the Greek from which the English is translated. ...
>
> We never like to judge the motives of individuals, so we will name no particular translation here. But it appears to us that there are two basic reasons for one to change the Bible: first, men want to change what it teaches to coincide with their own preconceived ideas or beliefs; and second, they want to popularize the Bible to which they hold the copyright so that they can make money. After all, the Bible is still the world's best seller; and if someone can change it just enough to get a copyright and make his particular version the most popular in the country, he can be a wealthy man in short order.
>
> When you see a Bible with a different name across the front than the King James Version, remember, 'Things that are different are not the same' (Curtis Hutson, "Things That Are Different Are not the Same," *Sword of the Lord*, Oct. 21, 1994).

Dr. Hutson argued for the King James Bible from the standpoint of its history and power. These are good points, but in the opinion of this writer, his statement left something to be desired for at least two reasons. First, Dr. Hutson said he did not want to argue manuscript evidence, which we assume is a reference to the issues surrounding the texts underlying the versions. It is impossible, though, to defend the Authorized Version and to oppose the modern versions properly without dealing with these matters, because they are foundational. The text underlying the modern versions is corrupt. Regardless of how carefully and accurately any modern version is translated, it cannot be pure because it is translated from the wrong text. The textual issue cannot be ignored. It desperately NEEDS to be dealt with in fundamental Baptist circles. The eclectic Greek text should be exposed for the corruption that it is. To hold to the King James Bible without dealing with the textual issue is to refuse to deal with the heart of the matter. Many young preachers are being brainwashed with

eclecticism. To say that the KJV has a glorious history is not sufficient to counteract this training. The case must be made for the superiority of the Received Text.

Second, Dr. Hutson's statement fell short of being as important as it could have been because he failed to mention the modern version that has the greatest influence among fundamentalists—the New International Version. He mentioned the American Standard Version and the Revised Standard Version, but these have little influence among fundamentalists. It is the NIV that is making the deepest inroads. The things he said were applicable to every modern version including the NIV, but we would have liked to have seen this one exposed plainly.

Having said that, it was encouraging to see the editor of the *Sword* take this stand for the King James Bible and against the modern versions. Dr. Hutson did make it clear that he believed that all the modern versions are inferior to the King James. This is significant because the *Sword of the Lord* has not taken this position in the past. Dr. Rice spoke against "King James Fans" [see the Index for more about this] and believed the American Standard Version is no less the inspired Word of God than the Authorized Version. He did not believe the varying Greek texts required an either/or decision. His was the typical position of Greek departments in some fundamental Bible colleges and seminaries that are mimicking the scholarship of the modernists. Dr. Rice's daughters have followed in his footsteps in this regard with their *Joyful Woman* publication. The January-February 1992 issue contained an advertisement for the New International Version.

After Hutson's death, Shelton Smith became the new *Sword* editor, and we were interested to see in the July 28, 1995, issue a front page article by Harold B. Sightler (1914-1995, in which he exalted the King James Bible with these words:

> **I FIND NOTHING WRONG WITH THE KING JAMES VERSION**. When I was at Furman, it was suggested to me that the Bible was filled with contradictions and mistakes. I graduated from Furman in 1946, and I HAVE BEEN PLOWING THROUGH THIS KING JAMES BIBLE ALL THESE YEARS. I HAVE YET TO FIND ONE MISTAKE, ONE CONTRADICTION. If there were as many as I was led to believe, I should have stumbled over at least one by now. I AM CONVINCED THAT WE HAVE A PERFECT WORD OF GOD. We are going to stand by it, preach from it and lift up the arms of a publication like the *Sword of the Lor* that doesn't apologize for the King James Bible. One of the curses of our day is the many translations that are totally unneeded and are totally money-making deals. I wouldn't help them out if I were you. **I would just stay with this old-fashioned King James Bible** (emphasis added) (Harold Sightler, "Seven Ways to See Good Days," *Sword of the Lord,* July 28, 1995).

Dr. Sightler, who died less than two months after that article was published, was an old timer in fundamental Baptist circles. In 1952 he founded the Tabernacle Baptist Church of Greenville, South Carolina. In 1995 he was the oldest living member of the Cooperating Board of the *Sword of the Lord*. It is refreshing to see an unequivocal testimony about the Bible in a popular fundamental Baptist

publication, and we pray that this position will grow stronger and will not be watered down in coming days.

One of the curses of this hour is the strange position taken by some that say they believe the King James Bible is the preserved Word of God, but they WILL NOT take a stand against the modern versions. This is an impossible position. Indeed, things that are different are NOT the same! Some do not want to have any conflict over the Bible version issue. Friends, if the Bible itself is not worthy of conflict, what is? The deity of Christ? What do we know about Christ's deity that we did not learn from THE BIBLE? Salvation by grace alone through faith alone? What do we know about this apart from THE BIBLE? The Bible is the foundation for everything we believe and do as Christians, and if we are not willing to contend for the textual and translational purity of the Bible, we are shadow boxing in regard to everything else. It is the Bible that God has MAGNIFIED ABOVE ALL HIS NAME (Psalm 138:2). In light of this I cannot understand how it would be possible to be TOO zealous for the details of the Word of God.

Let us return now to the subject at hand, Dr. Carter's book *Things That Are Different Are not the Same*. The epilogue to this book, "Recent British Museum Experience," is so fascinating that I have gotten his permission to include it in this book. Take a walk with this man of God through the British Museum and observe how the preserved Word of God has disappeared from the halls of scholarship today:

> While this book was nearing its final assembly process, I received a twenty-third anniversary gift from my church, a trip to old England. On Saturday ... March 20, 1993, I visited the world-famous British Museum. My main interest, of course, was the old Bibles and their supporting manuscripts.
>
> I walked through the special displays that were set up for the general public. These consisted mainly of Latin copies, with their special artwork often included among the pages. These later bibles [Dr. Carter does not capitalize 'bible' when referring to corrupted editions], most in codex form, dated to the twelfth or fourteenth centuries or later. Also, under glass there appeared to be authentic copies of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts.
>
> In another room there were copies of the English Bibles, beginning, of course, with Wycliffe's, Tyndale's, on through the Geneva, and, finally, the King James. Frankly, their collection was no more complete than the one our own church has in our front foyer.
>
> Dr. William L. Hiltz, our college dean, and I tried unsuccessfully to get into the Archives that are reserved for the 'scholars.' Since we did not have a prearranged appointment or a letter of recommendation, the guard would not allow us in. The guard did tell us the curator was off on Saturday, but otherwise might have met with us. The guard then called another staff person, but that person knew nothing of the Textus Receptus and kept wanting to take us out to see the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus. The staff person seemed a little embarrassed that they knew nothing about the manuscripts in the King James lineage. This was especially true when I pointed out that they only had on display

two manuscripts (the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) for the Latin (Catholic) bible, but were not displaying any of the 5,000 manuscripts behind the Authorized Version for which England and her King, King James, were famous.

As Dr. Hiltz and I left the Archives office, he remarked, **'It seems there is a deep, dark conspiracy to withhold the truth and deceive concerning the preservation of God's Word.' No sooner had Dr. Hiltz said this than the Lord allowed us to witness firsthand this deception being put into practice.** A group of 20 to 30 people, wearing badges bearing 'Bible Tour' and whom we later found out were Jehovah's Witnesses, were just ahead of us. The guide was beginning his lecture at the Latin bible display. Overhearing him say, 'Now the Catholics wanted to keep the Bible out of the hands of the common man by refusing to allow it to be translated into English,' we decided to tag along and listen, as a number of others without tags seemed to be doing.

Saying some good things against this evil, the guide proceeded to the English Bible display and spoke well of the Wycliffe, Tyndale, and Geneva Bibles as good efforts of men who sacrificially got the Word out in English, though done in haste. The guide then came to the King James Bible and said, 'Now the King wanted a Bible with which to promote his own doctrine, so he authorized this Bible. Therefore, the Authorized Version has been added to and, therefore, contains much error in doctrine.' The guide went on to propose, 'How can we separate these errors out?' The guide used the illustration of a woman baking a cake. He said, 'Ladies, how do you get the bad foreign elements out of your cake batter? You "sift" them out.' ...

Upon hearing this, I said to Dr. Hiltz, 'Bill, that guide is going back to the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, which has not been shown to the group or even mentioned.' Sure enough, the tour group turned and backtracked to the showcase that held these corrupt manuscripts. Then with great delight the guide began to say, 'Now we can "sift" the Authorized Version by comparing it to these "old" manuscripts.' The first example was 1 Timothy 3:1, which was read from the Authorized Version out of the guide's lecture notebook. The guide said, 'Now these manuscripts do not say "God was manifest in the flesh," but "He was manifest in the flesh." Thus showing that Jesus was not God, which He wasn't.' (Remember that the New International Version, the Revised Standard Version, and the Jehovah's Witnesses' New World Translation and many others use 'He.' Now you know from where it came.)

This deceiver went on to point out that 1 John 5:7 was missing from the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. 'And,' the guide said, 'rightly so, because it was a false doctrine of King James and his church.'

Now, brethren, I saw and heard with my own eyes and ears exactly what I have been saying for many years: 'Change a few words and teach any bad doctrine you want to teach.' This is what Jesus knew when He said every word, every jot, and tittle is preserved. This only proves that it is only a matter of the 'degree' of error that can be taught when the Word is changed. Every fundamentalist that changes the words only differs in degree level from such blaspheming heretics as the Jehovah's Witnesses.

It never occurred to the intellectual guide that the 'sifting proposition' contradicted itself by going back for its authority to the Catholic manuscripts that had been

condemned earlier in their Latin codex forms. Today those who are defending the new corrupt versions are going back to the old Roman harlot for their authority. It is the same trick the evolutionist uses when he says, 'See this rock. It is ten million years old. How do I know? Well, it is found in this ten-million-year-old strata (earth). How do I know the strata is ten million years old? Well, because I found this ten-million-year-old rock in it.' Absurd? Yes, but, of course, you are not supposed to apply logic or common sense. It might mess up the scholar's playhouse.

In conclusion, as I walked out of that museum, my heart was rejoicing that God had allowed me to see the physical proof that He has so written His Word that sinful man has to change it before he can teach bad doctrine and attack the deity of the Lord Jesus. I went in the museum looking for a testimony of the Old Book. God gave me more than I could have hoped for. Amen! (Mickey Carter, *Things That Are Different Are Not the Same,* copyright 1993 by Landmark Baptist Press, pp. 203-206).

LOUISIANA BAPTIST SEMINARY

Louisiana Baptist Seminary is a ministry of the Baptist Tabernacle of Shreveport, Louisiana. Dr. **J.G. Tharpe** (b. 1930) is the pastor and head of the school. In a letter to me dated April 18, 1995, he said, "I became interested in a special way when the RS came out. I declared war on all translations but the King James Version. Dr. Don Fraser enlightened me more than any other person. Dr. Otis F. Brooks added to my knowledge. We use the King James Version only and we teach the King James Version in all Bible courses. All Independent Baptists used to defend it!"

MARANATHA BAPTIST BIBLE COLLEGE (from 1968-83)

Founded in 1968 by **Blaine Myron Cedarholm** (1915-1997, the Maranatha Baptist Bible College of Watertown, Wisconsin, was considered a miracle school during its first two decades. While its goal of seeing 1,000 in its enrollment was never achieved, thousands of men and women have been trained and sent forth to serve Christ. From its opening until changes were made in the mid-1980s, four generations of students were trained in the historical Baptist faith, in a strong position on biblical separation, and in the defense of the Received Text and the King James Bible. Many of these students in turn have gone on to defend the Word of God and to influence others in pastorates and on mission fields throughout the world. While Dr. Cedarholm was President (until 1983) the teachers were required to assent to the school's doctrinal position, which included the following position on Bible texts and versions:

Maranatha Baptist Bible College is dedicated to the defense of the Massoretic Text, the Textus Receptus, and the Authorized Version and uses them in its classes for study and the Authorized Version in the churches for preaching. Maranatha is the first college to organize on its campus a Dean Burgon Society chapter, which society exists for the defense of the traditional Baptist texts.

A number of scholarly Maranatha professors in past years stood unhesitatingly for the TR and the King James Bible. Three examples are James Hollowood (retired), Gary La More (pastor of Grace Missionary Baptist Church in Scarborough, Ontario), and Richard Weeks (deceased).

M. James Hollowood (1916-2004) was a professor as well as a trustee of the school from its inception. He had a B.A. from the College of New York (today the University of New York) and a Th.B. from Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. The Central Baptist Seminary of Minneapolis bestowed upon him an honorary doctorate. Hollowood pastored at least 17 years in various churches and taught at Central Baptist Seminary and at the Buffalo Bible Institute prior to joining Maranatha. He was a long-standing member of the Dean Burgon Society and a vice president from its inception.

Gary E. La More (b. 1943) taught at Maranatha from 1976 to 1980. He has a B.A. in History from Western Washington University (1965), an M.Div. in Greek and Hebrew from Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary (1969), an M.A. in Ancient Near Eastern History from Western Washington University (1971), a D.D. from Heritage Baptist University (1981), and a Ph.D. from Clarksville School of Theology (1981). La More has also studied Library Science at Western Washington University and the University of Michigan. He was the head librarian at Grand Rapids Baptist Bible College and Seminary. His personal library contains 12,000 volumes. La More left Maranatha in 1980 to become the Academic Dean and Vice-President of the Baptist Bible College Canada, Simcoe, Ontario. He was there until 1985. Today he pastors the Grace Missionary Baptist Church, Scarborough, Ontario, and is president of the Historic Baptist Bible College and Seminary at this church. La More has been a member of the Dean Burgon Society and has served on its Executive Committee since 1992. He has presented a number of papers in defense of the King James Bible, including "Dr. Kenneth Taylor's Search for The Living Bible" (1992), "Following in the Footsteps of a Liberal: The Life and Work of Dr. Philip Schaff (1993), "Softening Words in the Word of God" (1994), and "¿Cuál Es La Santa Biblia En Español?" (1995).

In a letter dated March 27, 1995, Dr. La More explained how he became involved in the Bible version issue:

> I first became aware of the version battle when I moved to Grand Rapids in 1971. At that time I was introduced to Dr. David Otis Fuller. One day he took me into his study at the church and gave me a copy of his book, *Which Bible?* He made me aware that I had been taught Westcott and Hort in seminary. **I WAS NEVER TOLD IN SEMINARY THAT THERE WAS ANOTHER SIDE TO THE ISSUE OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM AND THE GREEK TEXT.** I did not know about the T.R. in those days. We used the Aland Greek Text or the Nestle Greek Text in our Greek classes. I ended up taking the equivalent of six years of Greek by the time I finished my seminary training. I was a King James man

> before seminary and have been ever since. I am thankful for the influence that Dr. Fuller has had upon my life. He helped me to understand the issues. I am eternally indebted to him.

At the DBS meeting, July 2001, Dr. La More delivered a message comparing the 3rd and 4th editions of the UBS Greek New Testament, demonstrating that the editors have changed the rating system whereby readings are graded for alleged certainty and have arbitrarily given more authority to their readings without any change in the evidence. He further demonstrated that the critical apparatus in the UBS Greek NT is undependable. Dr. La More cited the book *Textual Optimism: A Critique of the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*, by Kent D. Clarke.

Maranatha's position in favor of the King James Bible in days gone by is evident in two other areas: First, it had an on-campus chapter of the Dean Burgon Society. The DBS, founded by Donald Waite and David Otis Fuller, stands for the King James Bible and for an educated defense of the same. The first Annual Meeting of the DBS was held at Maranatha. Second, Maranatha Baptist Bible College was the publisher of Everett Fowler's *Evaluating Versions of the King James Bible* in 1981. This work had been distributed in at least four mimeographed versions prior to its formal publication in a perfect-bound edition. Dr. Cedarholm wrote the foreword to Fowler's book in defense of the KJV, saying, "In a day when there is such a perverting of the Bible and an attempt to put God's Holy Word into man's word, a document is so necessary to expose these perversions and defend the Authorized Version." In his foreword Cedarholm mentions seven people associated with Maranatha that participated in the publication of *Evaluating Versions*.

The change in Maranatha's position toward Bible versions since Cedarholm's retirement in 1983 is evidenced in the fact that the copyright for Fowler's book was reassigned in 1986 to M. James Hollowood. The preface to the second imprint says: "Through the duration of the years of the first printing, Mr. Taylor [a Christian businessman who financed the printing of *Evaluating Versions*] became aware that a change in administration of the organization through which he had arranged his sponsorship of the work had *led to diminishment of fervor for the project and its goals*, and he began praying about a change in copyright ownership. The result of his prayers and efforts led to his choice for the copyright ownership of Dr. M. James Hollowood who chaired the editorial work of the original printing" (emphasis added).

MARYLAND BAPTIST BIBLE COLLEGE

Maryland Baptist Bible College is a ministry of Maranatha Baptist Church, Elkton, Maryland**.** Pastor **Allen Dickerson** (b. 1926) is an old-time fundamental Baptist who has seen a lot of changes during the long years of his ministry. On June 12, 1994, he celebrated his fortieth year as pastor of Maranatha. One of their brochures says, "Maranatha Baptist Church is an old-fashioned, independent Baptist Church that stands without apology for the old-time religion, using the

King James Version of the Bible, and militantly defending the 'Faith Once for All Delivered to the Saints.'" The church supports more than 100 missionaries, sends out more than 1,000 audio tapes bi-monthly to preachers and shut-ins, and has aggressive soul-winning activities, including street preaching, prison services, nursing home and rescue mission ministries, tract distribution, and soul-winning visitation. Radio station WOEL-FM, operated by the church, broadcasts 24 hours a day. The church's 32-acre Shiloh Baptist Camp Ground has an open-air tabernacle seating 800, and old-fashioned summer camp meetings are held each year. The church has published the *Maranatha Baptist Watchman* for 45 years. This monthly publication stands for the Old Bible and the Old Faith and goes into thousands of homes.

Maranatha Baptist Church is also the home of the Maryland Baptist Bible College & Seminary. The school started as the Maranatha Bible Institute in 1972. More than thirty classes have graduated since then and are serving the Lord as pastors, evangelists, missionaries, Christian Day School teachers, and children's workers. The institution's name was changed to Maryland Baptist Bible College in 1983. **Robert Hitchens** (b. 1942) has been the president from the school's founding. The doctrinal statement of the school leaves no doubt about its position on the Bible:

> We believe in the verbal, plenary inspiration of the original autographs of the Scriptures, and that they were inerrant and infallible. We also believe that God has preserved His inerrant Word down through the ages in the Masoretic Hebrew text of the Old Testament and the Greek Received Text of the New Testament. This authority we believe has been preserved for the English speaking world in the Authorized Version of 1611, the King James Bible.

The Winter 1994 issue of the school's quarterly publication, *The Swordsman*, was dedicated to the subject of Bible versions. The lead article was "Why Do We Believe in the King James Version of the Bible" by Academic Dean **Lee Henise** (b. 1952. This article reveals the heart of the school toward the King James Bible. Henise includes a little of his testimony:

> When I went to Bible college I was given a copy of the Greek NT. I assumed that this was an authentic copy of the New Testament in the Greek language. As I began to translate this copy into the English language I found that my Greek NT (the United Bible Societies edition) was a more accurate source for the New American Standard Version (NASV). This Greek text is sometimes called the Alexandrian text; I like to call it the critical text. ... **IT WAS NOT UNTIL THREE YEARS AFTER GRADUATING FROM BIBLE COLLEGE THAT I HEARD ABOUT ANOTHER GREEK TEXT, THAT WE CALL THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS** (TR), or Received Text. When I first heard this, I thought the whole thing was 'crazy.' ...
>
> In fact, the KJV is the only translation in the English language that comes from the TR, whereas every other translation of the Bible in the English language comes from or supports the critical text. This fact is significant. If the KJV came from a perverted text, as the liberals, new evangelicals, and evangelicals would

have us believe, then there was a period of at least 250 years when the world was without a proper Bible in the English language. ...

The issue of the KJV is not so much one of inspiration but of preservation. Here at MBBC we believe that the KJV is a copy of the inspired Word of God preserved in the English language. However, **WE DO NOT BELIEVE IN DOUBLE INSPIRATION, THAT IS, THAT THE KJV WAS REINSPIRED. RATHER, WE BELIEVE THAT GOD SUPERINTENDED THE TRANSLATION OF THE KJV IN ORDER TO PRESERVE ITS INTEGRITY AND INSPIRATION**. ... MBBC has purposely chosen to stand upon the Bible doctrine of preservation. This position is not a blind adherence to sentimental religion. It is based upon the scholarly, intellectual, and logical study of God's Holy Word (Lee Henise, *The Swordsman*, Winter 1994).

This issue of the *Swordsman* also contained an article by **John Cereghin** (b. 1964) entitled "Position Paper of Maryland Baptist Bible College on Various Teachings of Dr. Peter Ruckman." Cereghin lists seven teachings that are peculiar to Ruckman and that the school rejects: (1) That the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts can be corrected with the English of the Authorized Version. (2) That there are errors in the Greek text from which the AV was translated. (3) That there are "advanced revelations" in the AV. (4) That Satan is a fundamentalist. (5) That the chief purpose of all higher education is to get rid of absolute authority. (6) Setting a date for the Second Advent. (7) Displaying an un-Christian attitude toward those who do not agree with Ruckman's interpretations.

If the Hebrew and Greek need to be corrected as if there were flaws or errors in them, then they cannot possibly be inspired. ... If the Greek is faulty, how can the English, which is translated from that Greek, be pure? 'Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one' (Job 14:4). MBBC believes the Bible does not need to be corrected and that includes the AV, the Textus Receptus Greek and the Masoretic Hebrew. ...

Dr. Ruckman believes there are mistakes in the AV-1611 despite his claims to the contrary. He writes, 'Mistakes in the A.V. 1611 are advanced revelation!' Dr. Ruckman claims at least 45 such advanced revelations, or 'mistakes' are in the AV-1611. Are there or are there not mistakes in the AV? Logically speaking, Dr. Ruckman would have to claim at least 45 mistakes in the AV if there are 45 advanced revelations. If there are no mistakes in the AV-1611 as Dr. Ruckman claims to believe, why this nonsense about 'advanced revelations'? Maryland Baptist Bible College believes there are no errors in the AV-1611 while Dr. Ruckman believes there are. Since there are no errors, there is no need of 'advanced revelations.'

Maryland Baptist Bible College, therefore, should not be identified with these teachings of Dr. Peter Ruckman and does not wish to be identified with the same. It should also be understood that MBBC does not support the ministries of several men who actively oppose Dr. Ruckman, including Dr. Robert Sumner, Dr. R.L. Hymers, Bob Ross, Doug Kutilek, Gary Hudson, Chris McHugh and others who use the false teachings of Dr. Ruckman to attack the

> preservation of God's Word within the AV-1611. Maryland Baptist Bible College takes the superior position that we have the preserved Word of God in our Authorized Version of 1611, that there are no errors included within it and that it is absolutely reliable in all matters of faith and practice.

Dr. Cereghin has also put together an interesting report entitled *In Defense of Erasmus*. It was printed in serial form in the *Maranatha Baptist Watchman*. Consider a sample of this, in which the author deals with the myths and half-truths about Erasmus that are commonly put forth by modern version proponents:

> If Erasmus was so 'Catholic' and his text so 'Catholic,' then why was his Greek text so universally adopted by the Reformers, who were the enemies of the Roman church? And why was Erasmus' manuscript never adopted by Rome? Erasmus' Greek New Testament was placed on Rome's Index of Forbidden Books by the Council of Trent, which meant that it is forbidden for Catholics to even read it without approval from their bishop upon pain of mortal sin.
>
> A Catholic writer, Hugh Pope, under an official imprimatur and *nihil obstat*, says Erasmus was a heretic from Rome. He scoffed at images, relics, pilgrimages and Good Friday observances. Pope suggested Erasmus had serious doubts about every article of Catholic faith: the mass, confession, the primacy of the Apostolic See, clerical celibacy, fasting, transubstantiation and abstinence. Erasmus was also a vocal opponent of Roman scholastic theology and of the ignorance of the monks.
>
> The Pope offered to make Erasmus a cardinal but he refused (as did the martyr Savonarola), saying he would not compromise his conscience. Erasmus was committed to putting the Bible into the hands of the common man and for the worldwide translation of the Bible, something no pope ever supported. ... The Sorbonne condemned 37 articles extracted from his writings in 1527. His books were burned in Spain and long after his death (Cereghin, 'In Defense of Erasmus,' *Maranatha Baptist Watchman*, May 1995).

MASSILLON BAPTIST COLLEGE

Massillon Baptist College, Massillon, Ohio, was founded in 1973 by Pastor **Bruce D. Cummons** (1924-2004) as a ministry of the Massillon Baptist Temple. Dr. Cummons founded this church in 1950. Pastor Cummons was trained under the leadership of J. Frank Norris and Louis Entzminger at the Bible Baptist Seminary, Forth Worth, Texas. He was editor of the *Baptist Reporter*, and for 20 years he conducted the "Grace and Peace" radio broadcast aired on more than 40 radio stations. In a letter to me dated May 18, 1995, Pastor Cummons said that the school stands strictly for the King James Bible and uses only the Textus Receptus in Greek studies. All teachers are required to hold the same position on Bible texts and versions. Pastor Cummons' position on the KJV is laid out in his book *The Foundation and Authority of the Word of God*. The title describes Dr. Cummons' understanding that the Bible version issue relates directly to the authority of the Word of God.

'I will worship toward thy holy temple, and praise thy name for thy lovingkindness and for thy truth: FOR THOU HAST MAGNIFIED THY WORD ABOVE ALL THY NAME' (Psalm 138:2).

What an awe inspiring text! We are often accused of 'worshipping the Bible,' or 'worshipping the KJV.' This is not true. Bible believing Christians worship the one and true God, Jehovah, in the Divine Trinity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. He alone deserves and receives our worship. But our Lord does place His Word in a place of great power and great authority. We need to respect His Word, and declare it at every opportunity.

WE SURELY OUGHT TO ACCEPT THE BIBLE AS THE VERBALLY INSPIRED WORD OF GOD, AND NOT WASTE TIME TRYING TO DISPROVE IT, POINT OUT SUPPOSED 'ERRORS' AND 'MIS-TRANSLATIONS,' AS THOUGH WE WERE A CROWD OF UNBELIEVERS. THE BIBLE STANDS OR FALLS AS A UNIT. IF IT IS IN ERROR IN ONE PLACE, HOW CAN YOU RELY ON WHAT THE BOOK SAYS IN ANY OTHER PLACE? ...

The burden of the problem rests with those who would call themselves 'Fundamentalists,' and yet question, deny, 'correct,' add to and take away from the Authorized Translation.

When I, as a fundamentalist, accept the Word of God, declare it to be the Word of God, preach it, and teach it as the very Word of God, I DO NOT HAVE TO LABOR TO PROVE ANYTHING!

If you read the pages of this book on 'The Foundation and Authority of the Word of God,' and then say that you do not believe we have an infallible Bible, that you do not believe the KJV has come down to us by a pure manuscript line, preserved by our Lord as He promised to do, and that you do not believe that we have a Bible free from error, **THAT IS REALLY YOUR PROBLEM, AND NOT MINE**! (emphasis in the original) (Cummons, *The Foundation and Authority of the Word of God*, pp. 48, 53).

MIDWESTERN BAPTIST COLLEGE

Midwestern Baptist College is a ministry of Emmanuel Baptist Church of Pontiac, Michigan, which was started **Tom Malone** (1915-2007). The church started in 1942 and the school in 1954. Today **David Carr** is the President and **Joseph Fortna** is the College Dean.

NORRIS BIBLE BAPTIST INSTITUTE

Norris Bible Baptist Institute, Fort Worth, Texas, was founded in 1984 and is operated by the Independent Baptist Fellowship International. **Raymond Barber** is the president. In a letter dated March 28, 1995, Barber gave the following testimony of the school's position on the Bible: "Our stand is that we consider the King James Version as God's preserved and perfect word for us. We include in our curriculum a course entitled 'KJV Textus Evidences.' This course gives our students a clear understanding of our attitude toward and acceptance

of the King James Version as the Word of God. Our school started in 1984 and from the very first our stand has not changed on the KJV."

Barber also sent me a statement that each faculty member is required to sign:

> We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men supernaturally inspired; that it has truth without any admixture of error for its matter; and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the age, the only complete and final revelation of the will of God to man; the true center of Christian union and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and opinions should be tried.
>
> 1. By 'The Holy Scriptures' we mean that collection of sixty-six books, from Genesis to Revelation, which as originally written does not only contain and convey the Word of God but is the very Word of God.
>
> 2. By 'inspiration' we mean that the books of the Bible were written by holy men of old as they were moved by the Holy Spirit in such a definite way that their writings were supernaturally and verbally inspired and free from error, as no other writings have ever been or ever will be inspired.
>
> 3. We believe that the original manuscripts are no longer in existence, but that God supernaturally and providentially preserved His Word from the beginning through all of time to this very moment. Psalms 12:6-7; Isaiah 59:21; Matthew 5:18; 24:35; I Peter 1:23.
>
> 4. We believe that God's Word is preserved for us today in the Authorized King James Version (1611) and that it is the God-honored text of the Reformation. We believe that inspiration without preservation would be meaningless. We reject all other translations and paraphrases of the Word of God and subscribe to and use only the KJV (1611) in all of our activities.
>
> 5. We believe the Bible to be the absolute and final rule of faith, doctrine and practice for the believer and that every believer must come under its authority in order to be obedient to God.
>
> II Timothy 3:16-17; II Peter 1:19-21; Acts 1:16, 28:25; Psalm 119:105, 130, 160; Luke 24:5-27; John 17:17; Luke 24:44-45; Psalm 119:89; Proverbs 30:5-6; Romans 3:4; I Peter 1:2-3; Revelation 22:19; John 12:48; Isaiah 8:20, Ephesians 6:17; Romans 15:4; Luke 16:31; Psalm 19:7-11; John 5:45-47; John 5:39.
>
> I DO HEREBY BELIEVE AND PRACTICE THE ABOVE ARTICLE OF FAITH:

This is an excellent and commendable statement of faith.

NEW ENGLAND SCHOOL OF THE BIBLE

New England School Of The Bible is a ministry of Central Baptist Church, Southington, Connecticut. **Jim Townsley** (b. 1953) is the pastor of Central and president of the school, and **Bob McKeever** is the executive vice president. New England School of the Bible "offers specialized night time college level training for those preparing for Christian service through the local church." In the publication "Why Attend New England School of the Bible," the first reason listed is this: "As a fundamental Baptist college, NESB makes no apology for its uncompromising

stand that the KJV Bible is the preserved Word of God. Every instructor uses the KJV exclusively and every student must comply." Two courses deal with the Bible version issue. These are TH 202 Bibliology, and TH 304 Inspiration, Preservation, and the KJV.

In an interview with Pastor Townsley on May 4, 2001, I was told that he started Central Baptist in 1975 after graduating that January from Tennessee Temple Baptist College in Chattanooga. The church started the New England School of the Bible in 1995 or 1996. Pastor Townsely said: "Our goal is to train people in the northeast to be missionaries who might otherwise not go away to school. We want to make it convenient for people in this area to get the training needed to be a pastor, an assistant pastor, or start churches."

The school had roughly 40 students in 2001, and the church runs about 400 on Sunday mornings. When asked about their position on the Bible, Pastor Townsley replied:

> We hold to the King James Version and have done that through the years. Everything we teach in the Greek classes upholds the Textus Receptus. We are not ugly about it, but that is where we stand and we're not changing it.

I asked Pastor Townsley if he believes this is an issue that needs to be faced by churches today, and he replied:

> I seems like it goes along with a number of other issues. It is rarely just that issue. And I think when people take kind of a lax attitude toward the King James Version, they lower their standards and try to accommodate people. I think they lower their position on authority; they lose their authority.

I asked Pastor Townsley if he held the same position on the Bible when he was at Tennessee Temple, and he replied:

> I didn't really know that much about the issue. I was just out trying to start churches and get people saved. Then I suddenly realized that just using the King James Bible wasn't enough, that you had to be able to know and defend your position; so gradually we started researching and preparing ourselves so we could train our people. If you don't train your people, they will have problems with it. I probably never really studied the issue until 10 or 15 years ago. *Which Bible* by David Otis Fuller helped me. Your material has had a very position impact. Dr. Waite has had an impact, too.

Finally I asked Pastor Townsley, "Do you believe the Bible version issue should cause any divisions among fundamental Baptists? He answered:

> Certainly, we wish it didn't, but obviously it does and it is going to [cause divisions]. The only alternative is to not take a stand, and that is no alternative. So it will cause divisions. There is no question about it.

OKLAHOMA BAPTIST COLLEGE

Oklahoma Baptist College is a ministry of Windsor Hill Baptist Church of Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. **Jim Vineyard** (b. 1940) is the pastor and founder of the school. **Robert A. Ross, Jr**. (b. 1947) is Executive Vice-President of the school. **Joe Finn** (b. 1950), associate pastor of the church, is Dean of the school. The school began as a night-time institute in 1972. In 1974 it went dormant until Vineyard came to the church in 1977. He revived the school and changed the name to Oklahoma Baptist College and Institute, inaugurating both day and evening classes.

The school's position statement on the King James Bible is as follows:

> The Bible is the verbally inspired, infallible, inerrant Word of the living God, and is the final authority in all matters of faith, doctrine, and practice. Not only was it inspired when God caused it to be written, but it is preserved today. The King James Bible is the Word of God, and is reliable, trustworthy, accurate, and proven. The King James Bible is the only Bible used and upheld in all teaching and preaching at Oklahoma Baptist College and is the only Bible sold in our bookstore. Although we take this position on the King James Bible, we do not fall into the censorious character of many of our brethren who take this same position on the Bible.

The Greek text used is the Received Text published by the Trinitarian Bible Society. The school has a Bibliology course that covers revelation, inspiration, canonization, preservation, textual corruption, foundations of the reformation, translations, the history of the Authorized King James Version, the Westcott-Hort Theory refuted, and early and late twentieth-century perversions. The course also covers the excellence and influence of the KJV.

In a fax dated April 6, 1995, Joe Finn, who has been on staff at Windsor Hill Baptist Church since 1978, made the following statement about the teachers at Oklahoma Baptist College and Institute:

> All of our teachers hold the same view on the King James Version. Several years ago, because of much controversy about the King James Version, Bro. Vineyard decided that we were going to have to put a definitive statement of our stand on the KJV in our college catalog. He asked three instructors to come up with a positional statement on the King James Bible. At this time, it was discovered that one of our instructors did not hold to the KJV as we do. He believed in the 'oldest is best' theory. He used the KJV, but believed that there were other versions such as the NIV and the New KJV that were more accurate translations. He did not agree with our positional statement, because we indicated in it that we were King James only. To make a long story short, that instructor is not with us today. He is in his own camp now.
>
> As far as I know, Oklahoma Baptist College has always held to the same position that we take now on the KJV. We believe that the King James Version is God's preserved Word for the English-speaking people today. ... Though we are 'King James only,' we do not believe that the English corrects the Greek. We are

neither followers nor promoters of Peter Ruckman. We believe that he is a critical extremist who is out in left field concerning many of his beliefs.

PENSACOLA CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

Pensacola Christian College in Pensacola, Florida, has taken a stand for the defense of the King James Bible and its Received Text. In the fall of 1997, Pensacola held a forum on the subject of Bible texts and versions, featuring Dr. J. Michael Bates (b. 1949), Dr. Dell Johnson (b. 1944), and Dr. Theodore Letis (1951-2005). The videos of that forum ("The Bible ... the Text Is the Issue" and "The Leaven of Fundamentalism," Pensacola Christian College, Pensacola, FL 32523. 800-722-3570) have received wide distribution.

This forum and others conducted at Pensacola for the defense of the King James Bible were organized by **Dr. Dell Johnson**, a scholarly man of God who is relatively new to the defense of the Received Text. He was not taught this position during his many years of higher education. He was not even aware of the writings of men like John Burgon and Edward Hill. Today, though, he is standing for the Bible that has been preserved by God through the centuries.

The introductory presentation in Pensacola's video "The Bible ... the Text Is the Issue" by Pastor Bates is excellent. In a level-headed, Bible-believing manner he gives an overview of the doctrine of Bible preservation and leaves his hearers with the conclusion that the King James Bible and the Received Text are the preserved Word of God. Pastor Bates gives quotations from men who teach in fundamental Baptist schools who have adopted the rationalistic position that no Bible text or version can be called the inspired Word of God and that God has preserved His Word only in a very general sense.

In the Winter 1997 *PCC Update*, **Arlin Horton**, President of Pensacola, described the school's position on the Bible text:

> Pensacola Christian College teaches that God gave the words of Scripture by inspiration without error in the original autographs. God promises that He will preserve His Word; Jesus said, 'But my words shall not pass away' (Matt. 24:35). We believe God has kept that promise by preserving His infallible Word in the traditional Hebrew and Greek manuscripts and that the Authorized Version (KJV) is the best translation of the preserved Word of God in the English language. We hold it with confidence believing that it accurately reflects the inspired and infallible words of the Hebrew and Greek. The issue of God's Word is important for individuals to understand as well as institutions and churches.

SHAWNEE BAPTIST COLLEGE

Shawnee Baptist College is a ministry of Shawnee Baptist Church in New Albany, Indiana. The church started in 1923, and in 1972 **Lonnie Mattingly** (b. 1943) became the pastor. The church left the Southern Baptist Convention in 1977 and the school started in 1985 as an evening Bible Institute and in 1995 as a full-time

day Bible college. Mattingly is the President and **Ricky Moon** is the Executive Vice President. As of 2008 they have 93 full-time students. The college's statement of faith says: "We believe in the original verbal inspiration and eternal preservation of Scripture. We believe that the Bible is preserved in the Masoretic Hebrew Text, the Greek Textus Receptus and the King James Version English Bible. The Bible is our final authority in all matters of faith and practice."

In an e-mail to me dated September 22, 2008, Mattingly said:

> "I grew up in a home and church where I knew only the KJV. As a young adult called to preach I was warned about the RSV by my pastor. Believing that the KJV was reliable, I determined at that point to minimize the confusion by simply sticking with it. The Good News Bible and others were starting to flood the market about that time. When I became a pastor, my first strong stand came when I removed all the hardback RSV pew bibles from the church. I knew then that I had to have more than an opinion, so I began with my limited education to research the matter. I read many books by many authors, watched and listened as prominent pastors flip-flopped on the issue, and sought Godly counsel. I always came to the same conclusion. The KJV is the Word of God. We have never wavered from that position. Shawnee Baptist Church adopted a new statement of faith as part of our church constitution to reflect that stand with the hope and prayer that it will continue to be the church's position until the Lord returns."

SOUTHEASTERN FUNDAMENTAL BAPTIST COLLEGE

Southeastern Fundamental Baptist College is a ministry of Madison Baptist Church, Madison, Alabama, and offers two Bible training programs. The Madison Bible Institute is a three-year program consisting of 288 lessons encompassing Theology and Old and New Testament surveys. Southeastern Fundamental Baptist College is a four-year program and courses are taught at night. **Mike Allison** (b. 1949, senior pastor, is the president of the school, and **Bill Boruff** (b. 1935) is the dean. The school's statement of faith says: "Southeastern Fundamental Baptist College exists and functions as an inseparable ministry of the militant, independent, Madison Baptist Church, which stands without apology for the old-time gospel and the fundamentals of the faith. However, due to the uncertainty, compromise and confusion on the religious scene--even affecting some institutions labeled as fundamental--it is necessary that our stand on certain sensitive issues of the day be clearly stated. ... We believe and teach that God has kept His promise to preserve His word 'from this generation forever' (Ps. 12:6, 7 and the internal and external evidence abundantly prove that the King James Bible is the preserved Word of God in the English language."

SOUTHERN INDIANA BAPTIST COLLEGE

Southern Indiana Baptist College is a ministry of Dupont Baptist Church of Dupont, Indian. The pastor is **Don Hamilton**. The school's statement of faith says: "We believe the Bible is God's message to mankind. We only accept the King

James Version as God's preserved word. Therefore, it is preached in all our services and taught in all our Sunday School classes."

The church publishes an article at its web site entitled "Reasons Why We at Dupont Baptist Church Use the King James Bible Exclusively." The article gives five reasons for holding to the KJV: Theological Reasons (the modernism of textual critics and modern version translators), Textual Reasons (the Received Text vs. the Critical Text), Philosophical Reasons (formal equivalence vs. dynamic equivalence), Cultural Reasons (the heritage of the KJV), and Practical Reasons (e.g., retaining the distinction between singular and plural pronouns, italics).

Following are some excerpts from this article:

> So-called 'textual criticism' is more faith than it is science. If one studies the thousands of Greek manuscripts of the New Testament with the belief that God has preserved His Word through the years, he will come to different conclusions than one who studies the same documents with the belief that such preservation is unlikely. Much of the work is guesswork and many of the conclusions are debatable. For this reason, thoughtful conservative Christians will decide that it is safer to stay with the traditional text than to adopt the revised one. The only widely used English versions that are translated from the traditional text are the King James Version and the N.K.J.V. ...
>
> The very popular N.I.V. is a 'dynamic equivalency' translation. The looseness of the N.I.V.'s translation is admitted by the publishers and well known. The scholars who did the translation believe that it is possible and beneficial to put into English what the writers of scripture meant rather than what they actually said. One great problem with this approach is the element of interpretation that is introduced into English. To interpret is to explain what it means. Experts will say that all translation involves some interpretation even when this is not the object of the translators. However, much more interpretation will go on when the composers of a new version try to convey the thoughts rather than the words. If we let the translators interpret the Bible for us, we might as well let the priest do it! Our belief in the priesthood of the believer calls on us to reject highly interpretive versions.
>
> The King James Version of the Bible has played an important and unique role in the development of American culture. It can be said that the foundation of our society is the Holy Scriptures. The theology of the Bible influenced the ideas behind our Constitution. The language of the King James Bible was scattered throughout our early literature. The revivals that formed and changed our culture resulted from the preaching of Bible texts.
>
> For many years, Americans knew a certain amount of Scripture by heart. Many or most could quote at least the Twenty-Third Psalm, and recognize the Beatitudes, Ten Commandments, and parts of the Sermon on the Mount when quoted. But now the influence of the Bible was waned significantly. One reason for the decline of Biblical influence has been the loss of a standard version of the Bible. ...
>
> For the first two hundred years as a nation, the King James Version was the Bible to most Americans. Even after so-called "modern" versions became

popular, the King James Bible continued to be the version memorized, quoted, and publicly read most often. With the demise of the old Bible, our country has been left without a standard text of Scripture. Who can quote the Twenty-Third Psalm anymore? Who knows how to repeat the Christmas story? The question always arises: 'Which version?' Everybody realizes that our nation's spiritual and moral foundations have been crumbling, but few have understood how the multiplication of Bible versions has contributed to the decay.

We will stick with the King James Version out of concern for our country's future, if for no other reason! Why should conservative Christians join in the mad movement to throw away the standards that made our county good? Our Constitution is jealously guarded against change by an elaborate and difficult amendment process. If it takes two-thirds of Congress and three-fourths of the states to change one sentence in the Constitution, why should the churches be so willing to accept great changes in the Bible without serious and extensive 'due process'? ...

Believe it or not, some of the features most criticized in the King James Bible are among the best reasons to keep it! For example, consider the 'thee's' and 'thou's. The King James Version was not written in the everyday language of people on the street in 1611. It was written in high English, a very precise form of our language. In modern English, the second person pronoun is expressed with one word, whether in singular or the plural. The word is 'you.' Most other European languages have both a singular and a plural pronoun in the second, as well as the first and third person. The first person singular pronoun in the nominative case, for example, is 'I,' while the plural is 'we.' The third person singular pronoun (also the nominative case) is 'he,' while the plural is 'they.' Modern English, however, has only 'you' for its entire second person pronoun uses. High English uses 'thout for the second person singular, and 'yout for the plural! In this way, the King James Version lets us know whether the scripture means a singular 'you' or a plural 'you.' 'Thou' or 'thee' mean one persons being addressed, and 'ye' or 'you' mean several. This feature often helps us interpret a passage.

We also find the italic in the old Bible a great help. The translators italicized words they put into the text that do not appear in the original language. The new translations do not do this. We appreciate the integrity of the ancient scholars in letting us know what was added and what was original, and are disappointed that modern translators have let us down in this area.

The matter of quotation mark is also a question of importance. The King James Version does not use them, because the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts do not have them. The reader determines where a quotation begins and where it ends by the context, and by other means of interpretation at his disposal. The new versions do not give us the luxury of deciding the extent of quotations ourselves because they have inserted quotation marks according to the translator's interpretations of the various passages. John 1:15-18 and John 3:27-36 present examples of places in the Bible where the length of the quotation is a matter if interpretation.

Such features make the King James Version the most helpful translation of the Bible in English for the serious reader. ...

> For all of these reasons, it just makes good sense for conservative, Bible-believing churches to keep the old King James Bible as their standard text. The new versions present too many problems and simply are not fit to replace the English version we have trusted for so long. Let's stick with the King James! The movement to abandon it will move us from clarity to confusion, from authority to anarchy, from faith to doubt. We ought not to make such a move ("Reasons Why We at Dupont Baptist Church Use the King James Bible Exclusively," Dupont Baptist Church, Dupont, Indiana).

SYDNEY BIBLE BAPTIST COLLEGE

Sydney Bible Baptist College is a ministry of Metropolitan Baptist Church, Sydney, Australia. Pastor **Mario Schiavone** (b. 1964) is the president and **R.L. Hester**, is the principal. The school stands unequivocally for the King James Bible. The school's 2008 prospectus says: "We believe the scriptures to be the inerrant, infallible Word of God, as found in the 66 books from Genesis to Revelation. We believe God not only inspired every word, but has preserved them through the ages. At SBBC we use only the King James Version which we honour as a faithful, accurate and unsurpassed English translation of the inspired and preserved text."

TABERNACLE BAPTIST BIBLE COLLEGE, VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA

Tabernacle Baptist Bible College and Theological Seminary is a ministry of the Tabernacle Baptist Church of Virginia Beach, Virginia. **Rodney Bell** (b. 1936) founded the college in 1970, and I was told that it has stood for the Received Text and the King James Bible from its inception. **Edward Caughill** (b. 1932) was Academic Dean of the school when I researched the first edition of this book in 1994. He gave the following testimony regarding his involvement in the Bible version issue:

> My involvement began as a teacher endeavoring to instruct students in regard to texts and versions. Dr. B.M. Cedarholm introduced me to consider the Textus Receptus text and its value. I had been taught that the other texts were better and that the TR was not worth considering (Letter, March 24, 1995).

Until 2000, **Dr. Thomas Strouse** (b. 1945) was Chairman of the Department of Theology at Tabernacle. Strouse, who left a teaching position at Maranatha Baptist Bible Seminary in 1988 and started the seminary at Tabernacle that same year, was the head of the Doctorate Program at Tabernacle. He has a B.S. in industrial engineering from Purdue University, an M.Div. in theology and biblical languages from Maranatha Baptist Graduate School of Theology, and a Ph.D. in theology from Bob Jones University. Strouse was a founding member of the Dean Burgon Society (1979) and stands firmly for the Received Text and the King James Bible. In a letter to me dated March 2, 1995, he said:

> I took a course on textual criticism at Maranatha under Dr. M. James

> Hollowood. He was a close friend to Dr. D.A. Waite and used some of his materials to defend the *textus receptus* in 1972. In 1974-78, I was at BJU and was exposed to the critical text and I found it inferior to the *textus receptus*. Maranatha was started in 1968 by Dr. Cedarholm who used the *textus receptus* until his successor, Dr. A.Q. Weniger, came in 1983. I left Maranatha in 1988, after trying to preserve the foundational heritage of MBBC in regards to the text, the local church doctrine, and fundamentalism, and failing.

The following is excerpted from Strouse's book *The Lord God Hath Spoken: A Guide to Bibliology*, published in 1992:

> The student of the Bible must recognize that the Bible's underlying texts are extremely important. ... The student of the Word should use the Masoretic Text of the Hebrew OT because it is the standardized and traditional text of the OT, and the student should use the Received Text of the Greek NT because it is superior to the Critical Text and Majority Text textually, historically, and Christologically. Not only is the text of the Bible important, but so is the translation of the Bible. Since the Masoretic and Received Texts are superior, it follows that their resultant translation, the KJV, is superior. ... **THE KJV IS THE WORD OF GOD IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE**. It has no errors in it because it carefully reflects the original language texts closest to the autographs. The AV, like all translations, has 'language limitation*s,' but these are not errors.*

In 1980 Dr. Strouse published *A Critique of D.A. Carson' the King James Version Debate*. He argues that Carson's book has "a potential of causing a devastating impact upon fundamental Christianity," and he gives four reasons for this charge: 1) *The King James Version Debate* (*KJVD*) is for the most part non-technical, and it is written to the pastor and laymen. 2) The *KJVD* obfuscates the central issues in textual criticism and translations. 3) The subtitle of the *KJVD*, *A Plea for Realism*, immediately casts a shadow upon the usage of the AV and/or the TR for whatever reasons it is used. 4) The *KJVD* undermines the supernatural approach to textual criticism by using the oft-repeated argumentation based on the naturalistic principles of Lachmann, Westcott and Hort." Strouse then deals with the 14 arguments Carson uses in his attempt to overthrow the authority of the Authorized Version. The following excerpt from the introduction and conclusion of this study shows Dr. Strouse's position on this issue:

> One of the key issues in contemporary fundamental Christianity is Bibliology, the doctrine of Scripture. Included in this controversial issue certainly is the authority, inspiration and preservation of Scripture. ... Satan has cleverly fostered a barrage of translations upon the Christian public to cause doubt to be cast upon both the doctrine of Scripture and subsequently all doctrines. Certainly God is not the author of this confusion concerning His Word. And because of this confusion, Christian pastors, laymen, missionaries, etc., are doubting the validity and fidelity of their long-standing translation of the Word of God, the AV. ...
>
> In conclusion, it is hoped that the concerned pastor or layman is not misled by

> Carson's fourteen theses. It is apparent that Carson presents only one side of the picture, and certainly his picture is not beyond refutation. In fact, **his position is permeated with theologically fallacious arguments and with statements insensitive to historical data.** He stresses conflation, harmonization, and transcriptional probability similar to his mentors—Westcott and Hort. **CARSON'S APPROACH TO TEXTUAL CRITICISM IS NATURALISTIC, LEADING TO THE SUBJECTIVE, ECLECTIC TEXT. THE SUPERNATURAL APPROACH, WHICH CARSON IGNORES, STARTS WITH GOD'S PROMISES AND ENDS WITH GOD'S WORD.** May believers realize that the AV is the best English translation available today because it is based on the best Greek text (TR), and may believers use this approved standard both in private and public worship unto the praise of His glory! (Strouse, *A Critique of D.A. Carson' The King James Version Debate*, pp. 1, 21).

A meeting entitled "National Leadership Conference, Coping with the Issues of the Next Generation of Fundamentalism," sponsored by Calvary Baptist Seminary in Lansdale, Pennsylvania, was held Feb. 27-Mar. 1, 1996. One of the seminars dealt with the subject of Bible texts and translations. While many, if not the majority, of participants were antagonistic toward what they label "King James Onlyism, we are happy to note that a paper defending biblical preservation was presented at this seminar by Dr. Strouse. The paper, "Fundamentalism and the Authorized Version," dealt with various views of preservation that are prevalent today: No Preservation, Partial Preservation, Heavenly Preservation, and Verbal Plenary Preservation. Dr. Strouse defends the latter position, which results in accepting the Received Text and the Authorized Version as the preserved Word of God. An excerpt from this paper follows. The entire report can be viewed at the Bible Version section of the End Times Apostasy Database at the Way of Life Literature web site – http://www.wayoflife.org.

> The real issue beneath the textual debate between the Received Text (TR) and the Critical Text (CT) is whether or not God, having verbally inspired His Word, has indeed cast 7% of it into the furnace of rationalism. Those who hold that the TR is essentially equal to the autographa believe themselves to be on solid footing Biblically, Theologically, Practically and Historically. …
>
> Perhaps the strongest theological argument for holding to the TR as the preserved words of God is simply that the position itself arises from a strong sense of the mighty power and faithfulness of God Himself. TR adherents believe in a God Whose wisdom foresaw the need for an inspired and preserved Scripture, and Whose omnipotence guaranteed that men throughout Christian history would have one. One wonders about the theology of those who are still in the process of deciding upon the best of numerous readings in their Greek NT. …
>
> In practical terms the TR adherent has enormous assurance when he preaches from any passage of Scripture in his Bible, confidently believing all of it to be the Word of God. But what must the CT adherent or MT adherent do when he preaches from a passage which has variant readings? Does he decide himself

or take the editor's variant reading? It is hard to imagine such a ministry having any solid footing, especially if expository preaching is being attempted. …

The unsettled text of the Critical Text and the uncertain translational techniques of the modern versions should be sufficient cautions to the fundamentalist about moving away from the certainty of the standard, received and authorized Bible. …

The author has some concerns for fundamentalism. Why would some want to move away from the tried and reliable 400 year heritage of the TR/AV for new translations based on uncertain textual techniques and unproven spiritual value. After all, the AV has been identified with fundamentalism for many years. James Barr makes an astute observation:

'For fundamentalist society as a whole the Authorized Version functioned as the direct and immediate expression or transcript of divine revelation. ...The virtual use of only one English version, and it one originating within very traditional early seventeenth-century Christianity, thus indirectly but very powerfully supported the alienation of the fundamentalist public from, and its opposition to, the positions, interests and methods from which all biblical criticism grew and on which it depended' (James Barr, *Fundamentalism*, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1978, pp. 210-211).

Others make the same claim for the AV with fundamentalism. The new-evangelical Robert Gromacki admits that the AV is the Bible of fundamentalism (Robert Gromacki, *New Testament Survey*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1974, p. xii). Fundamentalist leader Ian K. Paisley preached a sermon in the World Congress of Fundamentalism at Bob Jones University Campus in 1983, citing the resolution of the congress on the Holy Scriptures: 'We recognize the unique and special place of the Authorized King James Version providentially preserved by God in the English-speaking world' (Ian R.K. Paisley, "The Authority of the Scriptures vs. The Confusion of Translations," Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University, August 1983, cassette). …

This author believes that Beza's 1598 Greek Edition of the New Testament is essentially equivalent to the very words of the NT autographa. This view is based on Christ's promises of Providential Preservation of Scripture, on the inextricable relationship between the doctrine of verbal, plenary inspiration and the doctrine of verbal, plenary preservation, on the practical consideration that 93% of it is without doubt the preserved text, and the remaining 7% has been universally 'received' by Christians as authentic, and on the historical validation that this is the received, standard, and authorized text of multitudes of believers.

MAY FUNDAMENTALISTS UNDERSTAND AND PROCLAIM THE GREAT BIBLIOLOGICAL TRUTHS OF INSPIRATION, INERRANCY, INFALLIBILITY AND PRESERVATION, SO THAT FUTURE BELIEVERS WILL HAVE THE SAME OPPORTUNITY AND ASSURANCE OF MICHAIAH, WHO "HAD HEARD OUT OF THE BOOK ALL THE WORDS OF THE LORD" (JER. 36:11) (Dr. Thomas M. Strouse, *Fundamentalism and the Authorized Version*, Tabernacle Baptist Theological Seminary, 717 N. Whitehurst Landing Rd., Virginia Beach, VA 23464. 804 420-1960).

For more information about Dr. Strouse see Emmanuel Baptist Theological Seminary.

TABERNACLE BAPTIST COLLEGE, GREENVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA

Tabernacle Baptist College is a ministry of Tabernacle Baptist Church in Greenville, South Carolina. It was founded in 1963 by **Harold Sightler** (1914-95) and has stood for the King James Bible from its beginning. A letter from Assistant Dean Gene Griffin makes their position on the Bible plain: "Our school takes the position of the King James Version only. We do not endorse any other version. We only use and recommend the Textus Receptus as the Greek text. We have a course which addresses the Bible version issue entitled 'General Biblical Introduction.' All of our teachers are required to hold the same position as that of the school. In short, we believe the King James Bible to be the very Word of God. Thus, we today have no less the Word of God than those who possessed the original manuscripts. We should not be classified with the philosophy of Peter Ruckman."

In a letter to me in April 1995, Dr. Sightler said that he preached his first message on the Bible version issue in 1950. In regard to the Revised Standard Version, he said that many in the South preached against it, including himself, Lee Roberson, Oliver B. Greene, and John Waters. He explained that "our church stopped using Southern Baptist material because they advertised the RSV on the backs of Sunday School literature." [Dr. Sightler's testimony about the KJV is also found under the section dealing with Mickey Carter. See the Index.]

TRINITY BAPTIST COLLEGE

Trinity Baptist College of Jacksonville, Florida, was founded in the 1970s by **Bob Gray** (1926-2007) "as a means by which born-again people might prepare themselves thoroughly and effectively for virtually any aspect of Christian service." The school is a ministry of Trinity Baptist Church. In the 1960s Gray led his church out of the Southern Baptist Convention and they began sending missionaries out directly from the church and supporting missionaries directly rather than through a cooperative program. They started the school to train Christian workers. In 1993 Gray resigned from the pastorate and went to the mission field in Germany. **Tom Messer** is pastor of Trinity today. The 1994-95 catalog says more than 500 preachers have been trained through Trinity. The school's position on the Bible is this:

> We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men and supernaturally inspired; that it has truth without any admixture of error for its matter; and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the age, the only complete and final revelation of the will of God to man; the true center of Christian union and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds and opinions should be tried. ... We also believe that the King James Version of the Bible is the divinely preserved Word

> of God for the English-speaking people (Psalm 12:-7) and that it has enjoyed a miraculous manifestation of God's approval all during its history and use.

The Received Text is used in the Greek courses.

WEST COAST BAPTIST COLLEGE

West Coast Baptist College is a ministry of Lancaster Baptist Church, Lancaster, California. **Paul Chappel**, senior pastor, is the president. **Mark Rasmussen** is the vice president and Mike Lester is the academic dean. The school was founded in 1995 and has graduated nearly 400 in its first 10 years. Their doctrinal statement says: "We believe the King James Version is the preserved Word of God for the English-speaking people and is the only acceptable translation to be used in this college by faculty or students (Psalm 12:6-; II Timothy 3:15-17; I Peter 1:23-25; II Peter 1:19-21)."

ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS

The following men and organizations are listed in alphabetical order. Please understand that I have made no attempt to be exhaustive. That would not be possible. Countless others hold the same position on the King James Bible as that maintained by the following men. While I know many of the key men in this battle personally and have read and discussed these things widely, I readily admit my lack of omniscience. In some cases I would have included a man or institution but I could not obtain sufficient information. One thing I have observed in researching material for this chapter is that the number of men and organizations boldly defending the King James Bible appears to be increasing today.

AUTHORISED VERSION PRESERVATION VENTURE

The Authorised Version Preservation Venture, founded in England in 1986 by **David C. Ellis** (b. 1929), distributes Fact Sheets dealing with various aspects of the Bible version issue, as well as cards and bookmarks, etc., which carry the Authorized Version text. Ellis has been a Baptist preacher for 40 years. His father was also a Baptist pastor. Ellis gave the following testimony in a letter to me dated April 20, 1995:

> I was the youngest of nine, and we were all brought up to attend the services regularly, and to memorise and recite passages from the Bible at Sunday school. Although I disliked this I have often been so thankful for it during the years of my public ministry as so often a few verses of Scripture would come to mind whilst speaking. This has always encouraged me in the teaching of children who are unconverted as it may be that later in life they will, as I do, thank the Lord for the days when I had to memorise. Of course, it is so difficult now that modern versions are used.

We were taught that the Holy Bible was God's Holy Word. We must always reverence it and never drop it or throw it about. I did not know another version in those days, and the AV was a very holy Book to me (and still is!).

It has been in later years that I have observed the evangelical churches being swamped with NIV's and Good News [for Modern Man], and I felt increasingly that someone should prepare and send out literature to rebut these increases. ... **A CERTAIN ANNIVERSARY SERVICE WHEN THE PREACHER SEVERELY CRITICISED THE AV AND HELD ALOFT THE NIV EXTOLLING IT TO ALL, PERSUADED ME THAT I MUST DO SOMETHING, WITH THE LORD'S HELP**. I began to prepare *Fact Sheets* dealing with various aspects of the subject and so began a mailing list. ...

There are signs of hope here as we find more people are returning to the AV and realising the errors of the other versions. However, this is really a drop in the ocean and those who use the AV are considered old fashioned and out of touch with the real world. It is quite rare to see an AV Bible in a Bible shop these days.

BAPTIST BIBLE TRANSLATORS INSTITUTE

The Baptist Bible Translator Institute (BBTI) of Bowie, Texas, was founded in 1972 by **George Anderson**, who began holding classes in the Rolling Hills Baptist Church in Ft. Worth, Texas. In 1974 the school was moved to Bowie. Its object is to train independent fundamental Baptist missionaries in cross-cultural communication and Bible translation techniques. It has courses in such disciplines as Articulatory Phonetics, Phonological Analysis, Ethnology, New Testament Greek, and Adult Literacy Training. The BBTI is unique in a number of ways. All of its linguistic training is founded upon the principle of "using the King James Version, Textus Receptus, as the basis for translating into other languages." The doctrinal statement says, "We believe the King James Version to be the preserved Word of God in the English language. We believe the Massoretic and Textus Receptus texts to be the preserved Word of God in the Hebrew and Koine Greek languages." The BBTI is not a parachurch entity, but is a church-commissioned missionary training school operating under the oversight of Eastside Baptist Church of Bowie, Texas. The BBTI rejects the ecumenism and interdenominationalism that is so predominant in most missionary work. Graduates of the BBTI have gone to Venezuela, Columbia, Mexico, the Philippines, Papua New Guinea, Quebec, Canada, Costa Rica, Alaska, Hungary, Chile, the Chippewa Indians of Michigan, and other mission fields of the world.

Charles Turner (b. 1934) was the Director of the Baptist Bible Translators Institute for many years. He was a missionary to New Guinea with Wycliffe Bible Translator for twenty years, but left that mission in 1982 to protest its ecumenism and its refusal to use the Received Text as the basis for its translation work. In his pamphlet *Why the King James Version: The Preservation of the Word of God through Faithful Churches*, Turner describes the erosion of authority that

has resulted from the multiplicity of modern versions:

> Someone has wisely said, 'A man who owns only one watch knows what time it is, but a man who has two watches is never quite sure.' In a similar way this is the problem with the many different translations of the N.T. ... **THE AUTHORITY OF GOD'S WORD IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE IS BEING ERODED BY THESE MANY TRANSLATIONS.** ... When there are two authorities, there is no authority at all. Your feeble judgment becomes the authority as to whether this translation or that translation is right. ... **WHERE THERE IS MORE THAN ONE AUTHORITY, THERE IS NO AUTHORITY AT ALL**. ... More than one authority in the home is a house divided against itself. More than one authority in the government is anarchy. More than one authority in the churches is division and chaos. ... It comes down to two choices. We can accept the text handed down by the churches for nearly two thousand years or accept the findings of modern scholars, no two of which agree. **If we go with the scholars, there is no one text that is accepted by all of them**. **CONFUSION REIGNS AMONG THE SCHOLARS. THERE IS NO STANDARD** (Turner, *Why the King James Version*).

Since 2005 **Rex Cobb** (b. 1947) has been the director of the Baptist Bible Translators Institute. In an e-mail to me dated September 7, 2008, he said:

> My first interest in the textual purity of the Bible began in the early 70's when I heard Oliver B. Green on the radio talking about the corrupt RSV. I think he offered a booklet about it that I ordered. Of course, I had never used anything but a King James Bible, but I hadn't thought anything about defending it. At Midwestern Baptist College while I was there for one semester I was exposed to the issue a little bit, although they certainly didn't stand firm for the KJB. One teacher, Dr. Paul Vanaman (sp?) made a statement that I didn't understand, but it made me think. He said that the Catholic church has always tried to destroy the Bible but at the same time we are indebted to the Catholic church for preserving the Bible for us. Now I know he was talking about the Vaticanus. I got Dr. David Otis Fuller' book *Which Bible* back then and that helped me, and later his book *True or False*. I think my pastor, Fred Schindler, and the teachers at FaithWay Baptist Institute where I graduated (1973) were a little worried about me because I was believing the KJV too much. My pastor later became a 'believer' too, and he was always getting in trouble with the other brethren there at FaithWay over the issue. Also in those early days I was exposed to the teaching of Dr. Ruckman on the subject. When we came to BBTI in 1973 I read his book about *Manuscript Evidence* and listened to a lot of his tapes. Since then other books on the subject have convinced me that God has preserved His word through the TR family of manuscripts and in the Bibles, especially the English Bible, that have been translated from the TR.

BARNETT, ROBERT

Robert Barnett (b. 1933) has been the pastor of Calvary Baptist Church in Grayling, Michigan, for 32 years. He is the author of *The Word of God on Trial*, which has helped hundreds of people understand the Bible version issue more clearly. Pastor Barnett is on the Executive Committee of the Dean Burgon Society

and has presented a number of papers to the Dean Burgon Society annual meetings. At the 1991 meeting in Cedarville, Illinois, he presented an answer to James Price's Temple Baptist Theological Seminary dissertation "The King James Only Controversy in American Fundamentalism since 1950. He entitled it "An Answer to the Latest Attack on the KJB Position." In 1993, at Indianapolis, Indiana, he spoke on "Dangerous Trends against Bible Defense."

Pastor Barnett is a gracious man of God and I count it a great privilege to know him personally. On September 13, 1992, I conducted a taped interview with Pastor Barnett in his home in Grayling. The following is an excerpt:

QUESTION: PASTOR BARNETT, COULD YOU BRIEFLY TELL US WHEN YOU WERE BORN AND A LITTLE BIT ABOUT HOW YOU WERE SAVED?

ANSWER: I was born in 1933 in Harrisburg, Illinois. I was born again when I was six years old at the bedside of my grandmother, who led me to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ. I was raised in an Arminian home, mostly Methodist, Nazarene, Church of God. Later on in life I became interested in the Bible, and in reading the Bible, and the Lord dealt with my heart, and I became concerned about my grandfather and his salvation. He was ninety years old. Fearing that he was going to Hell, I knelt down and rededicated my life to the Lord when I was twenty-eight years old, and went in and led him to Christ. I told him that I didn't want to see him go to Hell.

My ministry began very gradually. I became involved in the jail ministry. A pastor asked me if I wanted to go to the jail, and I started preaching there. We started a preaching ministry in the factory where I was working. Then the pastor asked me to speak at the rescue mission in Evansville, Indiana, and I began to preach regularly there. I also began to get a few opportunities to fill the pulpit, and one day the pastor said, 'You know, if you're going to do all this preaching, maybe you ought to get an education.' During an invitation, I stepped out. The Lord spoke to my heart from Romans chapter one. Pastor Bill Kato, First Baptist Church, Preston, Indiana, was preaching on the passage in which Paul said he was a debtor, that he was ready, and that he was not ashamed of the Gospel. When he got to the part, 'I am ready to preach the Gospel to you who are at Rom also,' the Holy Spirit just pricked my heart. I was willing to go the places the Lord had opened to that point, but I wasn't sure I was ready to go wherever the Lord would lead. That day I went forward and dedicated my life to the Lord for full time service. I had done that out in a cornfield, prior to that, about August 18, 1966. The Lord led us to Grand Rapids Baptist College where I completed four years in five! I took a few seminary courses while I was there. Then the Lord called us to Calvary Baptist Church here in Grayling, where I have been now in our 21st year.

Q: YOU HAVE WRITTEN A BOOK CALLED *THE WORD OF GOD ON TRIAL*. CAN YOU TELL ME WHY YOU WROTE SUCH A BOOK? HOW DID YOU GET INVOLVED IN THAT ISSUE?

A: I had always used the King James Bible. At Grand Rapids they asked us to use the 1901, the AS, because it was 'more accurate'—they didn't tell us why. I bought one, but I never felt really comfortable with it. The first thing I read about the Bible version issue was from the late M.R. DeHaan. Back in the '50s he had

a book out on *Versions and Perversions*. ... Then after completing Grand Rapids, I went down for ordination in my home church in Preston. One of the questions they asked me was, 'Can you give us what you consider to be your strongest verse on the Trinity?' I quoted 1 John 5:7. That, of course, was the weakest verse, supposedly, in the Received Text position. At that point I still held to every verse in the Bible but I didn't fully understand it. Then when I was called to pastor here at Grayling, they had a statement in their constitution which said that only the King James Bible would be used in this church. The church was split over it. There was one Sunday School class using the Living Bible. An older class was using the King James. So I had to really wrestle with the problem and defend the position of the church. I had gone down to hear Dr. Fuller lecture. I had read his book, *Which Bible?* I knew there was an awful lot of evidence to support the King James Bible, but I really didn't understand a whole lot about it at that point in time. As I began to read and study—and I read what I could get my hands on—it bothered me that I really couldn't find a simple book that covered the whole thing. Thus the only reason I wrote my little book was simply to put something down very brief, concise, that gives an overview of the subject for people that had to go through what I had to go through when I started studying the issue. If I would have had something simple like that I feel that it would have been a lot easier for me.

Q: YOU SAID DR. FULLER HAD AN INFLUENCE IN YOUR LIFE?

A: Dr. Fuller probably influenced my life in defense of the King James Bible more than any other single person. In fact, we became good friends and had a lot of correspondence and telephone conversations. Of course, I'm not the only one. There were a lot of people [that he corresponded with]. Dr. Fuller made you feel special, and really spent time with you and encouraged you. He did that with me.

Q: HE HAS BEEN CALLED A DECEIVER BY SOME? DO YOU BELIEVE THAT WAS TRUE?

A: I know they called him 'a deceiver, a liar, and a turkey.' That was Ron Chadwick down at the college. I have that on tape. When they told Dr. Fuller that, he said, 'I like that turkey part. I can eat that one,' and he laughed. He said, 'Just don't serve me any boiled chicken.' He always had a sense of humor.

Q: HE STOOD FOR THE KING JAMES BIBLE? DO YOU THINK HE WAS JUST A FANATIC?

A: Dr. David Otis Fuller was a totally sincere man. He said what he meant and meant what he said. He was a lot wiser than people gave him credit for in the defense of the King James Bible. He had a tremendous amount of material in his book that he never tried to communicate when he was on a platform. He had a very simple approach that he repeated over and over on the platform, to try to reach the people. I think he knew that this is a very complicated subject, and if you tried to explain all of the details you will lose a lot of people before you get through.

A week or two before Dr. Fuller died he was involved in an automobile accident. The first thing he did was rush over to the other car and ask the individual if he had been seriously injured and died, did he know he would have gone to Heaven. Dr. Fuller never missed an opportunity to witness, no matter where he

was or who he was talking to. He was always concerned about souls. The day he died, which happened to be on a Sunday, he was at Wealthy Park, his home church where he was Pastor Emeritus. He was talking to a little girl. He took her on his lap and began to witness to her about Jesus and her soul, and it was at that time that he became seriously ill and they called the ambulance. He was pronounced dead by the time they got him to the hospital. The little girl made a profession of faith because of Dr. Fuller's witness, and she went forward in the funeral to make her decision public. Dr. Fuller had written instructions for his own funeral in a sealed envelope, and had given them to Pastor Gage. I believe that was ten years before he died, if I'm not mistaken. Pastor Gage went to the front and had a few opening comments before the funeral, because Dr. Fuller had requested that the casket was not to be opened during the funeral and that his name was not to be mentioned. He had given instructions on the sermon, what it was to be, the songs, and every detail of the funeral. After Pastor Gage had given some preliminary opening remarks, they brought Dr. Fuller's casket down the aisle, and he preached a tremendous message and gave the invitation. I'm not sure how many came forward, but on a show of hands for rededication, out of the 700 or so people there, several hundred people raised their hands. I didn't notice a dry eye in the audience.

Q: DAVID OTIS FULLER SAID THAT J.J. RAY OUT IN OREGON HELPED HIM IN THE BIBLE VERSION ISSUE. DID YOU KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT J.J. RAY?

A: I phoned J.J. Ray in 1981 when I had my book first printed and I wanted some material from him. We were going to have a Bible conference, and I called him one night. As I remember now, he was either 86 or 87 years old, and his wife had died. He was alone. He still had an effective ministry mailing out literature. He was very zealous. To talk with him, you would never think he was that age. He was sharing with me about how back in the '50s he had worked with Dr. Fuller in helping him to see the importance of the Received Text issue. Dr. Fuller's first tract, as I recall, was based upon J.J. Ray's book *God Wrote Only One Bible*. Ray claimed to have been baptized by a Baptist minister, and that he pastored a Baptist church. He attended a Baptist church up until his death. His entire life and ministry revolved around being Baptist, though his organization didn't have the name Baptist on it.

Q: IT SEEMS THAT THE BIBLE VERSION ISSUE WAS NOT A BIG ISSUE AMONG THE CHURCHES PRIOR TO THE 1970S. WHY DO YOU THINK THAT IS?

A: It was an issue concerning the Revised Standard Version. Prior to that the modern Bibles had never gone anywhere. The 1901 AS, which was the American edition of the 1881 English Revised Version, was not used by the people. It was only used by the scholar, and it never really reached the pew. It wasn't until the RSV that the whole question of a different Bible took center stage. I think as far as textual criticism, even, it became more pronounced in the Revised Standard Version than it was in the 1901 ASV. [I refer to] the omission of verses and the changes within the text. **Also the flood of new versions started coming out after that, and intensified, and when people began to see all of the different versions and their differences, then they began to question what really is the Word of God.**

Q: A NUMBER OF YEARS AGO I CORRESPONDED WITH A MEDICAL DOCTOR IN NEPAL ABOUT BIBLE VERSIONS. IN THE LAST LETTER I RECEIVED FROM HIM, HE SAID SOMETHING TO THE EFFECT, 'EVEN IF THERE ARE 2,000 OR MORE WORD DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MANUSCRIPTS, I DO NOT BELIEVE JESUS WOULD HAVE US ARGUE ABOUT THIS.' WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT SUCH A STATEMENT?

A: Jesus said not one jot or tittle would pass till all be fulfilled. Jesus Christ became our Teacher concerning the Scriptures, and when we go back and read the words of Jesus Christ, we see that He showed complete respect for the Old Testament Scriptures, which would make up three-quarters of our present Bible. Nowhere do we find Jesus Christ at any time saying, 'This is a Greek rendering, but in the original Hebrew this would be better rendered,' or nowhere does He correct any Scripture. Everything that He says would teach us to honor and respect the Received Text. Of course Jesus Christ had the Received Text at the time [the Massoretic Hebrew text which is the same Hebrew text underlying the King James Bible], and He accepted it without question. **If the God who gave us the Scriptures came back to this earth after three-quarters of them were completed and none of the original manuscripts were available, and He could find no variance or error worth mentioning, certainly that would indicate that God had preserved His Word like He had promised.**

Q: THE MATTER OF INSPIRATION COMES UP A LOT. WE BELIEVE THE BIBLE IS INSPIRED, BUT SOME PEOPLE DON'T LIKE TO SAY THAT THE KING JAMES BIBLE IS THE INSPIRED WORD OF GOD. WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THAT?

A: Paul said to Timothy that 'all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished in all good works.' That was the Scripture that Timothy had studied to be saved. Paul had said that 'from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation.' Timothy's father was a Greek, so **whether those Scriptures were Hebrew or a Greek translation, certainly they were not the original autographs. And they were called Holy Scriptures. So they would have been accurate apographs [copies] at best, and they were still called Holy Scriptures, given by inspiration of God.** I think that today people are stressing that inspiration has to do with inerrancy, and I believe in inerrancy and infallibility, but I believe they are products of inspiration. **I think the primary purpose of inspiration was not inerrancy and infallibility—that is understood with the fact that God inspired. The purpose was the profitability.** 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, AND IS PROFITABLE for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.' So it is the profitability of inspiration which means a continuation so that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works, which was not only for Timothy's generation but for every succeeding generation as well. **As far as inspiration, I believe that when God breathed the original autographs, they were God breathed. God breathed life into a Book, into the words**, not the ink or the paper, but the very *rhema*, being the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek letters, and the very *logos* being the truth communicated by those Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek letters.

> One time I was walking down a hospital corridor, and I heard a nurse say that some fellow had just expired. It kind of hit me, and I thought, 'When in the world was he INspired?' God only inspired one man, and his name was Adam. He didn't have to inspire any other because the rest of us were present within Adam, and through procreation man is still breathing. We are still 'inspired.' **GOD DID NOT HAVE TO REINSPIRE THE SCRIPTURES. I DON'T BELIEVE IN SECONDARY INSPIRATION. THE TRANSLATORS DIDN'T HAVE TO DO ANYTHING. THE ORIGINAL SCRIPTURES THAT GOD BREATHED OUT ARE STILL BREATHING. They were breathing through the apographs. If you hold only to the original autographs, you have to say there was something special about the ink, or that paper, or something. But it had nothing to do with that. IT HAD TO DO WITH THE WORDS, THE VERY WORDS. AS LONG AS THOSE WORDS ARE AVAILABLE, YOU HAVE THE VERY INSPIRED WORD OF GOD.** Just because you get down to English doesn't mean that all of a sudden those words die because you transfer them over into a new language. We don't have an inspired *rhema*. The English words and letters are not inspired. But we have the inspired *logos*. The same truth is communicated out of the Hebrew, the Aramaic, and the Greek, right into our own English language. I'm not a Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek scholar, but more than once I have asked Dr. [D.A.] Waite, who has studied every word in the Bible in its original languages, 'Have you ever found a mistranslation or an error in the King James Bible?' He says, 'No.' That's good enough for me.
>
> **I believe that to the extent that the English communicates the equivalent of the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek it communicates the very inspired Word of God.** And I believe the Holy Spirit, who has promised to lead us and guide us into all truth, can also help us in the area of English that some would say is not as clear as the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, and **like our 17th-century forefathers who believed in infallible interpretation by comparing Scripture with Scripture, I BELIEVE YOU CAN COMPARE SCRIPTURE WITH SCRIPTURE IN ENGLISH AND LEARN A DEEPER TRUTH THAN YOU CAN BY BORING A HOLE WITH SOME KIND OF HEBREW, ARAMAIC, OR GREEK STUDY** (David Cloud's interview with Bob Barnett, September 13, 1992).

Pastor Barnett has made some very interesting remarks about the inspiration of the Bible as it relates to various texts and versions. I am going to make a composite of material on this subject contained in one of his letters and in a report entitled *Possessing an Infallible Bible*. He describes his position on this interesting and controversial issue. Some of this is duplicated from the previous interview, but I believe it is worth repeating:

> **I remain in the tradition of Dr. [D.O.] Fuller and many, many others in declaring the authorized King James Bible to be the inspired, inerrant, infallible Word of God in English. In an attempt to avoid confusion, I have accepted the wisdom of using modifiers to explain and qualify these terms when they are questioned.**
>
> I understand that in theological circles, it is not scholarly to claim inspiration, inerrancy, or infallibility for any one-language Bible. Yet, all of us agree and say in public that the Bible is inspired, inerrant, and infallible. When some make that

claim, they are referring only to the original autographs of the Bible. When others make that claim, they are referring both to the original autographs and also to the apographs from which the authorized King James Bible was translated. When some of us make that same claim, we are speaking of the total traditional Bible line preserved by divine providence from the autographs, continuing through the apographs, and manifested in English today through our authorized King James Bible. When laymen hear each of us speaking, they often assume we are all talking in agreement about the same Bible.

In reality, **if inspiration be limited to the languages of the original autographs, then logically an Englishman must master four languages before he can claim to accurately know and communicate God's inspired scriptures to other English-speaking people**. He must master Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek as well as his own English tongue. This elevates the accurate ministry of God's inspired Scriptures to a small handful of scholars who have spent many years in diligent preparation for a few years of ministry. It renders the average pastor and masses of believers submissive to the Bible interpretation of these scholars. This violates the scriptural principle of Acts 17:11. ...

BY FAITH I BELIEVE MY AUTHORIZED KING JAMES BIBLE IS INSPIRED. I DO NOT BELIEVE THE KJB TRANSLATORS WERE INSPIRED, NEITHER WERE THE ENGLISH WORDS THEY USED. I DO BELIEVE THE KJB DERIVES ITS INSPIRATION, ITS INERRANCY IN DOCTRINE, AND ITS INFALLIBLE AUTHORITY FROM THE ACCURATELY TRANSLATED APOGRAPHS OF THE ORIGINAL AUTOGRAPHS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. The KJB is inspired, not directly, but derivatively. It is inspired, not perfectly, but practically. It is inspired in the *logos*, but not the *rhema*. By this we mean the English letters and words are not inspired, but the truth they communicate in the English language is inspired and alive. This same inspired truth has continued from the original God-breathed Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek into our English language. This results in an infallible body of truth through which the Spirit of Truth can lead the English speaking Bible-believer unto all truth. **WE CANNOT ADEQUATELY DEFEND THE ACCURACY AND AUTHORITY OF THE AUTHORIZED KJB WITHOUT DEFENDING ITS INSPIRATION.**

Satan's primary attack upon the Bible today is not upon the original autographs; they are gone. It is not upon the remaining apographs of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Scriptures. Few people have the ability to read, study, and know them. THE AUTHORIZED KING JAMES BIBLE IS THE GREATEST DANGER TO SATAN IN OUR GENERATION. It is the Bible he hates and attacks the most. While we cannot defend the KJV separate from the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek roots from which it comes, neither can we effectively share our faith in these apographs of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Scriptures to an English-speaking world without preaching and defending the KJV.

BEARING PRECIOUS SEED

Bearing Precious Seed (BPS is both an organization and a concept. Its goal is "to put Bible publication back into the local New Testament church." It is "a ministry of local churches working together to publish God's Word for worldwide free distribution to independent Baptist missionaries." **Don Fraser** (1926-2003) of Bowie, Texas, was the man with the original vision for Bearing Precious Seed in 1962. He didn't like to be called the founder because that sounds like local church publishing work is something new. He saw himself, rather, as the "modern day initiator" of a work that dates back through the centuries. He renewed the scriptural vision and began teaching those principles to men who were willing to base their work on the Bible rather than a traditional methodology. Fraser's burden was to get the pure Scriptures into the hands of missionaries across the world, and he understood that it is the churches that have the responsibility for this, not the traditional Bible publishers. It is the church which is the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Timothy 3:15). BPS was described by missionary Ron Helzerman as follows: "The Bearing Precious Seed movement is truly Baptist history in the making! Baptist churches publishing Scriptures—scripturally!"

The formation of Bearing Precious Seed was described to me as follows in a letter from missionary Dennis Deneau:

> Dr. Don Fraser of Bowie, Texas, was the man to whom God gave the vision to print the Word of God in the local church. He had gone to Mexico as a missionary and found they had no Scriptures. He began to buy them from Bible societies and to search for a church that would begin to print. Since that time, many churches have taken on the burden. Most are called Bearing Precious Seed ministry which is the name that the Lord gave to Bro. Fraser for this ministry, but some have other names. Some churches that play a very important role in this ministry have no name for their ministry—they just help us immensely with ours (Deneau, Letter, March 27, 1995).

James McWhorter, pastor of Wildwood Baptist Church of Mabank, Texas, in a letter dated April 8, 1995, explained the origin of the name "Bearing Precious Seed"—

> In 1962 Brother D.M. Fraser went to Mexico to begin a mission work to reach the areas that had never heard the gospel of Jesus Christ. On that trip he witnessed with his own eyes the tremendous need for Bibles on the foreign mission fields. He came home with a great burden for the people of the world who did not have access, either because of poverty, or the unavailability of the Word of God. Because of this burden he began to go out to Independent Baptist churches to raise funds to furnish free Bibles to the people of Mexico, at first, then to other areas of the world. At first he called the work 'Send the Word of God Abroad.' He was given an office at his home church, Rolling Hills Baptist Church, from which to operate. One night as he was working in his office he began to pray. He was seeking the leadership of the Holy Spirit concerning the work he was doing. As he cried out to the Lord, he said, 'Lord, what is this that is happening, what am I doing?' Brother Fraser said that he did not hear an audible voice answer him, but

in his mind came the words, 'You are BEARING PRECIOUS SEED.' Reaching for his concordance he looked up the passage in Psalm 126:6. 'He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him.' From that moment forward the work became known as Bearing Precious Seed.

Later in that same year Brother Fraser obtained a picture of a man sowing seed. (I am not sure of the source.) He took the picture to Brother George Anderson who helped him design the logo for Bearing Precious Seed. They had the picture made into a slide (or perhaps used a projector that projects images off of pictures), and projected the image onto a large piece of paper on the wall. Brother George then added the Bibles falling from the man's hand onto the earth.

Don Fraser was based in Texas. At first he purchased Scriptures from the American Bible Society and the World Home Bible League and shipped them to the foreign churches. It soon became obvious, though, that this was not a good plan. Again we quote from McWhorter:

Special plans were made with the American Bible Society of New York to provide New Testaments and Bibles for Bearing Precious Seed. Brother Fraser would collect the money from churches who supported the work. The funds were then sent in with the orders for Scriptures to the American Bible Society in New York. They had five major store houses in Latin America for the distribution of Bibles. When they received Brother Fraser's order, they would break it up and send it out to these distribution centers where they were shipped to the missionaries. This distribution system, Brother Fraser called it a pipeline, was used to send the Word of God to twenty-two Spanish-speaking countries.

Later Brother Fraser developed a plan with the World Home Bible League for Scripture production and distribution. Volunteer workers would come in to help produce the books. The Home Bible League furnished the workers, building, and equipment and Brother Fraser supplied the paper, cover stock, etc. It was not long before Brother Fraser's work with the Independent Baptist churches was accounting for about seventy-five percent of their total production. The World Home Bible League had a big warehouse in Mexico City that would hold about twenty tons of Scriptures. As the work developed and increased with the World Home Bible League Brother Fraser gradually ceased to work with the American Bible Society. On a trip to Mexico City with Brother Carlos Demarest, he and Brother Carlos discovered that the World Home Bible League was distributing the new popular language version of the Bible. They were the Spanish translation equivalent of the Good News for Modern Man. They were very upset about this discovery. He decided to sever relationships with the World Home Bible League even though he had no one else to go to for Bibles.

About two weeks after he ceased to work with the World Home Bible League he received a call from Brother Charles Keen, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Milford, Ohio. He told Brother Fraser that their church wanted to begin to print the Scriptures.

Before the First Baptist Church of Milford began to do printing, a church in Texas got involved in Scripture production. Brother Bobby Lemmon working in

> his home church, the Hemphill Baptist Temple of Ft. Worth, produced the first Scriptures printed by a church in connection with Bearing Precious Seed. The first books printed were the Gospel of John. [Bob Lemmon was the pastor of Hemphill and his son, Bobby, did the printing. Today they operate the Bible & Literature Missionary Foundation of Shelbyville, Tennessee, about which more will be said later.]

By 1973 the churches associated with Bearing Precious Seed had already purchased and distributed one million Scriptures in the eleven years they had been involved in this ministry. In a prayer letter from that year Fraser gave this testimony:

> Eleven years of service has been a joy, and we believe that if we have not passed the one-million Testament mark already then we will soon. Many churches took on sponsorship of the Bearing Precious Seed method—to handle the funds and distribute the sacred Scriptures. Ton after ton after ton has gone abroad as seed to be handled carefully by missionaries who wanted precious seed to sow. The harvest of souls saved on so many fields have been so abundant in souls that we raised our hands in joy at the sheaves. The present rate of shipments is approximately three tons per month, with our highest month having been over 10 tons. However, missionaries are now waiting for over 150 tons to be shipped to them.
>
> We believe that the printing, publishing and distribution of the Scriptures on a scriptural basis is a responsibility of the local Baptist church.

Since then, thousands of tons of Scriptures have gone to foreign fields from the churches associated with Bearing Precious Seed.

There are dozens of churches involved with producing Bibles in a manner similar to Bearing Precious Seed. Fraser, in a telephone conversation on April 1, 1995, told me that he estimated there were 15 to 20 churches that were printing in a consistent manner at that time. He counted seven churches that operated large roll-fed presses, with another one that was being set up in the Philippines.

The largest Bearing Precious Seed ministry is located at First Baptist Church of Milford, Ohio. This ministry was started in 1973 under the direction of **Charles Keen**, who was the pastor at First Baptist from 1964 to 1999. Since then **Bill Duttry** has been the senior pastor. Keen was influenced by Don Fraser's aforementioned vision. First Baptist's statement of faith says: "We believe God has preserved His Word in New Testament form in the manuscript text known as the Textus Receptus. We further believe God has preserved His Word in Old Testament form in the manuscript text known as the Masoretic Text. Finally, we believe we have His preserved Word in the English language in the Bible known as the King James Version or Authorized Version. The King James Version is our sole authority for all purposes of reading and studying in English."

First Baptist's printing ministry began with a small sheet-fed press located in the church's basement. The first full year of production they printed and shipped

12,000 Scripture portions. Today they have a roll-fed press and produce more than four million Scriptures annually, including whole Bibles, New Testaments, and portions. Since 1973 they have printed and distributed more than 70 million Bibles and portions in 42 languages. There are 87 Seedline churches associated with Milford BPS.

As of 2008 there are 17 missionary families working out of this ministry. Five of them are based in El Paso, Texas, where a BPS printing operation focuses on Spanish Scriptures for distribution in Mexico and throughout Latin America. (It is important to emphasize again that the name Bearing Precious Seed is generic and that many men not directly connected with First Baptist of Milford use the name.) Among other things, First Baptist's BPS missionaries travel to churches and speak on the importance of getting the Scriptures out to the ends of the earth, and they raise funds to keep the presses rolling and the supply lines full.

The Bearing Precious Seed vision is a cooperative effort among independent, fundamental Baptist churches. Some of them print the Scriptures, and others assist in the process through a ministry called "**Seedline**." The seed is the precious Word of God, and it passes from the presses down the "line" to other churches which take over the binding process. First Baptist of Milford and other Bearing Precious Seed churches with printing ministries produce the signatures (folded sheets of paper with eight or sixteen pages in numerical order on one sheet) on their presses, and send them to the Seedline churches for assembly and shipping. Hundreds of volunteers are involved in this type of activity. This plan was described by James McWhorter:

> A *seed line* is a group of churches that work together to collect funds for printing, help assemble, and distribute (ship to other seed lines, churches, mission fields, etc.) the Scriptures. The funds are collected and sent to a *head water* church. A *head water* church is a church where funds are collected or pooled from several *seed line* churches to buy large quantities of paper. They also coordinate the printing and shipment of the printed Scriptures. The *head water* church purchases paper and uses the paper to print or have printed the Scriptures. Often several *head water* churches pool their money in order to make larger paper buys possible thereby greatly reducing the cost of paper. Once the Scriptures are printed they are assembled at the church where they were printed, or they are sent to other *seed line* churches to be assembled there (McWhorter, *Developing A Texas Seed Line*, p. 1).

One of the goals of Bearing Precious Seed is to establish a local church Bible publishing work on every continent. In 1995, one was being established in Africa through the ministry of missionary Mike Shaver. Another, in Europe through missionaries Tom Miller and Colin Christensen. Another in Canada through Peter Hiebert, a Bearing Precious Seed missionary working out of the Open Door Baptist Church in Grand Centre, Alberta. Another was being established in the Philippines. A roll-fed press was being set up there for the printing of Scriptures for that part of the world.

We must emphasize once more that the name Bearing Precious Seed does not designate any one organization or church. It is the name of a vision for local church printing. In a message dated April 5, 1995, Tom Gaudet, director of Old Paths Scripture Press, gave a helpful overview of this:

> There are basically three types of ministries such as these in independent Baptist churches. Some use the name 'Bearing Precious Seed.' Others operate in a similar fashion but do not use the name. Still others do not operate the same way but do use the name. I will here try to categorize the three basic types of 'printing ministries' whether they operate the same as others or use the same name or have nothing to do with any others:
>
> **1. The church with a printing ministry**: You will see why I am making this distinction in a moment. These ministries have printing equipment which they use to print Bibles, Scripture portions, tracts, etc. Some have rather large operations with full-blown press and bindery operations which have cost many thousands of dollars. The larger operations generally have web presses, similar to the type newspaper and book publishers use.
>
> The largest scripture printing ministry in an independent Baptist Church is First Baptist Church, Milford, Ohio. The largest tract printing ministry of any kind in the world is in an independent Baptist Church; Fellowship Baptist Church, Lebanon, Ohio. Still other churches have smaller equipment and use it faithfully to reproduce the Word of God. To name all of these churches would be quite a chore. Some of the higher production shops with web presses are Berean Baptist Church, Indianapolis, Indiana; Mt. Pisgah Baptist Church, Oliver Springs, Tennessee; Lifeline Baptist Church, Broomfield, Colorado; Parker Memorial Baptist Church, Lansing, Michigan; Broken Arrow Baptist Church, Pearce, Arizona; Victory Baptist Church, Milton, Florida; Lock Haven Baptist Church, Kissimmee, Florida.
>
> By the way, as far as I know, the highest production and the oldest printing ministry in a Baptist church is in a Southern Baptist Church, Milldale Baptist Church, Zachary, Louisiana. Their ministry is not supported by the Southern Baptist Convention, but by their local church and others around the country, much like the ministries in Independent Baptist churches.
>
> **2. The church with a publishing ministry**: These are churches which have some printing equipment, with some production capabilities, but have chosen to have someone else do the printing and primarily organize the fundraising and assembly work in various places. This is a very visible type of ministry because of the fundraising aspect. Offerings are collected into the church, and the printing is done by someone with larger equipment capable of printing truckloads of paper quickly. Some of these projects have even been done by commercial printers. The printed material is then distributed to other churches to be assembled. Some of this material has even been shipped overseas to be assembled by national churches. A quantity of material is assembled by the church with the publishing ministry. This type of ministry is more conducted in the other churches rather than in a large printing plant as in #1.
>
> A sampling of churches with ministries such as these would include, First Baptist Church, Park Rapids, Minnesota; Liberty Baptist Church, Rapid City,

South Dakota; First Bible Baptist Church, Rochester, New York; Grace Bible Baptist Church, Springfield, Missouri.

3. The church with an assembly ministry: These churches are doing a tremendous amount of 'hands on' work assembling material which others have printed. Typically, the church is assembling Gospels and has invested from a couple of hundred to several thousand dollars on bindery equipment such as staplers, folders, and cutters. Some have equipment which will hot-glue larger books such as New Testaments and Bibles. Some have limited printing equipment on which they print covers for these books. Some of the 'Bearing Precious Seed' ministries call these churches 'seed line' churches. There are literally dozens of these churches around the country.

In addition to the above three types of ministries, there are several **other churches who have men out doing the work of distribution**. Some of these are connected with printing ministries; some are not. Wings Bearing Precious Seed, Alpine, Tennessee; Bearing Precious Seed International, El Paso, Texas; River Oaks Baptist Church, Porter, Texas; Central Baptist Church, Bowie, Texas.

The following is a list of some of the churches involved in producing Scriptures. Some of these have been mentioned already. Not all of them use the name Bearing Precious Seed or have any connection with Bearing Precious Seed in Milford. Please understand that this is just a sampling. It is not within the compass of this book to list all of the churches involved with Bible publishing. We mention these to illustrate the broad-based nature of this movement. The churches and ministries are listed in alphabetical order.

Berean Baptist Church, Indianapolis, Indiana, operates a 27-inch web press for the publication of Scriptures. This ministry was founded by Pastor **Bill Gindelsperger** in May 1977, through the exhortation of BPS missionary Carlos Demarest. **Vern Vaughn**, who was in the church at that time, took the challenge that year to become the printer, and he has been with this ministry ever since. They use the name Bearing Precious Seed to describe their ministry, though they are independent of any other BPS ministry. The pastor of Berean since February 1995, is **Bill Blakley**. In 1994 Berean's printing ministry produced 270,000 Scripture portions. They work in 14 languages, and are preparing to produce Scriptures in two others, a special Romania for gypsies and the Susu language of Africa.

Bible & Literature Missionary Foundation of Shelbyville, Tennessee, was founded in 1968 by **Bob Lemmon.** He died in August 2007, and today the ministry is overseen by his son, Bobby. Bob's grandson Shannon also works in the ministry. In English they only print the King James Version. The ministry statement says that they are "dedicated to the preservation of the King James version of the received text (Textus Receptus) of other languages." In a letter dated March 21, 1995, Bob, said of the KJV: "We believe it is God's gift to the English speaking world. We believe all these other translations that have been produced have behind their production the ultimate motive to leave out vast

portions of the inspired word and to water down some of the cardinal truths." The Bible & Literature Missionary Foundation also prints Received Text Scriptures in Spanish, Portuguese, Russia, Romania, Hungarian, Swati, and other languages, and has printed tracts in Chinese and Korean. The Foundation sends many of its printed signatures to associated Seedline churches that bind and ship them. As of 2008 Houston Buchannan and Joshua Phillip represent the ministry.

Bob Lemmon gave us the following overview of his involvement in local church Bible publishing:

> My son and I introduced the Bible printing ministry to several churches and pastors. Some of them printed for awhile and then dropped by the wayside. However, some of them are still going strong. I suppose that the most successful of them is Dr. Charles Keen at First Baptist Church in Milford, Ohio. The first press they used was one we bought here in Nashville, and my son delivered it to them there in Ohio and trained someone in the church to operate it. Another church that is still printing is Mt. Pisgah Baptist Church in Oliver Springs, Tennessee. My son Robert, Jr., established that ministry in the church and worked and supervised it for seven years (letter from Bob Lemmon, March 21, 1995).

Broken Arrow Baptist Church, Pearce, Arizona, has a web press and produces Scriptures in English and Spanish. Pastor **Clyde Thacker** founded this ministry in 1984. He was murdered in a robbery in 1994, and his son, **Tim**, assumed the pastorate of the church and oversight of the printing ministry. The press operated by Broken Arrow is 56 feet long and has four printing units. Two were in operation in 1995, producing 25,000 impressions per hour. In one month they produced 5,000 New Testaments. They were preparing to print and bind whole Bibles.

Lighthouse Baptist Press is operated by Liberty Baptist Tabernacle of Rapid City, South Dakota. The pastor is **H. Wayne Williams** and the director of the printing ministry (since 2001) is **Tom Furse** (b. 1944. **Eric McCarty** and his family are missionaries out of Liberty Baptist and represent the printing ministry to churches in the Rocky Mountain region. This Scripture printing ministry was founded in 1987 by **William Byers** (1944-2001), who resigned his pastorate in Custer, South Dakota, to enter the field of Scripture printing. In a message to me dated April 5, 1995, Byers said, "I am thankful for each and every Bearing Precious Seed church and ministry. I do not personally know a single BPS work that is not Textus Receptus/King James by conviction and historic Baptist in its doctrine. All are doing a great work and if I am privileged to be in a church supporting another BPS work, I promote that missionary and ministry before the people." In 1996 Liberty purchased a web press from Milldale International Ministries and by September 1998 they were able to dedicate their new print building debt free. In 2002 they added another building to house three semi-truck loads of paper. The night the church voted in 1996 to purchase the press by faith a new convert named **Bret Foley** raised his hand and said he was a professional

printer and knew how to operate the press! Today he is on staff as the print shop manager. There are 10-15 churches that work with Liberty Baptist in helping to print and distribute Scriptures. As of September 2008 they are printing Scriptures in Arabic, English, French, Malagasy, Portuguese, Russia, and Spanish.

Caprock Baptist Church in Amarillo, Texas, under the leadership of **Ken Black**, become involved with Bearing Precious Seed in printing and binding in the mid-1990s. They were printing in the Czech language.

Another roll-fed press associated with Bearing Precious Seed is located in **El Paso, Texas. Carlos Demarest** is the BPS missionary there. Demarest works out of the First Baptist Church of Milford. James McWhorter gave us an overview of the El Paso work in 1995: "There is a great work going on in El Paso. A Bearing Precious Seed base is located there that has carried many tons of Scriptures into Mexico for the last several years. This base, while located in Texas, is not the work of Texas Baptists, but is owned and operated by the First Baptist Church of Milford, Ohio."

First Baptist Church, Milford, Ohio, operates a large web press and produces great quantities of Scriptures with the assistance of dozens of other churches. We have already described this ministry.

First Baptist Church of Park Rapids, Minnesota. The pastor is **Joseph Sturtz**. Bearing Precious Seed missionary Dennis Deneau and Don Fraser set up the ministry in First Baptist in 1984 when Pastor Klenk was there. They have produced Scriptures in English, Spanish, Telugu, Croatian, Russian, Serbian, and other languages.

Lock Haven Scripture Press is a ministry of the Lock Haven Baptist Church in Orlando, Florida. **Neal Beard** is the pastor of the church, and the printing ministry is directed by **Edward K. Brown, Jr**. This printing work started as a BPS ministry in 1981 and later changed the name. Another man who works full-time with Lock Haven is **Duane Chase**, who has been with the ministry since 1983. They operate a 24-inch web press and a 36-inch web press, as well as smaller equipment. Between September 1983, to December 1994, the Lock Haven Scripture Press produced 577,679 New Testaments in 11 languages; 151,512 John & Romans in three languages; 20,490 Gospels in three languages; and almost 6 million gospel tracts in 11 languages. In the first quarter of 1995 they produced more than 15,000 New Testaments in Chinese, English, Russia, Vietnamese-English, and Creole. They are gearing up to print in the Khmer language of Cambodia.

Lifeline Baptist Church of Broomfield, Colorado, is the home of the **Old Paths Scripture Press**, which has been printing Bibles, New Testaments, Gospels, Scripture portions, and other material since 1985. **Tom Gaudet** was the founder of this ministry. Since 1994 he has held the position of International Representative, and serves in the capacity of promotion, fundraising, and working

with missionaries on the field, as well as opening up new avenues of paper acquisition for the presses. **C.T.L. Spear** is the pastor of Lifeline Baptist. They operate a roll-fed press. Old Paths Scripture Press has no connection with Bearing Precious Seed but has a similar burden and methodology and has had close fellowship with the various Bearing Precious Seed ministries through the years. Gaudet has been involved with local church Bible publishing since 1977. Before establishing the Old Paths Scripture Press, he spent one year in a school operated by First Baptist Church of Milford, Ohio, one year with a church in Kentucky, then five years working with the printing ministry of the Berean Baptist Church in Indianapolis.

The philosophy and methodology of local church Bible publishing is seen in a report given to me by Tom Gaudet on April 5, 1995:

> There are three aspects of this ministry which are very important to us, and which we are committed to maintaining. These are convictions and serve as the basis for this ministry:
>
> 1. This is a Local Church ministry. It is literally Lifeline Baptist Church printing the Word of God. This is not to say we can do it alone. We could not have the far reaching impact we do without other churches helping. But this ministry is not a para-church organization. We concur with the Scripture which says, '... the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth' (1 Tim. 3:15).
>
> 2. We will only print Bible texts which have been proven to be based on the Textus Receptus. We make no apology for this position. Or course, in English we only print the King James Bible. A text must be proven by this criteria and God's blessing through its history for us to consider printing it. 'The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times' (Psalm 12:).
>
> 3. The Scripture portions which we print are made available to missionaries and national churches at no cost. We never want to stand before the Lord and have to answer for warehousing the Word of God, looking for another customer. God intended His Word to be given to every creature. 'The Lord gave the word: great was the company of those that published it' (Psalm 68:11).

Mt. Pisgah Baptist Church of Oliver Springs, Tennessee, operates a Scripture printing ministry This church was founded in 1875. **Garvan Walls** has pastored the church since 1982. The printing director is **H.B. Carey II**. It began in 1975 when Don Fraser presented the burden for the need of Scriptures around the world and explained that the solution was "God's people producing the Word of God through the local church." The church set up a small A&M 1250 press in a corner of a basement Sunday School room, and volunteers began working long hours to produce the Word of God. Today Mt. Pisgah's Scripture publishing ministry is housed in an 20,000-square-foot printing facility and is accomplished with the assistance of more than a million dollars worth of equipment. Hundreds of thousands of Bibles are produced annually in 16 languages: Arabic, German, Hungarian, English, Spanish, Olongo, Cambodian, Polis, Kituba, Swahili, Russia,

and Italian. The print shop utilizes four different presses providing Scriptures in eight languages for worldwide distribution. The staff consists of three full-time workers, two part-time, and dozens of volunteers from surrounding churches. Through the years millions of Scriptures have been sent around the world for free distribution. As of 2008, three missionaries were representing the Scripture printing ministry.

Parker Memorial Baptist Church of Lansing, Michigan, operates a roll-fed press for the production of Scriptures. This ministry began in 1976. **Don Green** is the pastor. **Ron Helzerman** joined in 1981 as shop production manager. In 1995 he said: "The growth of our work has been slow but steady and the Lord has blessed us with a nice building, a web press, a good group of volunteers, and an increasing network of collating churches around us. We print Arabic, Spanish and English scriptures and have cooperated with other Bearing Precious Seed churches in collating and binding several other languages." As of 2008 there were four Bearing Precious Seed missionaries working out of Parker Memorial: **Dennis Deneau**, **John Green**, **Mark Chartier**, and **Rick Teremi**. Brother Deneau studied under Don Fraser, founder of Bearing Precious Seed.

Parker Memorial is the home of **Local Church Bible Publishers**, which produces an excellent selection of high quality leather-bound Bibles, including study Bibles. The Bibles are sold at cost and are about one-third of the retail price. This ministry was a vision of Dennis Deneau.

Victory Baptist Church of Sherwood Park, Alberta, operates **Scripture Printing Ministry Canada**. This began as a ministry of Open Door Baptist Church in Cold Lake, Alberta, and moved to Victory in 2004. The pastor is **Dave Harness** and the director of the printing ministry is **Reinhard Shumacher**. Currently the church is working with English Scriptures and planning to expand into other languages.

Victory International Printers of Scriptures (VIPS), a ministry of Victory Baptist Church of Milton, Florida, operates a large web press for the production of Scriptures. This ministry was started in 1984 by Pastor **Tom Woodward**, who died on May 11, 1994. In 1995 the printing work was overseen by **Al Berg**. In a telephone conversation on April 12, 1995, he told me that in 1994 they printed 216,000 copies of the John and Romans Scripture booklets. These were in Spanish, English, and Russian. VIPS has no connection with Bearing Precious Seed.

Vision Baptist Church of Leduc, Alberta, has operated a **Bearing Precious Seed Mobile** ministry since 2000. The pastor is **Jim Price** and the director of the BPS ministry is **Phil Smith**. They call their ministry Mobile, because the printed signatures and binding equipment are transported to various churches in a dual axle trailer and the church members provide volunteer labor to produce the Scripture portions. On October 15, 2008, Brother Smith told me that in 2007 they

were in eleven churches and assemblied 70,000 John-Romans. They assemble Scriptures in English and foreign languages for free distribution to church planters and missionaries.

Wyldewood Baptist Church of Oshkosh, Wisconsin has a Bearing Precious Seed printing ministry. This church is pastored by **Randall King**, and the printer and Bearing Precious Seed missionary is **James Hoffman**. **Tim Carpenter** is a representative. The church's Bearing Precious Seed ministry was established in 1979 and in 1996 moved into its own 3,700 square foot print shop. They distribute Scriptures in English and 20 foreign languages.

These and other churches are printing and binding Bibles, New Testaments, and Scripture portions by the hundreds of thousands each year. It is impossible to know how many Bibles, New Testaments, and Scripture portions have been published in this way. Only the Lord knows precisely, but it is many millions.

The point we need to make for the purpose of this study is that *all* of these Bibles and Scripture portions are King James in English or Received Text-based foreign language versions. This is not an accident; it is a conviction.

BIBLE LEAGUE

As noted in chapter three, the Bible League was founded in Britain in 1892 to defend God's Word against the onslaught of Modernism. In an article describing the history of the Bible League, S.M. Houghton associates its origin with the "Downgrade Controversy" which C.H. Spurgeon fought in the 1880s and 1890s. Spurgeon's death in 1892 galvanized some in the battle against Rationalism. The Bible League was formed later that same year. The *Bible League Quarterly* began to be published in 1912. **John P. Thackway** (b. 1950), who has been the editor of the *Quarterly* since 1993, told us that since its inception the Bible League "has stood for the TR and AV position, and from time to time since the *Quarterly* was first published in 1912 articles relative to this would have appeared. Certainly since the emergence of the NIV and NKJV such articles have increased." Some of these are as follows:

Textual Criticism: an Historical Note by S.E. McNair, 1949
The Holy Scriptures: the Task of the Translators and the Story of the Early Versions (three parts) by D.A. Thompson, 1960-61
Why I Prefer the Authorized Version of the English Bible by E.J. Poole-Connor, 1962
The Singular Care of the Providence of God, and the Textus Receptus by D.A. Thompson, 1971
The Authorised Version of 1611 by S.M. Houghton (three parts), 1984-85
Why I Prefer the AV by Ron Smith, 1995
Pure Words, Preserved Words: The Doctrine of Providential Preservation by Douglas W. Taylor, 1995

In chapter three we gave details of the Bible League's position on Bible preservation.

In his letter of May 10, 1995, Pastor Thackway said, "There are signs of hope within our range of experience. ... I think a number are realising the wrongness and danger of the NIV, but have come back only as far as the NKJV, which is not far enough for us. A number have been converted to the AV. On the whole I would say that there are signs of hope, but there is much ground that still needs to be re-captured."

BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES OF SINGAPORE

Some of the Bible Presbyterian churches in Singapore take a stand for the Received Text and for the King James Bible in English. On visit to the bookstore of the Life Bible Presbyterian Church in Singapore in September 2001, I saw a well-supplied section on the defense of the KJV. They had books by Jack Moorman, Donald Waite, David Otis Fuller, Edward F. Hills, this writer, and many others.

Three prominent Bible Presbyterian leaders who unhesitatingly defend the KJV are Dr. Timothy Tow (b. 1920), pastor of Life Bible Presbyterian Church, Dr. Siang Hwa Tow (M.D.) (b. 1925), pastor of Calvary Bible Presbyterian Church, and Dr. Jeffrey Khoo (b. 1964), Academic Dean of the Far Eastern Bible College.

In *The Story of My Bible-Presbyterian Faith* (Far Eastern Bible College Press, 1999), **Dr. Timothy Tow** includes a chapter warning about Westcott and Hort and their theories of modern textual criticism. He says:

> As Israel was under Philistine domination, fundamental and conservative seminaries, insofar as USA was concerned, came under their [Westcott and Hort] bewitching sway even from the days of B.B. Warfield (1851-1921). When I was a student in Faith Theological Seminary, Wilmington, Delaware, in 1948, the 'Gospel truth' of Westcott and Hort in textual criticism was covertly imparted to us, knowingly or unknowingly, and we accepted all that was given from the mouth of the New Testament professor. What made an indelible impression upon my mind was that the passage of Jesus pardoning the woman taken in adultery (John 7:53—8:11), the last twelve verses of Mark (16-9-20) and the Johannine Comma (1 John 5:7-8 were not in the Bible, but later interpolations. Somehow I could not stomach this spurious 'gospel,' because the Lord has promised those who love Him an unction and an anointing that teaches the truth, that no one can beguile them (1 John 2:20, 27).

Dr. Tow understands the doctrine of preservation and its importance in the Bible text-version debate.

> We believe the preservation of Holy Scripture and its Divine inspiration stand in the same position as providence and creation. If Deism teaches a Creator who goes to sleep after creating the world is absurd, to hold to the doctrine of inspiration without preservation is equally illogical. ... Without preservation, all the inspiration, God-breathing into the Scriptures, would be lost. But we have a Bible so pure and powerful in every word and it is so because God has preserved it down through the ages.

In 1998 **Dr. Siang Hwa Tow** published *Beyond Versions: A Biblical Perspective of Modern English Bibles*. In this he traces the apostasy of the last two centuries that has gone hand-in hand with the rise of the modern versions. He concludes:

> Now that the last roadblock has crumbled, the Romeward way is wide open. See what a vast congregation of Christians is on the move, led by liberal Protestants ... together with Charismatics and Evangelicals, and lately, Promise Keepers. They beckon to those of other faiths, 'Come along, jump on the Ecumenical Bandwagon, we are on the fast track to Rome!' ...
>
> Of particular interest are the front-runners of Christendom, the Charismatics singing, 'Praise the Lord, Hallelujah!' with tongues and utterances, miracles and healings, signs and wonders, dreams and visions, predictions and prophecies—dancing, shouting, barking, roaring, howling—laughing all the way to Rome.
>
> And marching alongside are the Evangelicals, finally convinced that the broad way (Matthew 7:13, 14) is not that bad after all, they press on with Modern Bible Versions in hand—NIV, RSV, NEB, TLB, NKJV, NASV, NRSV, GNB, TEV—counterfeit Christians carrying counterfeit Bibles. And swelling the Rome-bound sea of humanity are the Promise Keepers, gathering fellow travellers by the day.
>
> In the distance the golden dome of St. Peter's beams a glowing welcome, 'Ut Unum Sint! That they all may be one!' A red carpet welcome awaits the global pilgrims. The benign Holy Father with open arms calls to one and all: 'Rome sweet Home—there's no place like Rome!'
>
> The whole world—almost—speeds on to its fateful appointment with destiny, but for the remnant few still treading the narrow way (Tow, *Beyond Versions*, pp. 147, 148).

Dr. Jeffrey Khoo has written many articles and books in defense of the Greek Received Text and the KJV in English. In 2001 he published *Kept Pure in All Age: Recapturing the Authorised Version and the Doctrine of Providential Preservation*. It deals with the inspiration and preservation and transmission of the Scriptures, the history and error of modern textual criticism, the history of the English Bible, and a critical evaluation of the New International Version. This book, which began as a teaching syllabus entitled *The KJV-NIV Debate,* concludes with some "Frequently Asked Questions about the KJV-Only Issue." One question is "When you say the KJV is the only reliable and accurate Bible, are you saying that the Chinese, Tamil, Korean Bibles are not?" Dr. Khoo replies:

> No, we are not saying that at all. We are also not saying that everyone in the whole wide world regardless of language must use only the English Bible. We are glad over the fact that the Bible is translated into so many languages. The Westminster Confession itself says that the Scriptures 'are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation.' However, we must ensure that the translation used must be faithful, accurate, and reliable.

An Appendix to Khoo's book is entitled "Bob Jones University and the KJV: A Critique of *From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man*." Following are some excerpts:

[J.B.] Williams's charge that KJV-only advocates have created 'unnecessary confusion and division' is false. The only agenda KJV-only advocates have is to call the Church back to the traditional and preserved text of Scriptures as found in the KJV and its underlying Hebrew and Greek texts over against the plethora of modern and corrupted versions (or perversions) of the Bible. Why should fundamentalists who should be on the Lord's side be angry with those from within their camp who refuse to bow the knee to the modern Baal of Textual Criticism and side with modern Balaams like Westcott and Hort? Williams is upset over the militancy of KJV-only advocates, but is this not what the Lord requires of His Church militant? ... Westcott and Hort and their cohorts are enemies of Christ and His Word. The prophet Jehu's words to compromising Jehoshaphat apply equally to BJU, 'Shouldest thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the Lord?' (2 Chr. 19:1-2). The Bob Jones Sanhedrin is telling KJV-only fundamentalists to shut up. But we reply with the Apostle Peter, 'We ought to obey God rather than men' (Acts 5:29). ... It is this neutral attitude of BJU that is causing the confusion within fundamentalism! Dr. Dell Johnson of Pensacola Theological Seminary has rightly called this neutralism and compromise 'the leaven in fundamentalism.' Our plea to our fellow fundamentalists is one they know well: Be ye not unequally yoked together with Westcott and Hort. ...

[Paul] Downey provides a succinct, factual account of the process of biblical canonization. However, Downey's chapter is skewed by his comment that the KJV of 1611 'followed the Council of Trent, not the Reformers, in its treatment of the Apocrypha' (45). By so saying, Downey gives the distorted impression that the KJV translator had considered the Apocrypha as part of inspired Scripture. This cannot be further from the truth. It is without question, that the translators accepted those apocryphal books only for their historical value. They in no wise considered them to be inspired Scripture. Alexander McClure, in his book *The Translators Revived* gave seven reasons why they rejected the Apocrypha. ...

Downey has thus unfairly portrayed the KJV as a Popish Bible because it included the Apocrypha. He cast a slur against the KJV by saying that the Puritans and Separatists rejected the KJV in favour of the Geneva Bible because the latter excluded the Apocrypha (45-6). But this is not the whole truth. Dr. Errol F. Rhodes and Dr. Liana Lupas who edited *The Translators to the Reader: The Original Preface to the King James Version Revised*, present a more accurate picture: 'The books of the Apocrypha were included in the King James Version from the first as a matter of course, as they had been in all versions of the English Bible from the time of Wycliffe (c. 1384), including the Calvinist Geneva Bible of 1560. ... The deliberate omission of the Apocrypha from an English Bible is first noted in the 1640 edition of the Geneva Bible. ... Not until the nineteenth century, however, did the omission of the Apocrypha in Protestant Bibles become normal.'

The Protestants in those days were obviously a victim of their times. Although the Apocrypha was found in Reformation Bibles (including the Geneva) since Wycliffe, it is clear that all of the Reformers opposed the Roman Catholic Church, and by the same token, rejected the Apocrypha as spurious. ...

It is also significant to note that when it came to translating the Apocrypha, the KJV translator did not care very much for it. Scrivener wrote, 'It is well known to Biblical scholars that the Apocrypha received very inadequate attention from the

> revisers of 1611 and their predecessors, so that whole passages remain unaltered from the racy, spirited, rhythmical, but hasty, loose and most inaccurate version ... made by Coverdale for the Bible of 1536.'
>
> What can we say about this book *From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man*, which aims to present a 'balanced' view on the KJV issue? So far, this reviewer gets the sense that instead of presenting a 'balanced' view, the writers are bent on finding fault with the KJV. ...
>
> [Mark] Minnick believes in the Westcott and Hort lie that the difference between their revised Greek text and the traditional Greek text is no more than 'a thousandth part of the entire text,' which he adds is no more than 'one page of my entire Testament' (86). Scrivener's Greek Text published in 1881, and reprinted by the Dean Burgon Society Press in 1999, compared the Textus Receptus with the Westcott and Hort Text. Scrivener's comparison reveals 5,604 places where the Westcott and Hort Greek Text differed from the Textus Receptus. His footnotes show that Westcott and Hort changed a total of 9,970 Greek words either by addition or subtraction. That is almost 50 pages of my entire Testament.

Dr. Khoo concludes *The KJV-NIV Debate* with the words of Dr. Henry Morris: "I believe, therefore, after studying, teaching, and loving the Bible for over 55 years, that Christians—especially creationists!—need to hang on to their old King James Bibles as long as they live. God has uniquely blessed its use in the great revivals, in the worldwide missionary movement, and in the personal lives of believers, more so than He has with all the rest of the versions put together, and 'by their fruits ye shall know them' (Matthew 7:20). It is the most beautiful, the most powerful and (I strongly believe) the most reliable of any that we have or ever will have, until Christ returns."

BYNUM, E.L.

E.L. Bynum (b. 1926) has pastored churches in Texas since 1953. He was the pastor of the Tabernacle Baptist Church of Lubbock, Texas, from 1961 until his retirement in 2005. The church was founded in 1933 by Ben D. Johnson. Bynum is the editor of the *Plains Baptist Challenge*. In a letter dated June 6, 1995, he shared with me the testimony of his involvement in the defense of the King James Bible:

> I was born May 13, 1926, in Comanche, Oklahoma. I graduated from Bible Baptist Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas, in 1952 (school founded by Louis Entzminger and J. Frank Norris). Later on in 1952 I preached my first sermon against the New Versions. The complete Revised Standard Version had just been published. Even though I was young and green, I was appalled at their perversion of the Word of God. My sermon was entitled *Seven Reasons Why I Reject the RSV*. I soon found out that the text they used was corrupt. When you add this to their liberal theology, it was evident that their Bible would be corrupt. Most of the men that I knew that opposed the RSV did it on the basis of the horrible rendering of such passages as Isa. 7:14.

In March 1953 I was called as Assistant Pastor of Tabernacle Baptist Church, Lubbock, Texas. I had never been to Lubbock in my life, but was delighted to learn that the Pastor, Ben D. Johnson, had written a booklet entitled *Modern Infidelity and a Mutilated Bible*. It was on the RSV. The church was twenty years old at the time. Brother Johnson had organized it as an Independent Baptist Church in 1933. The church is sixty-three years old, and it has only had two pastors. (He died in the late 60s in his 80s). Ben D. Johnson was pastor from 1933-1961, and I have been pastor from 1961 until now. I was Assistant Pastor of Tabernacle from March 1953 until May 1958. I then organized and pastored the Manhattan Baptist Temple, Manhattan, Kansas, from the summer of 1958 until May 1959. I then returned to Tabernacle in June 1959.

The *Plains Baptist Challenger* was started about 1941 by Dr. Ben D. Johnson. For a few years it was published under two or three different names, until he finally settled on the present one.

The church was always KJV, but you must understand that prior to 1952 you rarely ever heard of any other version. I remember seeing a Moffatt Version as a young man, but I never heard of anyone owning one, reading one, or preaching from one. It simply was not an issue, because even the liberals used the KJV, while they corrected it and explained it away. I never heard of anyone owning or preaching out of an AS. I don't remember ever seeing it in a bookstore.

Much is made by our enemies of the fact that this was not a big issue until the 50s and 60s. The reason it was not an issue, is because all Bible-believing fundamental independent Baptists used the KJV. Even the charismatics and liberals used the KJV. The KJV was about all that could be found in the bookstores. It simply was not an issue because all of these new perversions had not been dumped on us. You do not hunt lions, tigers, and elephants unless you live in an area where they are.

In retrospect, of course, someone should have been raising the roof over this issue. While the saints were using the KJV, the seminaries and colleges were quietly using the Westcott-Hort text and slowly laying the groundwork for the new versions.

When the Amplified New Testament came out in the 50s, it did not make much of a splash. In retrospect there should have been an uproar over it.

A number of years after I had preached my first sermon against the RSV, I became acquainted with David Otis Fuller (this was sometime past the mid-50s). We corresponded from the early 60s until his death. He was a great encourager of people like myself.

I wrote my first tract on Bible versions in 1969. It was entitled *Why We Reject This Version* [dealing with the Today's English Version, also called the Good News for Modern Man]. We still print it, and by now we have likely published close to one million copies. I wrote it because the Southern Baptists were handing them out from door to door in our city and across the USA. In response to that tract, we received reports of some churches going back and picking up the copies of Good News for Modern Man. One Southern Baptist church in East Texas, after reading my tract, went back door to door picking up Good News for Modern Man and giving the people a KJV New Testament instead. They piled up

the perversions and burned them.

It has been my policy to encourage all the good men who are fighting for the KJV. We need the help and influence of all these men. After *Which Bible?* had gone through one or more editions, I asked Dr. Fuller to consider including the article by George Sayles Bishop. He had never heard of his writings, but in the very next edition, he included it. Although Bishop was not a Baptist, he opposed the ERV during the lifetime of Westcott and Hort. Fuller was a dear friend, a powerful preacher, and a fervent soul winner. I am grieved by the efforts of some to blacken his name after his death.

In the March 30, 1979, issue of *The Sword of the Lord*, Dr. John R. Rice [1895-1980] attacked David Otis Fuller and E.L. Bynum. He called us "King James Fans." He made a number of inaccurate statements. I answered his article in a series of articles in the *Plains Baptist Challenger*. This was published in a 47-page booklet which we still distribute. He never did reply to my articles.

In this testimony Bynum mentions John R. Rice' attack upon "King James Only men. In my estimation, Bynum's reply to Dr. Rice was a brilliant and Christ-honoring work. It is not brilliant from a perspective of worldly scholarship, but from a perspective of biblical, Christ-honoring wisdom. It is entitled *King James Fans?* and we offer some excerpts that will give the reader a feel for this battle as it dates back to the 1970s and still rages today:

Within the last year we have noticed that a number of fundamental preachers have mounted an attack against the King James Version. These attacks simply cannot be ignored. It is regrettable that it is now necessary to call names in order to properly answer some of these attacks upon God's Word. ... The fundamentalists of the first half of the 20th century did not face the rash of versions and perversions that we are facing today. Because they could see little danger, some of them unfortunately gave their approval to the American Standard Version. Most of them never seriously used it. The issue is far more critical today, and we cannot afford to yield to the liberal textual critics who have unfortunately so influenced even the fundamental scholars. Our loyalty is to God and His infallible Word, and not unto men, therefore there is no place for compromise on this vital issue.

The title for this booklet was not coined by this writer, but by Dr. John R. Rice. In the March 30, 1979, issue of *The Sword of the Lord*, there is an article by Editor John R. Rice entitled "Some Questions for King James Fans." For the sake of God's truth, this article must be answered.

At the very beginning, I want to say that I am not angry at Dr. Rice. I hold no malice against him, and can honestly pray that God will bless his ministry. ... I have heard him preach in person a number of times ... I have a number of his books in my library and I have been a reader of *The Sword of the Lord* for a number of years. I expect to continue to subscribe to the *Sword*, and I do find some good and helpful articles in it. This does not mean that I always agree with everything printed in the *Sword*, but I can disagree without getting an ulcer or having a nervous breakdown. ... However, Dr. Rice is the Editor of the *Sword of the Lord*, and he should be answered, because his inaccurate article has already gone into the homes of perhaps 300,000 people!

'Some Questions for King James Fans' is not a title that would tend to create understanding, or give a sense of fair play. In the first place I have never thought of myself as being a King James fan. ... Personally I prefer the correct title of this Bible, which is the 'Authorized Version,' the title that is used in England. However, since so many people in America know it as the 'King James Version,' we often use this title. **If to hold to this version is being a fan or fanatic, then we will just have to accept the name, for there is not another English version that we can recommend. ...**

[Dr. Rice] wrote, 'I have a tract before me by Brother E.L. Bynum of Lubbock which claims to be "a resume of Dr. Otis Fuller's book, *Which Bible?"* I have that book also before me. The tract says, "We as evangelicals believe the Bible to be the verbally inspired Word of God, inerrant—namely without error. THEN—we ask, is there one version extant among the multiplicity of versions which is without error today? If there is not, then we worship a God who is either careless or impotent to keep His Word pure thru the ages."' Dr. Rice was sadly mistaken when he wrote the above words. I did not write the tract that he is quoting from, and he can never produce such a tract at all. The tract that he is quoting from is entitled 'Is the King James Version Nearest to the Original Autographs?' Nowhere on the tract does it say or even hint that it was written by E.L. Bynum. It was written by Dr. David Otis Fuller. Less than two inches above the quote that Dr. Rice printed, in the same column and on the same page, it is clearly printed and set out by itself, 'By David Otis Fuller.' How could he miss that?

He says that I have misquoted Fuller, but I did not. These are Fuller's own words. He did not finish Fuller's questions in the paragraph, which stated, 'HOW can we say we believe in the inerrancy of the Word of God and yet say there are errors in every translation?' **IT APPEARS THAT BROTHER RICE WANTED TO CAST FULLER'S STATEMENT IN THE VERY WORST LIGHT POSSIBLE, FOR THE VERY NEXT PARAGRAPH OF THE TRACT SAYS, 'WE DO NOT SAY THAT THE KJV DOES NOT PERMIT CHANGES. THERE ARE A NUMBER THAT COULD BE AND SHOULD BE MADE BUT THERE IS A VAST DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A CHANGE AND AN ERROR.' OF COURSE HE COULDN'T PRINT THAT, BECAUSE THAT WOULD HAVE MADE THE TRACT NOT SEEM TO BE SO RADICAL AFTER ALL!!**

Although he had the tract right in front of him, he doesn't answer 'Is the King James Version Nearest to the Original Autographs?' **HE DOESN'T ANSWER THE TITLE, NOR DOES HE ATTEMPT TO ANSWER THE MATERIAL PRINTED IN THE TRACT**. We suggest that he can't and that is one reason he has to take off on a tangent and print a tirade against those who defend the KJV against the rash of revisers and critics. ...

Dr. Rice lists several questions which he insists that the defenders of the KJV answer, and if they don't answer them, he charges them to say nothing to him or to anyone else. **HIS QUESTIONS ARE LOADED, OR STATED IN SUCH A WAY THAT THEY WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO ANSWER. SOME OF THEM ARE LIKE THE OLD QUESTION, 'HAVE YOU QUIT BEATING YOUR WIFE YET?**' and then insist upon a yes or no answer. Either way you answer it, you are guilty. However, we are going to take a look at some of Dr. Rice's questions. ...

Dr. Rice's first question is as follows: 'What accepted Bible commentary, what statement of faith, of any church or denomination states that the King James Version is without error in translation?' This is a question that is calculated to be a KJV straw man, that Dr. Rice will vanquish on the field of combat. **I HAVE A QUESTION FOR DR. RICE: 'WHAT STATEMENT OF FAITH OF ANY CHURCH OR DENOMINATION STATES THAT THE KING JAMES VERSION CONTAINS A CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OR ANY AMOUNT OF ERROR? OUR QUESTION IS JUST AS FAIR AS DR. RICE'S, AND I CONTEND THAT THE CONFESSIONS OF FAITH GIVE MORE SUPPORT TO THE DEFENDERS OF THE KJV THAN THEY DO TO ITS CRITICS.** No Confession of Faith that I have seen makes any criticism of the KJV, nor do any of them suggest that another version is needed. ...

The General Baptists of England published the 'Orthodox Creed' in 1678. It says, 'And by the holy Scriptures we understand the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, *as they are now translated into our English mother tongue, of which there hath NEVER been any doubt of their verity, and authority, in the protestant churches of Christ to this day*.' ... The above confession may be found in *Baptist Confessions of Faith* by W.L. Lumpkin and published by Judson Press. If this does not answer Dr. Rice's question, we would like to know why. Of course it is not worded in the exact way that his question is asked, but that is not necessary, if it speaks to the point. ... These Baptists were not weighted down with 20th-century theories which would rob them of confidence in an infallible Bible. ...

THE CONFESSIONS OF FAITH GIVE LITTLE OR NO COMFORT TO THE CRITICS OF THE KJV. THE KJV WAS THE ENGLISH VERSION THAT REIGNED SUPREME FROM THE TIME OF THE LONDON CONFESSION OF 1677, THE NEW HAMPSHIRE CONFESSION OF 1833, THE BAPTIST BIBLE UNION OF 1923, AND ALL OF THE OTHER CONFESSIONS IN BETWEEN AND AFTERWARD. THE BURDEN OF PROOF FALLS UPON DR. RICE AND OTHERS WHO AGREE WITH HIM TO TAKE ALL OF THESE CONFESSIONS OF FAITH AND PROVE THAT THE KJV HAS ERRORS.

It will do no good to quote some obscure passage from some preacher that had a part in writing one of these Confessions. There may well have been some who would agree with Dr. Rice, if they were here today. What we do say, without any fear of successful contradiction, is this, at no time when any of these Confessions were being written could there have been any hope of getting any one of them passed, if they had said in any way that 'there are errors in the King James Version.'...

Whether Dr. Rice knows it or not, there are already many fundamental and independent Baptist churches who have placed the KJV either in their Confession of Faith or in their Constitution and Bylaws. More will be doing it in the days ahead, and especially the more they study the issues, and the more that they read in fundamental publications that there are 'errors' in the KJV. [Editor: We have quoted many such statements in this book.]

While we lay no claim to scholarship, nor do we pretend that we can answer any and every question asked about the KJV, nevertheless we will gladly stand up for this glorious book. Those who stand on the KJV do not have to be able to answer

all the critics. It is the critics who must be called upon to prove beyond a shadow of doubt that they are right. ...

Dr. Rice has mentioned what he believes to be two errors in the KJV. We sincerely wish that these two 'errors' were all he had in mind, but we know it is not. It is only a tiny tip of the iceberg. In the *Sword of the Lord*, and in a number of his books, Dr. Rice has mentioned quite a number of verses in the KJV that he thinks are in error. ... **WE WOULD LIKE TO CHALLENGE DR. RICE TO LIST ALL OF THE ERRORS IN THE KJV**. He could simply run a list of them in the *Sword of the Lord* for the benefit of all the 'ignorant' people who do not have the knowledge or ability to find all these 'errors.' Some of us would like to know how much 'error' we have been believing all these years. If he knows about 'errors,' the only honest thing he can do is to publish them all. ...

THE AWFUL TRAGEDY OF THIS 'ERROR' HUNTING GENERATION IS THAT NO TWO 'SCHOLARS' AGREE ON THE EXACT NUMBER OF 'ERRORS.' Any list that Dr. Rice would compile would be disputed by others who find 'errors' in the KJV. Some would want to take some off of his list, and others would want to add on many others. Now, we are not talking about what the modernists would do, but we are talking about what those who say they are fundamental and believe in verbal inspiration would do, who find 'errors' in the KJV.

This writer would be foolish to leave the impression that he can prove every verse, word and letter belongs in the Bible. Believing the Bible is a matter of faith and not scholarship. **I CANNOT ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS THAT SOME MIGHT ASK ABOUT THE BIBLE. NEITHER CAN I PROVE FROM A HUMAN STANDPOINT THAT ALL THAT IS IN THE KJV IS CORRECT. IT IS UTTERLY FOOLISH TO THINK THAT THE BIBLE CAN BE REDUCED TO FIT THE CHANGING FANCIES OF HUMAN REASONING. THIS IS A BOOK OF FAITH, AND WITHOUT FAITH IT CANNOT BE UNDERSTOOD OR BELIEVED.** While this line of reasoning does not suit the intellectual and even many who call themselves Bible scholars, it certainly fits the need of the simple believer in Christ. Millions of Christians have lived and died believing everything in the Bible, not because they could prove it all, but because it was in the Bible. ...

One thing that amazes me is the continued inconsistency of those who criticize the King James Version. Of course we are now talking about the fundamentalists, and not the modernists. Many of these brethren have written and spoken on the infallibility of the Word of God. They read their text from the KJV, all of their other proof texts from the KJV. They hold the KJV up in the air and wave it around, and loudly acclaim their belief in an inerrant Bible that is inspired of God. Everyone in the audience believes that they are talking about the KJV, but lo and behold they are not. They are talking about the originals, which no living man has ever seen on this earth!

At this point it will suit our purpose to show just one example, as follows: 'I have a miracle in my hands in this Book. I don't mean the paper, I don't mean the leather cover. I have in my hands a message from God, the infallible, eternal Word of God. And ten thousand years from now this will still be the Word of God' (Dr. John R. Rice, *Sword of the Lord*, April 13, 1973, p. 5). This is a classic example of what we are talking about. There can be little doubt which version Dr. Rice was holding in his hand. It was the Bible that he says that he does his preaching

and teaching from, the Authorized Version, better known in the U.S.A. as the KJV of 1611. Then in other issues of the *Sword of the Lord* and in his books, Dr. Rice would have us to believe that there are a considerable number of errors in the KJV. Which statement of Dr. Rice shall we believe? Both statements cannot be true! ...

The cry for a new version has come from the apostasy of the 19th century, which has taken root in the 20th century, even among God's people. The source of the new versions has been from the putrid fountain of German Higher Criticism, humanism, ecumenicalism and modernism. Have you ever met a modernist that preferred the KJV? I have not, and I don't expect I ever will. A modernist will prefer almost any version above the KJV. That should tell us something!

Not all advocates of the new versions are modernists by any means. But they have been drinking at the polluted fountains of modernism, Catholicism, and ecumenicalism. They have adopted a position that is detrimental to the truth, and which will be used of Satan to lead countless numbers into error. ... **WHEN WE ABANDON AN ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY, WE BECOME THE AUTHORITY, OR AT LEAST RECOGNIZE THE AUTHORITY OF SOME MAN WHO IS A SCHOLAR, OR AT LEAST CLAIMS TO BE ONE. REMEMBER THAT GOD IS A JEALOUS GOD AND THAT HE HAS MAGNIFIED HIS WORD ABOVE HIS NAME!** (E.L. Bynum. *King James Fans*?).

I appreciate the straightforward, yet gracious Christian attitude that was expressed in Pastor Bynum's report. He answered Dr. Rice without calling him ugly names and without labeling him a cultist. It is never easy to deal with personalities in a public manner like this. One's motives always seem to be misunderstood by some, but it is absolutely necessary that public challenges like Dr. Rice's be answered publicly and plainly. I would urge each reader to obtain a copy of Bynum's *King James Fans?* and read it carefully.

DEAN BURGON SOCIETY

As can be seen in Donald Waite's testimony in this same chapter, the Dean Burgon Society (DBS) was founded in 1978. The organizational meeting was held November 3-4 in Philadelphia. The Organizing Committee consisted of D.O. Fuller, D.A. Waite, and E.L. Bynum. A total of twenty men came together to form the new organization, among whom were Thomas Strouse, M. James Hollowood, and Everett Fowler. *The Articles of Faith, Operation & Organization* were adopted at this meeting. The DBS lists 13 objects under its Purpose of Existence. These can be summarized into the following points:

1. To reprint and circulate as widely as possible John Burgon's works.

2. To defend the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text of the Old Testament and the Traditional Received Greek Text of the New Testament.

3. To defend the Traditional English Translation of the Bible.

4. To expose and publicize the defects, deficiencies, errors, and mistakes both in the Texts used and in the Translation process and results of any and all modern

translations of the Bible, whether in English, or in other languages, which are NOT based on the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text and Traditional Received Greek Text which underlie the King James Version.

5. To revive interest in the firsthand study of the Hebrew and Greek Texts of the Bible.

6. To acquire, print, and distribute books by other late 19th-century and early 20th-century scholars who defended the Traditional Text and the King James Bible.

7. To encourage articles, research, books, and other materials devoted to the study of the history, canon, text, authority, inspiration, and translation of the Bible.

The key visionary behind the formation of the DBS was Dr. Donald Waite. The *Dean Burgon Society Newsletter* has been published infrequently since 1978, and an annual meeting has been held. The Society has served to encourage many men in the defense of the King James Bible.

Some have criticized the Dean Burgon Society, claiming that Burgon did not stand for what the DBS stands for. Further, some have made an issue of the fact that the DBS is composed largely of Baptists whereas Burgon was an Anglican. I have never been a member of the DBS nor have I attended any of the meetings, but I don't see any problem with the name of the society. Those who formed it had been encouraged by Burgon's defense of the Traditional Text; they had benefited from the old Anglican's zeal for the Word of God; and they wanted to honor the man and to walk in his footsteps *in that one particular area*. They acknowledge that they do not see eye-to-eye with Burgon in a number of important issues. I don't see any problem here except for those who are merely looking for a handle whereby to criticize. It's a stubby handle! This is the type of gnat that some men spend a great deal of energy straining out. D.A. Waite, for his part, has written an interesting defense of the use of Burgon's name by the DBS. It is titled *Ten Reasons Why the Dean Burgon Society Deserves Its Name* and is available from The Bible for Today.

The Dean Burgon Society statement on the Bible has been used by a number of schools and churches:

We believe that the King James Version (or Authorized Version) of the English Bible is a true, faithful, and accurate translation of these two providentially preserved Texts [the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text and the Received Greek Text], which in our time has no equal among all of the other English Translations. The translators did such a fine job in their translation task that we can without apology hold up the Authorized Version of 1611 and say 'This is the WORD OF GOD!' while at the same time realizing that, in some verses, we must go back to the underlying original language Texts for complete clarity, and also compare Scripture with Scripture.

We believe that all the verses in the King James Version belong in the Old and the New Testaments because they represent words we believe were in the

original Texts, although there might be other renderings from the original languages which could also be acceptable to us today. For an exhaustive study of any of the words or verses in the Bible, we urge the student to return directly to the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text and the Traditional Received Greek Text rather than to any other translation for help.

Bible inspiration and Bible preservation are supremely important. The undermining or destroying of either doctrine renders the other meaningless. **IF THE BIBLE IS NOT VERBALLY, PLENARILY, AND INERRANTLY INSPIRED, AND IF INSPIRATION DOES NOT EXTEND TO ALL MATTERS OF WHICH THE BIBLE SPEAKS, IT DOES NOT MATTER IF THE BIBLE HAS BEEN PRESERVED OR HOW IT HAS BEEN PRESERVED. IT ALSO FOLLOWS THAT, IF THE BIBLE HAS NOT BEEN PRESERVED, IT DOES NOT MATTER HOW IT WAS INSPIRED** (From the Committee Statement on Bible Preservation of the Dean Burgon Society).

At the annual meeting in July 1993, the Dean Burgon Society passed the following Resolution Defending Faith in the King James Bible:

WHEREAS the original language text of Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek underlying the authorized King James Bible is the only Received text perpetuated in historical continuity from the original autographs and:

WHEREAS the authorized King James Bible has been defended by a consensus of common faith of English-speaking saints for nearly 400 years as the English standard of God's Holy Scriptures; and:

WHEREAS the King James Bible is translated by superior texts, translators, techniques, and theology; and:

WHEREAS the authorized King James Bible and those who defend and use it are facing increased ridicule and oppression from some church leaders, educational institutions, and mission agencies;

Be it therefore resolved that we the executive committee and members of the Dean Burgon Society, meeting in annual session at Heritage Baptist University and Berean Baptist Church, Greenwood, Indiana, July 22, 1993, do hereby commend those who hold in honor the King James Bible (AV) as God's Holy Scriptures, and warn those who willfully oppose them, that they will one day face in Judgment the Holy God of Holy Scripture.

DIVIETRO, KIRK

Dr. Kirk DiVietro (b. 1952) is the pastor of Grace Baptist Church, Franklin, Massachusetts, and is a member of the Dean Burgon Society Advisory Council. At the DBS meeting in Hagerstown, Maryland, August 18, 1994, DiVietro spoke on the two-fold subject of "Use of Computers in Bible Research" and "Scholars Lie." Excerpts from this fascinating message follow:

I did all the normal college sophomore things, and one of the things my professors told me was that though the new Greek New Testaments have been altered, whenever they've been changed the original is down in the footnotes. ... I went home and started to look at my Greek New Testament. I looked in 1 John

5:13. In the Scrivener text there are three lines. In the UBS 3rd Edition Greek text there are two lines. There are 11 words missing. I looked in the footnote. There weren't 11 words in the footnote. I made a discovery as a college sophomore.

Scholars lie. They absolutely, unequivocally, unambiguously lie. So I started on a quest to find out what was going on.

I wrote a letter to Dr. Bruce Metzger, and I have here the response to my letter. Dr. Metzger is supposed to be the leading textual scholar in America. I said to him, 'Dr. Metzger, in a certain place you put a note that there was a rough breathing mark instead of a soft breathing mark on a word. Why, then, would you leave out 11 words without any kind of footnote?' He said, 'We only put in things that would make a translational difference.' That's a real interesting statement! [As if eleven words do not make a translational difference.]

As a consequence of that, I started some research. I am one of those people who loves to count things and look at things and investigate things. I was reading again in my Greek New Testament and recognized something that was very interesting to me. I wrote again to Dr. Metzger and said, 'Dr. Metzger, I've been working on a Greek New Testament, and as I've gone through it I have found out that not one time did you ever capitalize the word for God; not one time did you ever capitalize the word for Holy Spirit; not one time, if you could get away with it, did you ever capitalize the word for Lord. Was there a reason for that?' Dr. Metzger said, 'In the original manuscripts that we have there is no size difference indicating deity. To have introduced any capitalizations would have been an editorial comment.' I thought, That's interesting. I looked down the page. Here's the word for Devil; here's the word for Satan; and they are both capitalized. Interesting.

I found out that scholars lie.

I found out that even in the earliest manuscript we have, the infamous Codex B, the Vaticanus, the favorite of Westcott and Hort, the favorite of Bruce Metzger and the editing committee, that the words for God are always clearly indicated. He was right in that they did not capitalize them. But they did make a clear distinction. ... I learned that even the scholars who produced the Vaticanus indicated clearly the names of deity by the way they wrote the Greek characters for the Lord Jesus Christ.

Scholars lie. They do it consistently.

After seeing what they did in 1 John 5:13, I started to go through the entire New Testament. I went through all of 1 John, 2 John, 3 John, to Revelation. Then I started through the book of Mark. I checked 1 and 2 Peter. I checked into the book of James. I found out that one out of every three verses in the Greek New Testament is changed without a footnote, and that two out of every three verses that John wrote are changed without a footnote.

To make a long story short, I started my studies, then I ran into Dr. Fuller' book *Which Bible?* It was very helpful. Later on I read Dr. Burgon's book and several others I was able to track down. I then started a Master's thesis, got into computers, and started looking for a Greek text. The only one that was available was the UBS Third Edition, a Westcott-Hort version of the Bible. There apparently was no way to change it. I thought there had to be a way to change it,

and I started tinkering around. I got in and was able to change a word or two, then somebody else came out with a different version of the same program. They said I could get it from the University of Pennsylvania. I drove down there and they gave me the UBS Third Edition; they gave me the Latin Vulgate; they gave me some Aramaic targums, and all sorts of things. I brought them home and started to work. I started to change 1 John and got it changed over to the Textus Receptus. I went after 2 John, 3 John, and changed it. I then got a copy of the first page of Hebrews in the Stephens 1550. If you look at that and if you've had Greek, you will see that you have to relearn how to read the Greek because they didn't use the same kind of letters we use today. (I found out, by the way, that George Ricker Berry's 1550 interlinear is not an accurate transcription of the 1550 Stephen. He took liberties with the 1550. There are things missing; there are things added, without notes, that you won't pick up along the way.) I had to learn how to read the old Greek manuscripts. Then we had to go one step further. Not only did we have to learn a new alphabet, but we had to learn the computer codes. We had to go in word by word, letter by letter, punctuation by punctuation, and had to learn the computer codes for these so we could instruct the computer to make the proper Greek letters. It took about a month to do that. It took two years of analyzing the Greek texts, determining the correct reading, and converting it to the computer codes.

If you have heard of Logos, the Bible research program, the Scrivener's text that is in there is the text that resulted from this. Please understand that I have had no one to proof read it. Therefore, there are some mistakes which need to be worked out, because we just didn't have the help we needed at that time. Anyhow, that's how we got the text over.

FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

The Free Presbyterian Church stands firmly in the old Presbyterian faith. They are separated from the apostasy of the hour and hold to the Authorized English Bible. The Free Presbyterian Church was founded in 1951 in Northern Ireland. There are 17 of these congregations in North America and roughly 100 in the world. The following statement on the Bible is from *Separated Unto the Gospel*, a book published by the Free Presbyterians to explain their position.

> In carrying on this preaching ministry the Free Presbyterian Church has, throughout its history, used the Authorized (often called the 'King James') Version of the Scriptures. We wish to avoid the confusion that arises from the use of many different translations and paraphrases in church services. We believe the Authorized Version is unrivaled as a translation of the Scriptures and that it reflects the authentic, historic Hebrew and Greek texts that God 'immediately inspired, and by His singular care and providence kept pure in all ages' (Westminster Confession of Faith, I.8).

Observe that the Free Presbyterians apply the Westminster Confession's statement on the preservation of Scripture directly to the Authorized Version and to the Received Text. This, of course, is only reasonable, as this was precisely the Text revered by the men who drew up the Westminster Confession.

Many of the Free Presbyterian pastors and laymen have spoken and written in defense of the King James Bible. **Ian Richard Kyle Paisley** (b. 1926) in Ireland is one example. He is the senior pastor of a noted Free Presbyterian congregation. He is a revivalist and preaches evangelistically across Ireland. He also founded the Democratic Unionist Party to help stem the efforts to unite Ireland under Catholic authority. In 1970, Paisley was elected to the North Ireland Parliament. He was then elected to the British Parliament, and in 1979, to the European Parliament. Paisley's popularity is seen in that in this latter election he received more votes than any politician in all United Kingdom electoral history. His popularity has not waned. In 1994 he received even more votes than he had in the 1989 election.

David Beale gives an overview of Paisley's life in his history of fundamentalism:

> Paisley's father, Rev. I. Kyle Paisley, was a Baptist pastor who separated from the apostate Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland in 1935 and became an independent fundamentalist leader in Northern Ireland and the United Kingdom. American fundamentalists like J. Frank Norris and T.T. Shields preached for him in the independent church he established in Ballymena, county Antrim. On his retirement, the church that he founded and pastored became the I. Kyle Paisley Memorial Free Presbyterian congregation in Ballymena, and it is today one of the largest churches in the group.
>
> Ian's mother led him to Christ when he was six years old. He began preaching during his mid-teens. The little mission hall at Six mile Cross, county Tyrone, where he preached his first sermon, later became a thriving Free Presbyterian Church. When a beautiful new church building replaced the old mission hall, the hall was dismantled and re-erected on the grounds of the Whitefield College of the Bible for the use of the students there.
>
> Paisley prepared for the ministry in the Barry School of Evangelism, S. Wales. After completing the program there, he went on to study in the Theological Hall of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland.
>
> Liberal influences had been at work for many years in the Irish Presbyterian Church. For example, after a famous heresy trial back in 1926, the denomination had acquitted a noted modernist professor, J. E. Davey. It later promoted him to the position of principal at the assembly's college, a ministerial training school for Presbyterians, and during the 1950s Davey became the denomination's moderator. As a result of such inroads of modernism, many Christians had left the denomination and established the Irish Evangelical Church (better known as the Evangelical Presbyterian Church).
>
> In 1946, twenty-year-old Ian Paisley accepted a call from the Ravenhill Evangelical Church in Belfast. This church was formed by a major secession from Ravenhill Irish Presbyterian Church. Seventy families, the entire eldership but one, the church committee, and almost the entire Sunday school staff withdrew. The new church remained independent and did not join the Irish Evangelical Church. ... The Ravenhill Evangelical Church ordained young Paisley, and since then he has faithfully ministered to his congregation, known

around the world as the Martyrs' Memorial Free Presbyterian Church. ...

In 1969, with the construction of the largest Protestant church to be built in the British Isles in this century, Paisley's Ravenhill congregation became the Martyrs' Memorial Free Presbyterian Church ... The denomination has placed churches or missions in Canada, the United States, and Australia. ... In 1981, Paisley opened the Whitefield College of the Bible, near Gilford, Northern Ireland (Beale*, In Pursuit of Purity: American Fundamentalism Since 1850*, p. 332, 336).

Paisley's bold, uncompromising stand for the truth has gotten him into a lot of trouble through the years. In 1966, he was imprisoned for three months with two of his colleagues on a trumped up charge of participating in an illegal assembly. Irish Prime Minister Terence O'Neill, who hated Paisley's political and religious stand, instituted the court proceedings. In 1969, Paisley spent several more months in prison, "sentenced to hard labor like a common criminal." Paisley was arrested in Vatican Square for giving out copies of the King James Bible. In October 1988, Paisley was beaten and carried unceremoniously out of a European Parliament meeting in Strasbourg, France. The occasion was a speech made by Pope John Paul II before the Parliament. As the pope began his message, Paisley stood and held up a red sign painted in black letters with the words "John Paul II ANTICHRIST." Paisley shouted, "I refuse you as Christ's enemy and Antichrist with all your false doctrine." These were the words spoken by Archbishop Cranmer before he was burned at the stake for his testimony. Paisley tells what happened at that point:

I have read in the Book of Revelation the power of the word of testimony, but I never realised what power was in a martyr's testimony. If I had brought a ton of explosives and let them off in that Assembly it could not have had a greater effect. That vast Assembly erupted, and the books started to fly and the punches started to be thrown, and the kicking started, but I held my ground and maintained my testimony. **THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EUROPE TODAY AND EUROPE IN REFORMATION TIMES**. This afternoon I read again the story of Luther, at the Diet of Worms. Who presided over the Diet of Worms? The Emperor Charles, Head of the Holy Roman Empire. Who was he? He was a Hapsburg. It is interesting to note that one of the men who attacked me is the last of the Hapsburgs—Otto Hapsburg, the Pretender to the Crown of Austria and Hungary. I said to myself, 'The Hapsburgs are still lusting for Protestant blood. They are still the same as they were in the days of Luther.' The members of the Roman Catholic Party of Mr. Le Pen of which John Taylor is a member were round me battering away at me as hard as they could.

I have some little experience of protests. I know if you go to protest with one poster it is not any good, because if they tear it down your protest is over. So I filled my pockets with posters. The woman reporter in the R.T.E. said I was like a conjurer, from every pocket I was bringing out posters! When one disappeared a second one took its place. When the second one disappeared, a third one took its place. With some exaggeration she said I had posters in every pocket. Well, I did not have them in every pocket, I had them in one pocket. I

knew if I had them in the outside pockets they would tear them, so I had them buttoned here inside. I had folded them in such a way that they opened up almost simultaneously when I got them out of the pocket and held them up.

Eventually I was hauled out. **The Security men had allowed a vicious attack on a Member of the House, a violation of all the laws of the Parliament. Yet the President never once rebuked anybody who did the throwing of books or the vicious attack upon me physically. All he did was attack me for what I said**. I sustained injuries to my legs and spine and have lodged a claim against the Parliament.

If there be some Roman Catholic with us tonight we are glad you have come to hear the truth of the Gospel, and I implore you to turn away from your Church. I do not ask you to turn to Protestantism. I ask you to turn to Jesus. He alone can save your soul. I am not going to Heaven because I am a Protestant; I am going to Heaven because I am saved by the grace of God that I defend the great truths of the Bible and protest against all errors which are contrary to these Truths of God's Word. 'Neither is there salvation in any other for there is none other name under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved' (Ian Paisley, "None Dare Call Him Antichrist," sermon preached in Martyrs' Memorial Free Presbyterian Church, October 16, 1988).

In 1989 Paisley publicly opposed Billy Graham's ecumenical crusade in London because of the open participation of the Roman Catholic Church. He turned down an invitation to lunch with Graham, saying that he would have no fellowship with those who deny the faith.

Ian Paisley is a strong defender of the King James Bible. He has preached frequently on the superiority of the King James Bible and has written a number of papers on this subject, including *The Living Bible: The Livid Libel of the Scriptures of the Truth*; *The New English Bible, New Testament—A Corruption of the Word of God*; and *The New English Bible, Old Testament—Faithful Translation or Faithless Interpretation?* His position on the Bible was made plain in a message he preached before the World Congress of Fundamentalists at Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina, August 1983. This was published in Bob Jones University's *Faith for the Family* magazine, October 1983:

My subject this evening is a very vital and timely one in the present state of thinking and controversy on this subject amongst our fundamentalist brethren. 'The authority of Holy Scripture versus the confusion of modern English translations.' I'd like to bring you to one text of God's Holy Word this evening. It's the 160th verse of Psalm 119. 'Thy Word is true from the beginning, and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever.'...

As I take up this holy volume tonight I would like you to consider with me four most important and vital matters. It is essential that we have crystal-clear views on these, for they lie at the very foundation. They are indeed fundamentals. ...1) I want to speak about the Bible's Revelation; 2) I want to speak about the Bible's Inspiration; 3) I want to speak about the Bible's Preservation; and 4) I want to speak about the Bible's Translation. ...

And now I come to the hot water, to the controversy. ... I want to say to the fundamentalist brethren who will disagree with what I am going to say: Please don't think I'm a nut because I hold the views I do, and I can assure you I don't think you're a heretic or an apostate because you hold the views you hold because good men, and godly men, and great contenders differed on these particular issues. I don't think we fundamentalists should sweep them under the carpet today. I think we should get down with our brethren to a proper discussion of them because they are vital issues and they are of the utmost importance to us all. ...

The Bible's preservation is another fact. ... This book has been miraculously and mysteriously preserved. The many promises of God concerning its preservation have been gloriously fulfilled. ... The faith has not been delivered to a school. Thank God it has been delivered to the saints. 'The faith once for all delivered to the saints.' ... I believe that the believers accepted the genuine text and rejected the corrupt and the counterfeit text. ...

Attacked from all quarters, this Bible has never given any quarter. It has had an Ishmaelite experience. Every man's hand has been against it, and its hand has been against every man, but it dwells in the midst of the brethren. Princes, philosophers, prelates, and poets have all conspired against it. It has been insulted by the scorn of fools. It has become the jest of infidels and the joke of skeptics. It has been assailed consistently and persistently by professed scholars. It has been made the butt of every so-called 'higher critic.' Assaulted by every known plan of hell—bless God, it has come forth unscathed from the inferno.

Like the three Hebrew children it has been in the fire, and if you smell it, there is not a smell of smoke upon it. It has endured the flame because there's one walking in the midst of it, and He is the Son of God. The fire has yet to be kindled that can burn this Bible. The steel has yet to be forged that can wound it. The scholarship has yet to be developed that can discredit it. The science has yet to be created that can demolish it. The plan has yet to be devised that can annihilate it. The cunning of hell and the craft of earth have combined against the Bible, but it stands unmoved. ...

But **HE WHO WROTE THE BOOK PROVIDENTIALLY IN KEEPING WITH HIS PROMISE GLORIOUSLY PRESERVED IT UNTIL THE TIME OF REFORMATION CAME. THEN THERE AROSE A GLORIOUS COMPANY OF TRANSLATORS WHO SET TO WORK TO GIVE THE NATIONS THE BIBLE IN THEIR MOTHER TONGUE. ... I HAIL THIS BOOK THIS DAY. IT REMAINS AMID THE PASSING AND INJURIES OF TIME A HOLY TEMPLE, UNPROFANED BY THE FOOT OF THE ENEMY. IT REMAINS AN INVINCIBLE BUILDING OF GOD AMIDST THE CRUMBLING RUINS OF THE CENTURY. GOD HAS PRESERVED HIS BOOK AND WILL PRESERVE IT.**

And now we come to the Bible's Translation. ... The Reformation of the sixteenth century was the greatest revival the church had known since the day of Pentecost. It was brought about by the translation of God's Word, and its propagation and preaching. The Reformation did not give us the Bible. The Bible gave us the Reformation. ... This is a dynamic book. The devil fears it. The pope fears it. I was arrested for giving out copies of it in Vatican Square

some years ago, so I just stepped across the border into Italy and continued to give out the dynamite of God's Word. ...

And now I say lovingly to my fundamentalist brethren who will differ from me in this: **I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT IT WAS AN ERRONEOUS TEXT THAT BROUGHT ABOUT SUCH A SUPERNATURAL INTERVENTION OF ALMIGHTY GOD. NOR CAN I ACCEPT THAT THE MOST RELIABLE TEXTS WERE NOT THEN DISCOVERED.** In fact, they weren't discovered, we are told, until the nineteenth century when one was found in the trash can of a monastery and the other in the Pope's library. Because of that I can accept what is known as the Majority Text. And I believe that this is the text which originated the line of what we might call our English translations. They were all based on that text. The line through which the King James or Authorized Version has come—it comes to us via Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, the Great Bible, and the Geneva Bible. ...

Let me state again emphatically that no translation is given by inspiration of God. **Inspiration applies only to the original autograph. Inspiration has to do with the giving of the Scriptures, not their translation**. And those who speak otherwise deceive those that they address.

But what is more, the King James Version is a revision rather than a completely new translation. **It is unique and special because it comes to us providentially as a direct result of the great Reformation and its line of Bibles. ... SO THE KING JAMES VERSION WAS THE APEX—THE CLIMAX OF THE REFORMATION ENGLISH BIBLES AND CAME WITH A SPECIAL SEAL OF HEAVEN UPON THAT GREAT REFORMATION WORK.**

The King James Version is based on the Majority Text, on the Traditional Text, or the Received Text—received by the believers right up to the Reformation period. Again the King James Version was produced by men absolutely dedicated to the verbal inspiration of the Bible—hence, their use of italics to indicate an English word for which there is no equivalent in the original Hebrew and Greek.

The language of the King James Version is terse and reverent and is in timeless English that a child can read, learn, and understand. Its very rhythm has led to sanctity of thought, holy awe, and a worshipful approach to God. It is equally suitable to both private and public reading. **THE KING JAMES IS SPECIAL AND UNIQUE, NOT BECAUSE IT IS OLDER, BUT BECAUSE OUT OF MORE THAN 100 ENGLISH VERSIONS OFFERED, IT IS IN MY OPINION THE BEST TRANSLATION**. We cannot and will not exchange it for an inferior version. Its excellence, its faithfulness, its power, and its witfulness have been proved in our own hearts and in the hearts of millions more.

Now the question is asked, 'Have I got God's inspired Word in my hand?' I want to answer it. 'YES, I HAVE GOD'S INSPIRED WORD IN MY HAND.' THE AUTHORIZED VERSION IS A RELIABLE AND ACCURATE TRANSLATION OF THE VERBALLY INSPIRED WORD OF GOD, and I can pin my hopes on its promises knowing them to be the Word of a God that cannot lie. I CAN ABSOLUTELY DEPEND ON THIS BOOK. IT BRINGS TO ME ACCURATELY AND CLEARLY THE INSPIRED WORD OF THE LIVING

GOD—the word eternally begotten in Heaven, and thank God, eternally settled in Heaven. ...

What is the devil doing now? He's flooding the markets with a rash of counterfeit and corrupted Bibles. ...

I trust this night that sinners shall find a way to heaven, that backsliders shall be restored to their Lord, and that God's people will have a holy fire set alight by God the Holy Ghost within their hearts that we're going to read this book, we're going to obey this book, we're going to preach this book, we're going to defend this book, and we're going to propagate this book. May God make the fundamentalists men and women of the one book for Jesus' sake. Amen (Ian Paisley, *The Authority of the Scriptures vs. the Confusion of Translations*).

FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

The Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland is different from the Free Presbyterian Church founded in Northern Ireland, though both denominations have congregations in many of the same places, including Ulster, Scotland, England, and Canada. It was the confusion caused by two groups having the same name in the same places that resulted in my failure to make a distinction between these two groups of churches in the first edition of *For Love of the Bible*. The Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland came into existence in 1893 and traces its heritage to the Church of Scotland of the Reformation and is founded upon the Westminster Confession. Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland Pastor Keith M. Watkins, in a letter of April 15, 1996, stated the difference between his denomination and the Free Presbyterians of Ulster in these words: "The denomination to which we belong is a *completely* separate one from Dr. Paisley' Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster. Whilst we value the Protestant witness of that denomination, yet in terms of doctrine, worship and practice, it would not be going too far to say that we are almost poles apart! To risk over-generalisation, but in order to give you a taste of the difference, we would endeavour to be a thoroughly *Reformed* church, whereas we would look upon the Ulster denomination as more *fundamentalist* than anything else" (emphasis his).

The Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland has retained its Reformation zeal for old-line Presbyterian doctrine and remains opposed to Roman Catholicism and modern-day ecumenism. For example, the *Free Presbyterian Magazine* of April 1996 contains an article entitled "Roman Ecumenism." The Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland has maintained a zeal for the defense of the Authorized Version and its Received Text. It supports the Trinitarian Bible Society. In fact, three of the officers of the TBS are members of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland. These are A. McPherson (Vice-President) and E.P.C. Greene and K.M. Watkins (committee members).

A Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland minister that had a wide influence in defense of the Authorized Version through his writings was **William MacLean**

(now deceased), who pastored the Free Presbyterian Church in Gisborne, New Zealand, from 1960 to 1973. He wrote *The Providential Preservation of the Greek Text of the New Testament*. This booklet, which summarizes the writings of John Burgon and Edward F. Hill, has been widely used to introduce God's people to this issue. It is printed by Westminster Standard of Gisborne, New Zealand. "The aim of this tractate is to counteract the insinuations and avowed attacks on the integrity of the text on which the Authorised Version is based" (W. MacLean, *The Providential Preservation of the Greek Text of the New Testament*, Preface, p. 5).

The Old Bible is even defended, and wisely so, in the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland's *Young People's Magazine*. For example, the January 1995, issue contains an article by **Keith Watkins** (aforementioned Minister of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland in London, England) entitled "William Tyndale, Apostle of England: The True Bible in Our Language." This is the sixth in a series of articles on Tyndale. Watkins says, "In great measure, it is to Tyndale that we are indebted for our present enjoyment of a faithful and true Bible, for today these very same principles underlie our own Authorised Version of the Bible." He then lists four fundamental principles of Bible translation that Tyndale followed:

> *The first principle is that the Bible should be translated directly from the original languages* in which they were inspired at first by the Holy Spirit of God, that is, from Hebrew and Greek. ...
>
> *The second principle which may be drawn from Tyndale is that the Bible should be translated from the great body of accurate manuscripts which have been preserved in God's providence.* **NO TEXTUAL CRITICISM, NOR SEARCHING OF VATICAN LIBRARIES AND EGYPTIAN SANDS, WAS NECESSARY FOR TYNDALE TO ARRIVE AT THE TRUE WORD OF GOD. INSTEAD HE SIMPLY USED THOSE GREEK AND HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS WHICH IN THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD WERE THEN AVAILABLE TO THE REFORMATION CHURCH**. And to this day, although many more have been discovered since Tyndale's time, the great body of old manuscripts in Greek and Hebrew are faithful copies of the originals. ... **God's providential preservation of His Word ensured that the body of manuscripts available at the Reformation were faithful and true copies of the originals.** ...
>
> *Tyndale' third principle for a true and faithful Bible was that the Bible should be translated with the strictest faithfulness.* He could say, 'I call God to record against the day we shall appear before our Lord Jesus to give reckoning of our doings that I never altered a syllable of God's Word against my conscience, nor would this day, if all that is in earth—whether it be pleasure, honour or riches—be given me.' Thus Tyndale did not believe in what is known as the dynamic equivalence method, as so many do today, who are not afraid to alter whole sentences of God's Word to arrive at a version which is more interpretation than translation. Thankfully, Tyndale was determined to render every word strictly according to the original. Our Authorised Version is based upon the same strict method of translation. ...
>
> *The fourth principle which Tyndale held dear was that the Bible should be*

translated with increasing accuracy. ... And thus we are indebted to him, for such a spirit led in due time to our own Authorised Version, which although it built so much on Tyndale's work, yet it made improvements where appropriate.

FULLER, DAVID OTIS

David Otis Fuller (1903-88 obtained his Bachelor of Arts at Wheaton College, majoring in English literature. He obtained the Master of Divinity degree at Princeton Theological Seminary. Dallas Theological Seminary awarded Fuller the Doctor of Divinity degree. He pastored the Wealthy Street Baptist Church in Grand Rapids, Michigan, for 40 years (1934-74). (This church has stood for the fundamentalist faith for more than 100 years.) While there, he founded the Grand Rapids Baptist Institute that later became the Grand Rapids Baptist Bible College. In 1942 Fuller co-founded the Children's Bible Hour radio program, which is on nearly 600 radio stations, and for 33 years was its chairman. For 52 years Fuller was on the board of the Association of Baptists for World Evangelism, and he was a trustee of Wheaton College for 40 years. (When I asked Dr. Fuller in a letter in about 1982 how he could be on the board of a New Evangelical institution like Wheaton while at the same being associated with fundamentalist institutions, he took offense and threatened to cut off our correspondence!) He was on the Council of 14 in the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches. The *Baptist Bulletin*, which is the GARBC official organ, began publication in Dr. Fuller's church (as per an e-mail from Pastor Charles Dear, Dec. 30, 2000). Fuller published between fifteen and twenty books.

Dr. Fuller had a tremendous love for the Bible throughout his Christian life. It is natural for one who loves the Bible to be concerned about proposed changes in it. Such a one cannot look upon changes in his Bible as insignificant. He must examine those changes. He must see if they have any proper foundation. He believes what the Lord Jesus Christ said in Matthew 4:4, that man does not live by bread alone but by EVERY WORD OF GOD. He is not concerned merely for a WORD from God; He must have all of God's WORDS. This zeal for the Scriptures was one of the distinguishing features of Fuller's life and ministry. By the time he retired from 40 years as pastor of the Wealthy Street Baptist Church in 1974, Fuller had read the Bible through 75 times. That was 14 years before he died.

Fuller's zeal against what he considered to be corrupt versions did not begin in the 1970s. He was already preaching against them in the early 1950s in sermons aimed at the Revised Standard Version. At that time, though, the issue he was facing was not the underlying text of the RSV, but its gross modernistic leanings (such as "young woman" in Isaiah 7:14).

According to Fuller's own testimony, he first became concerned about the textual corruption underlying the modern versions through reading J.J. Ray's *God Wrote Only One Bible* in the 1950s (it was first published in 1955). Prior to that Fuller had only been confronted with the typical line supporting the Westcott-Hort text.

He corresponded with Ray for several months and began studying the issue for himself. He came across Philip Mauro's *Which Version*, Benjamin Wilkinson's *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, John Burgon's *Revision Revised*, and Alfred Martin's dissertation against the Westcott-Hort Text. Mauro had lectured at Princeton when Fuller was a student there. Martin was Vice President of Moody Bible Institute and defended the Received Text against the critical text in his doctoral dissertation at Dallas Theological Seminary graduate school. Martin corresponded with Fuller on the Bible text issue and allowed Fuller to publish a condensation of his dissertation in *Which Bible?* To say, as some have, that Fuller was brainwashed by any one certain man or book is to ignore the facts. Whatever Fuller accepted from Ray or Wilkinson or anyone else he accepted because he felt that it was affirmed by the other sources. Fuller was studying the issue from many angles, and he gained access to many of the nineteenth-century works in defense of the Received Text.

Fuller was so industrious in his zeal to search out the facts on this issue that he sought out John Burgon's unpublished works in the British Museum. "It was the privilege of this compiler, after struggling through several rounds of red tape, to see for myself three of the sixteen folio volumes Burgon had written in his own hand, a compilation of eighty-seven thousand quotations from the early Church Fathers. I make bold to say there is no other collection like this in existence" (Fuller, *Counterfeit or Genuine?* Introduction, p. 11).

We think it is no coincidence that Fuller published his first book in defense of the King James Bible at the beginning of the decade in which the Bible version issue heated up to fever pitch. Only three years after Fuller's first book appeared, the New Testament portion of the New International Version came on the scene.

Altogether Fuller edited three major volumes totaling 900 pages on the Bible version issue: *Which Bible?* (1970*), True or False?* (1973), and *Counterfeit or Genuine?* (1975). These volumes are evidence of Dr. Fuller's diligent research on the subject of texts and versions. He located many books long out of print and made the contents available again to his generation. Fuller's three volumes on this subject contain the full or summarized works of many older authorities on the textual issue, including John Burgon, Herman Hoskier, Philip Mauro, Joseph Philpot, Samuel Zwemer, and George Sayles Bishop, as well as the works of a number of contemporary writers, including Edward Hills, Terence Brown, and Wilbur Pickering. Dr. Fuller was influential in obtaining and publishing several post-graduate theses that defend the TR and the KJV in opposition to the modern versions. These include the following:

> *A Critical Examination of the Westcott-Hort Textual Theory*—Alfred Martin's dissertation to the faculty of the Graduate School of Dallas Theological Seminary, May *1951.*
>
> *The Preservation of the Scriptures*—Donald Brake's dissertation to the faculty of the Department of Systematic Theology at Dallas Theological Seminary in

partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Theology Degree, May 1970.

An Evaluation of the Contribution of John William Burgon to New Testament Textual Criticism—Wilbur Pickering's thesis presented to the faculty of the Department of New Testament Literature and Exegesis at the Dallas Theological Seminary in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Theology Degree, May 1968.

Dr. Fuller's books present in no uncertain terms the position that there IS a preserved Bible today in the English language, because it is accurately translated from the preserved Hebrew and Greek texts. Fuller's book *Which Bible?* has gone through more than a dozen printings, and more than 100,000 copies of Fuller's three books have been published. The material in Fuller's books have been reprinted and summarized in countless other books and pamphlets and used to document thousands of sermons.

Contrary to the wild-eyed caricature that many have drawn of him, Dr. Fuller did not claim that the King James Bible was given by inspiration or that it could not be improved or changed or that it is advanced revelation or any such thing. He claimed that it is the only reliable English translation of the preserved Greek and Hebrew text of Scripture. He did not believe the KJV has errors, but he differentiated plainly between improvements and errors.

> We do not say that the KJV does not permit of changes. There are a number that could be **and should be** made, but there is a vast difference between a change and an error (Fuller, *Is the King James Version Nearest to the Original Autographs?* nd., p. 1).

> I do NOT say the King James Version was inspired as the original manuscripts, but I DO say that God supervised and directed and chose by means of King James the First and his advisers, 48 of the greatest scholars of their time or any time in history. The Holy Spirit caused them to choose the manuscripts of the Old and New Testament which were nearest to the originals and the most accurate of all the manuscripts. I do not believe the King James Version has errors or mistakes in it. I do believe it has problems and I do not have the answer to all of those problems, but I KNOW there is an answer to every one. ... I am sure ... that the Great God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ will not condemn me or censor me for holding fast to that which I have stated above in defending God's pure, true, inerrant, infallible, inspired Word as found in the King James Version (Fuller*, My Answer to Those Who Have Misinterpreted My Stand on the Inerrancy of the KJV*, nd., pp. 4,6).

The thesis of Fuller's first book on Bible versions, *Which Bible?* is given on pages 5 and 6 as follows*:*

> **THE COMPILER OF THIS BOOK, AND THE ABLE WRITERS WHOM HE QUOTES, ALL CONTEND THAT THE BIBLE IS THE INSPIRED, INERRANT AND AUTHORITATIVE WORD OF GOD AND THAT THERE HAS BEEN A GRACIOUS EXERCISE OF THE DIVINE PROVIDENCE IN ITS PRESERVATION** and transmission. They are also deeply convinced that the

> inspired text is more faithfully represented by the Majority Text—sometimes called the Byzantine Text, the Received Text or the Traditional Text—than by the modern critical editions which attach too much weight to the Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus and their allies. For this reason the reader is encouraged to maintain confidence in the **King James Version as a faithful translation based upon a reliable text** (Fuller, *Which Bible?,* pp. 5, 6).

"A faithful translation based upon a reliable text." That is what David Otis Fuller believed about the King James Bible. For various reasons, many have not been content to allow Fuller to state his own position. Instead they have caricatured him as a wild-eyed individual who believed that every word of the KJV was penned by direct inspiration. One would think that Dr. Fuller went around saying, "If the KJV was good enough for Paul it was good enough for me." This caricature is convenient as a straw man that those who despise the Authorized Version can pummel in a very grand and pompous manner.

An honest evaluation of Fuller's *Which Bible?* was given by Dr. John Holliday in the *Gospel Witness*:

> WHICH BIBLE? is not a repudiation of scholarship. It is not an argument for the inerrancy of a translation. It is not a defense of out-dated forms of speech. It is an exposure of the presence of enemies in the field of Bible translation. It is a warning against adulterated versions of the Scriptures, particularly versions which show evidence of having been deliberately corrupted in order to destroy belief in vital Biblical truths. It is a long-overdue defense of the worth of the old Authorized Version ... **A DEFENSE THAT IS GROUNDED UPON THE TRUSTWORTHINESS OF ITS UNDERLYING TEXT AND THE FAITHFULNESS OF THE TRANSLATION**.

David Otis Fuller was powerfully aware of the fact that he stood before God in his life and ministry. He was not an arm-chair theologian; he was a soul winner and a pastor. His chief concern was for the authority of God's Word in the lives and hearts of people. His wisdom was not ivory tower; it was down-to-earth. Consider this reply he sent to an editor who misunderstood his position:

> These are desperate days, the VERY LAST days. Men wildly grope and seek for something solid and secure and certain to hold on to when everything around them is crumbling before their eyes. You and I will have to stand before a Holy God someday and give an account as to what we did or did NOT do to try and wake up sleeping, snoring, smugly contented Christians to the deadly peril we face as of NOW. The rug is being pulled from under us with this spate of 100 versions, so MANY of them naught but PERversions and the wool has been pulled over our eyes the past 100 years, ever since the publication of the Revised Version of 1881 where all this mischief began *(*D.O. Fuller, *My Answer*, p. 5).

As a member of the Council of 14 of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches, Fuller attempted to strengthen the position of the GARBC in regard to Bible texts. This battle was unsuccessful, for the most part, though he did succeed in encouraging many within the GARBC at the individual and church

level and the Michigan state branch of the GARBC did come out with a position paper in defense of the Received Text and the King James Bible. We see Fuller's heartbeat in all of this in a letter to Dr. Paul Tassel, National Representative of the GARBC:

> God is my witness. I am not trying to be divisive, controversial, or one that 'troubleth Israel.' To me, and to a great number of others to whom I have spoken in this country and Canada, this is a life or death matter, for if we do not have an infallible, inerrant, inspired, pure (Proverbs 30:5), true (John 17:17) Word of God now, (NOT in the originals), to rest our weary souls upon for Time and Eternity, then our salvation is worthless and we have but one option; let's eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die and go to hell (January 8, 1982).

It is this view of the issue that motivated Fuller in the battle of the versions. As we have noted, he loved the Word of God, and a great many men simply do not understand a genuine, heart-felt zeal for the Bible. The issue of exactly what motivated Fuller is so important that I am going to give another quotation:

> Please remember this. You and I are facing, as I have said before, the most vicious and malicious attack upon the Word of God that has ever been made since the garden of Eden, and the modern attack began with the publication of the Revised Version of 1881. This is an unpopular cause at present in Christian circles. I have found this out again and again, and I am going to find it out in the future. But I can say as far as I am concerned it doesn't make any difference what happens to me, but it makes a whale of a difference what happens to the cause of Jesus Christ. And someday you and I, my friend, will have to stand before a holy God and give an account to what we did or did not do in seeking to open the eyes of people to the facts that have been covered up for so long concerning His holy, indestructible, impregnable Word.

Some have questioned Dr. Fuller's motives in his stand for the King James Bible, but these individuals, unless they have divine insight into another man's heart, have no evidence that he was motivated by *anything* other than principle. He said he was motivated by love for the Bible. Those who knew him best believed this. I have looked at the evidence (including the statements by many of his critics) as one who did not know him, apart from communicating with him by mail, and I am convinced that for those who are not predisposed to vilify the man, the evidence points to one conclusion: Dr. Fuller was a brave Christian gentleman who was motivated by his God-given conviction that the King James Bible is the preserved Word of God and that the modern versions are corruptions thereof.

He certainly did not gain anything, from an earthly perspective, for his stand for the King James Bible. As we have seen, he was a highly respected pastor and Christian leader before he published *Which Bible?,* and he did not gain in prestige or influence for standing for the King James Bible. Rather, he was mocked, ridiculed, slandered, and ostracized, even by many of his own fundamentalist and Baptist brethren. He made no personal financial gain from

the sale of his books, having turned the profit back into the printing ministry.

Countless Christians today who have confidence in their Bibles, who have been delivered from the fog of critical textual theorizing and from the confusion of an unsettled text of Scripture, have David Otis Fuller to thank.

> One may not have understood the arguments and details Dr. Fuller was presenting, but when you left the room, you knew God was real to Dr. Fuller, and the King James Bible was His infallible authority in every area in which it spoke. You also knew Dr. Fuller had a genuine concern for both your soul and your life (Pastor Robert Barnett, *Which Bible? Bulletin*, March 1990).

Some of the fundamentalists who are promoting modern textual criticism, such as Bob Ross, Gary Hudson, Doug Kutilek, and James Price, have made the amazing charge that the current King James Bible defense is based upon the views of Benjamin Wilkinson, a Seventh-day Adventist professor. They claim that Wilkinson authored the view that the Received Text is the preserved Word of God that can be traced through history, and that J.J. Ray and David Otis Fuller picked up on his teaching and promoted it to the "KJV Only" crow.

In his 1930 book, *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, Wilkinson defended the text of the King James Bible and gave some evidence of its textual primacy among Bible believers through the centuries. Large portions of Wilkinson's book were republished in David Otis Fuller's 1970 book, *Which Bible*.

That much is fact. Whether Fuller was right or wrong in reprinting some of Wilkinson's writings (and hiding the fact that Wilkinson was an Adventist) is something each reader will have to decide for himself.

I believe that he was wrong. Wilkinson's writings added nothing of substance to the debate and by using Wilkinson's book Dr. Fuller gave his enemies something to use against him and his position on the Bible.

Further, Wilkinson was wrong in some of his facts, having leaned heavily upon the writings of Adventist "prophetess" Ellen G. White. (I have obtained the vast majority of the books cited by Wilkinson for my own library with the objective of checking his documentation.) It is not true, for instance, that the Waldensen had a perfect Bible that is exactly like the King James. While the Waldensian New Testaments were much closer to the King James than to the modern versions, they were not exactly like the KJV. I have had the privilege of examining two of the seven extant Waldensian Bibles--the one at Trinity College, Dublin, and the one at Cambridge University. Both are based on Latin and have the textual corruptions that pertain to Latin. For example both omit "God" in 1 Timothy 3:16. Wilkinson claimed that the Waldensian Bibles were based on an "old Latin" rather than the Latin vulgate and were textually perfect, but this is not true (if we believe that the Greek Received Text is pure).

At the same time, to claim that Fuller's views on the Bible version issue were

derived from Wilkinson and to make Wilkinson the father of King James Bible defense is pure unadulterated nonsense.

Further, I am convinced that it is *MALICIOUS* nonsense, because even though this silly little myth has been refuted (such as in my book *For Love of the Bible,* first edition 1995 and second edition 1999, as well as in this article, which was first published in 2000) the aforementioned men continued to perpetuate it. As of September 8, 2008, their articles purporting this myth are still on the web.

Why is it nonsense to say that Fuller's views were derived from Wilkinson? For one thing, long before Wilkinson wrote on the Bible version issue, there were pastors and Christian leaders defending the King James Bible in the same way that Dr. Fuller defended it. We have carefully and extensively documented that fact in this book.

Fuller published the writings of a wide variety of men on the Bible version issue, and many of them wrote prior to Wilkinson. Thus, to focus on Wilkinson as the basis for Fuller's views is something that is done merely to demagogue Fuller and other defenders of the KJV.

Fuller was only a man, with the faults and weaknesses of a man. I respect him but I do not idolize him. The eternal treasure is held in "earthen vessels" (2 Cor. 4:7) and those who preach the Word of God are "subject to like passions as we are" (Jam. 5:17). But there can be no doubt that Fuller was a scholarly individual who studied the Bible Version issue from many angles. As we have seen, he even visited the British Library to seek out John Burgon's unpublished works.

For more on D.O. Fuller see the section on Robert Barnett.

GIBSON, DENIS

Pastor Denis Gibson (b. 1931), Calvary Baptist Church, Brampton, Ontario, is a member of the Dean Burgon Society and has written a number of papers in defense of the King James Bible. The following testimony was contained in a letter dated April 19, 1995. I find Pastor Gibson's testimony refreshing. The man has been willing to take a stand for the truth all along the way in his Christian walk, regardless of the price.

> I am no expert, nor would I claim to be such. I have taken considerable Greek and Hebrew studies, and continue to read the Biblical languages on a daily basis. ... I tried to face this issue as it affected me as a pastor who must answer to God one Day for how I have handled the Word of life.
>
> I was born in Northern Ireland (Ulster) in December 1931, brought up in a typical Protestant home. My sisters and I were sent off to Sunday School and church (Presbyterian). There was little or no gospel message that I could remember. I came under conviction of sin at an early age (about 10 years old) in a Salvation Army meeting for children, but this experience was not fostered or encouraged at home. There was no interest in the true faith in my home or most of the homes

around us. I forgot about that time when I wept my heart out at the 'Penitent [Room]' in that meeting, but God never forgets. We grew up into our teen years just as the World War II was ended. After my father's release from the air force, we moved to the city of Belfast in July 1945. God was going before, and we became attached to a Presbyterian Church where there were a number of saved people. At a Victory Mission in that church in November 1945, I gave my heart to the Lord and went on for some time, but with a lot of failures. In October 1949, there was another mission. I was now almost 18. I had become attracted to a fine Christian girl (now my wife of 41 years!). That night I surrendered my life to the Lord, and told God I was willing to do whatever He wanted of me. Shortly after that I began to study with a view to becoming a Presbyterian minister. This took me eventually to university and the Divinity College. Ordained in November 1958, I set out for Canada, now married and with two children. I sought to maintain my evangelical faith and struggled with the Canadian Presbyterian [denomination] which was becoming increasingly modernistic and ecumenical. I resigned from that ministry after ten years, when I had come to Baptist convictions. Unfortunately, I was soon encountering more and more compromise among my new Baptist brethren. How disconcerting to discover that they were not really Baptists at all. Any label would have suited just as well. During this time I also taught in Toronto Baptist Seminary for five years. I became pastor of my present congregation in 1973. Since then a number of 'battles' had to be fought. Some years ago (June 1990) we withdrew from the Fellowship of Evangelical Baptist Churches and became independent. We circulated our letter of withdrawal to all the Ontario churches, which was considered a hostile act by many. Our intention was merely to let it be known openly why we were withdrawing.

The Lord has sustained us, and we are seeing the congregation grow slowly, but we trust, faithfully. The people who come are standing with me in the separated, fundamental position. I have taken some of our men through Dr. Waite's book on defending the KJV. One of my men has been doing a series on the versions and their errors at Wednesday Prayer Meeting. ... It is encouraging to see some young men also coming to grips with this and other issues and faithfully attending P.M. ...

Like so many others, I became involved in the Bible Version issue when I read Fuller's book *Which Bible?* This opened contact and correspondence with Dr. D.A. Waite. I attended my first DBS Annual Meeting in Louisville in 1989. I began writing at the request of Dr. Waite, and gave my first paper in Warren, Maine, in 1990. I can say that I thank God for the contribution of the DBS men to this fundamental struggle, and for their encouragement to me personally. ... We, at Calvary, Brampton, have the joy of hosting this year's Annual Meeting of DBS (July 12-13, 1995).

One of our last battles revolved around the attempt to introduce the New King James Version by two young men who were studying at Central Baptist Seminary, Toronto. This was doubly sad for me for I had poured a lot of myself into those young men. We did prepare a resolution on the NKJV which was adopted.

My knowledge on the state of the battle today is limited to my own small circle. For what it is worth, **I SEE A REAL HOSTILITY THAT HAS BEEN GENERATED IN THE MINDS OF SOME OF THE YOUNGER PASTORS.** There does not

seem to be, on their part, a serious interest in dealing with this issue. It is better to let people make up their own minds. They, either willingly or ignorantly, see the issue as just a matter of translation. They think the newer versions read more smoothly. It doesn't seem to matter whether they are also accurate. It is the hostility, however, that is troubling. **Sides are forming and deep prejudices are evident. To be 'a King James man' is now a term of opprobrium. This opposition is within 'so-called' evangelicalism, not as in the past, from the liberal-modernist camp. 'Truth is fallen in the street'** (Isa. 59:14; Jer. 5).

As for signs of encouragement, yes, for God is still on the Throne. He still has His remnant! He will yet vindicate His cause. Let us who are in this battle keep close to Him, and let our trust be in His promises. 'So that I may boldly say, The Lord is my helper, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me' (Heb. 13:6) (Denis Gibson, Letter, April, 19, 1995).

The resolution mentioned by Pastor Gibson in regard to the New King James Version is very interesting, and since this is a question faced by many churches we want to print the entire statement:

WHEREAS: We are fighting a spiritual battle and the enemy of the souls of men has developed a spiritual climate where he can logically say 'HATH GOD SAID' and

WHEREAS: This is being accomplished by the proliferation of translations of Holy Scripture, all of which translations (the K.J.V. excepted) are based on the critical Greek text produced by Westcott and Hort for the 1881 Revised Version and

WHEREAS: These versions (R.V., A.R.V., R.S.V, N.E.B., et al) were seen by the evangelical Bible believers to be corrupt and dangerous to the faith, they were for the most part rejected in the strongest terms ... and

WHEREAS: Many evangelical Bible believers still rejected the further attempts to produce 'evangelical versions' such as the N.A.S.B. and the N.I.V, because these versions were also based on the same critical Greek text as the 'modernist versions' yet another attempt was made to reach those still holding to the K.J.V. by the production of the New King James Version (1982) and

WHEREAS: This version by using the K.J.V. and Authorized names gives the impression that it is just the K.J.V. 'brought up to date,' but since this is far from the case, this version may be an even more dangerous one than any other version to date, and

WHEREAS: **THE EDITORS OF THE NEW KING JAMES VERSION CLAIM THAT THEY ARE FAITHFUL TO THE RECEIVED TEXT THAT LIES BEHIND THE OLD KING JAMES BUT IN FACT DEPART FROM IT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND INCLUDE FOOTNOTES FROM THE CRITICAL TEXTS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT** and since in the preface (page vii) the editors clearly state that they 'make no evaluation of readings' and that these variants are 'produced for the benefit of interested readers representing all textual persuasions' they seem to clearly show that **FAR FROM BEING SUPPORTERS OF THE R.T. OF THE K.J.V. THE EDITORS ARE IN FACT**

SEEKING TO BE 'NEUTRAL' AS TO WHAT THE WORD OF THE LIVING GOD REALLY IS, and

WHEREAS: A footnote system is used in the N.K.J.V. which footnote system the editors explained was to 'encourage further enquiry by readers' and to make it 'easier for the average reader to delete something he or she felt was not properly a part of the text than to insert a word or phrase which had been left out by the revisers' (N.K.J.V., page 1235) thus **NOT ONLY SHOWING THAT THE WORD OF GOD WAS NOT YET SETTLED AND SURE FOR THE EDITORS BUT ALSO SETTING UP THE AVERAGE READER TO BE HIS OR HER OWN TEXTUAL CRITIC**, and

WHEREAS: The N.K.J.V. is admittedly not yet in its final form, but will likely be revised even further in the years ahead, we still do not have the final form of what the editors consider to be the Word of God,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That we, the members of Calvary Baptist Church, Brampton, in our Annual Meeting on this day of our Lord, June 8, 1988, do hereby reject the use of the N.K.J.V. in our pulpit and church school or any other activities where the Word of God is being taught and that we reaffirm our unswerving commitment to the K.J.V. (1611).

At her coronation, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II received a copy of the Authorized Version of the Bible (K.J.V. 1611) which was presented to her with these words, 'Here is Wisdom; here is the Royal Law; here are the Lively Oracles of God.' This is our firm belief and confidence: Here is the Word of God.

Some of the papers Pastor Gibson has written on the subject of Bible versions are *Trifling with God's Word or Trembling at God's Word; The Good is Ever the Enemy of the Best; The Critical Text - the Scholar's Text - not God's*; and *Textual Criticism in the Pastoral Context: How It Impinges on Faithful Preaching*.

GOSPEL STANDARD BAPTIST CHURCHES

The Gospel Standard Baptist Churches of the United Kingdom continue to stand for the King James Bible as they have since the mid-1800s. They trace their heritage through immersionist assemblies back to the apostolic churches of the first century. Their more recent history derives from certain doctrinal controversies of the 1860s. False teachers were denying the eternal Sonship of Jesus Christ, and the Gospel Standard Baptists were founded by men that took a stand against this heresy. Chief among these were William Gadsby, John Warburton, and John Kershaw.

In 1835 *The Gospel Standard* paper was founded by William Gadsby and his son with the purpose of lifting a voice for the truth of the Word of God. By 1840 the co-editors of this paper were John M'Kenzie and Joseph Charles Philpot. After the death of M'Kenzie in 1849, Philpot was the editor of *The Gospel Standard* until his death in 1869. Philpot took a clear stand against the attempts that were being made in his day to revise the Authorized Bible and he frequently used the pages of

The Gospel Standard to defend the KJV. We have given excerpts from these in chapter two under the section on Joseph Philpot.

In a letter from H.D. Haddow of the Gospel Standard Trust Publications, May 24, 1995, I was told that "from their foundation these Churches have used the Authorised Version of the Bible, and I am glad to say that the great majority adhere to this practice. ... You will be interested to know that some months ago an article appeared in *The Times* with a title something like 'The book which every pupil should read.' The writer of the article was stressing the value of the KJV in view of its literary merit and similar matters. This we can endorse, whilst we believe the spiritual aspect is far more important."

In 1990 the Gospel Standard Trust Publications printed *The Old Is Better: Some Bible Versions Considered* by Alfred Levell. The author had been the chairman of the Trinitarian Bible Society for 11 years at that time. This booklet contains an excellent chapter entitled "'Thou' or 'You'?" on the use of the second person singular pronouns in the English Bible. After discussing the use of 'Thee' and 'Thou' as a fitting way of addressing God, Levell makes these important remarks:

> The pronoun 'You' started to be used instead of 'Thou' towards the end of the 13th century, and this use extended in the following three centuries. But the translators of the AV did not conform to this rising usage, so that, when the AV appeared, it was not in some ways in the usage of the 17th century. **Why did the AV translators not adopt the up-to-date English of their time? For one particular reason which many people have perhaps not realized—*accuracy of translation*!** Whenever the Hebrew and Greek texts use the singular of the pronoun, so does the AV; and whenever these texts use the plural, so does the AV. In other words, the AV translators stuck closely *to the Biblical usage*, and translated the Word of God using a kind of Biblical style of English. The version was a faithful one above all else. The same cannot be said so completely for any other English Bible—in fact most are nowhere near that standard. There is a distinct loss of accuracy in translation if 'You' is used for the singular as well as the plural: it becomes an ambiguous word. The AV informs us correctly on what was the proper original sense. Thus, in Luke 22:31, 32, the Lord says to Peter, 'Satan hath desired to have *you*, that he may sift *you* as wheat,' '*you'* here referring to Peter and the other disciples; 'But I have prayed for *thee*, that *thy* faith fail not,' '*thee'* and '*thy'* referring to Peter only. Such shades of meaning are completely lost when 'you' is used throughout (italics in the original) (Levell, *The Old Is Better*, p. 31).

GRADY, WILLIAM

William Grady, author of *Final Authority: A Christian's Guide to the King James Bible*, taught Bible, theology, and church history at Hyles-Anderson College, Hammond, Indiana.

Final Authority contains an interesting and well-designed presentation of the history behind the significant aspects of the Bible version debate. The author

immediately gets at the foundational issue: that of the authority of the Bible. He traces the confusion surrounding the modern versions to its source in the first centuries after Christ's return to glory. The spirit of Nicolaitanism was already blooming in the apostolic era, and it came into full blossom during the next four centuries in the form of the Roman Catholic Church. This apostasy was attended by a corruption in the Bible text by Origen, Jerome and others, and it is this very corruption that was adopted by the Revisers of 1881 and incorporated into today's popular texts and versions. *Grady notes that Nicolaitanism undermined the infallibility of the Bible by making it necessary for scholars to be the definers and interpreters of the Bible. This is precisely the spirit that is at work in the confusion of the Bible version issue today*. The child of God is told that no text or translation is inerrant, and he is made dependent upon the scholars and his own choice in the matter. Grady understands the fruit of this has been doubt: "This author can personally testify on behalf of many that it was only after attending a neo-evangelical college that he began to doubt the Book that had delivered him from over two decades of Catholicism."

Grady traces the path of the textual corruptions from their source in Egypt through the rationalistic textual editors of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, to the Westcott-Hort text of 1881, to the modern versions that have multiplied in our day.

> The average Christian is unaware that the manuscripts from which the modern 'Bibles' have been translated are Egyptian in origin; more specifically, Alexandrian. This lack of understanding is exacerbated by little or no knowledge of Egypt's heretical climate at that time. ... By an equating of spirituality with religious intellectualism, the typical Bible college faculty will venerate a host of Egyptian heretics from Clement to Origen (p. 73).

Grady's history of the King James Bible and of the conditions leading up to the Revision of 1881 is well done. Chapter 15 is entitled "Behind Closed Doors," and exposes the incredible duplicity surrounding the entire Revision project. Chapter 14, "Vessels of Dishonour," summarizes the apostasy of Westcott and Hort. Grady concludes that chapter with a seven-fold reply to Dr. Stewart Custer's defense of these two apostates:

> Stewart Custer of Bob Jones University remains one of their [Westcott and Hort staunchest defenders. Dr. Custer is chairman of the division of Bible and professor of graduate studies. In 1981, Dr. Custer authored a thirty-eight page pamphlet entitled *The Truth about the King James Version Controversy*. On page twenty-six, he states: 'Most of the things quoted against Westcott and Hort come from their private correspondence. One of the damaging things quoted against Hort was written when he was 23 (1851). To quote a man's private correspondence and statements of early years when his theological position was still being formed is unfair at the very least. Especially when these men have written in their mature years book after book defending the conservative interpretation of Scripture, it is unjust to characterize their whole ministries by a few misinterpretations that they may have been guilty of.'

The reader will observe at least seven holes in Dr. Custer's remarks:

1. To insinuate a breach of ethics for exposing a man's private correspondence is ridiculous when one is dealing with a 'wolf in sheep's clothing.' The only way to catch a liar would be through his private correspondence.

2. Dr. Custer expects us to dismiss Westcott and Hort's early heresies because the professors were supposed to have gotten it straight in their older years. Has the Chairman of Bible forgotten that it was in those early years (1853-1871) that the heretical revisers were constructing their Greek New Testament? As late as 1860, seven years into the Greek New Testament project, a thirty-three-year-old Hort complained to Dr. Lightfoot, 'In our rapid correspondence about the N.T. I have been forgetting Plato.' And in the opening line of his very next letter (to Mr. A. Macmillan) he states, 'About Darwin, I have been reading and thinking a good deal, and am getting to see my way comparatively clearly.' Would a conservative scholar sandwich God's Word in between Plato and Darwin?

3. You will note carefully that Dr. Custer gives us no information as to when Westcott and Hort were born again. One cannot mature until he is alive!

4. Dr. Custer seems to imply that a man can move gradually from being a heretic to a conservative. Charles Wesley would disagree: 'Thine eye diffused a quick'ning ray, I woke, the dungeon flamed with light.'

5. We are supposed to be assured because a number of orthodox positions '... can be found' in the later works of Westcott and Hort. Liberals always talk out of both sides of their mouths. This is the very justification that is given for the modern English translations, despite their numerous heretical readings; i.e., 'every major doctrine can be found therein.'

6. As to Dr. Custer's impressive list of orthodox references from the late years, Dr. Donald Waite of The Bible for Today has already published a 182-page rebuttal of Custer's work entitled *Dr. Stewart Custer Answered on the Textus Receptus and the King James Version*. On pages 43 through 146, Dr. Waite demolishes the so-called 'mature writings' of Drs. Westcott and Hort, as taken from their commentaries on John, Hebrews and 1 Peter.

7. Dr. Custer said that Westcott and Hort discarded their 'few misinterpretations' (whatever that means) when they reached their mature years. When does Dr. Custer believe the golden years begin? 'No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history—I could never understand how anyone reading them with open eyes could think they did' (Dr. B.F. Westcott, March 4, 1890, age 65 years).

His *eulogy*, eleven years later, read in part: 'His earnest desire and endeavour were to promote the highest welfare of the human family by proclaiming the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.' How much more mature can a guy get?

Grady dedicates three pages of his book to the charge that James I was a homosexual. See pages 147-150 of *Final Authority*.

GULLION'S CHRISTIAN SUPPLY CENTERS

As of 2008 Gullion's operates four retail stores in North Carolina, in King, Walkertown, Statesville, and Mt. Airy. Their web site address is http://www.gullions.com/. The stores are owned by the three Gullion brothers, their father, and their cousin, Tim Johnson. They sell only King James Version Scriptures in English and Received Text-based Scriptures in other languages; and they are careful about the content of their books, refusing to carry the charismatic and ecumenical material that is standard fare in the average Christian bookstore today.

The enterprise started when Brian Gullion began selling used Christian books and Gospel music in a flea market in 1992, and about a year and a half later they opened their first retail store in Winston.

In an interview with Brian Gullion at the Winston store on May 15, 2001, I learned that the Lord led them to a conviction about the Bible text not long before they opened their first store:

> I got out of Liberty University in 1991 after a year of graduate school, and they taught me that the NIV was better. B.R. Lakin probably wouldn't have been too happy that they were teaching that at the school named after him. When I started selling books and music at the flea market I wasn't convinced about the King James. I was brought up to use the King James and we always went to Bible believing churches; but that seed of intellectual pride that they all have had been planted, and I thought I knew better. You know, you smile to yourself and say, 'Well, they can have the King James Bible but I know that the NIV and the NASV are better.' At the flea market, I would keep them under the counter. The salt of the earth people around here, at least, don't want the modern versions. They want the King James, but every once in a while you have someone come through who used the modern versions and I would talk to them about it. I would say, 'Yeah, I was raised up King James but I know better now.' But through the Lord's providence, I began reading on the subject. I can't put a finger on the date, but it soon became apparent to me that the NIV and the King James could not both be the Word of God. Only one of them could lay claim to that, and I came to an understanding of the need for the doctrine of providential preservation. For a while, after I quit selling the NIV, I was willing to sell the New King James. After studying that for awhile, we discontinued it as well. By the time we opened the first full retail store at the end of 1993, we had come to that point. My dad had always used only the King James, but he didn't understand the textual issue, either. He attended Appalachian Bible College and Washington Bible Institute and had been taught the Nestles Greek text. Through passing on books to him and discussing the matter, we both came to the same conclusion that we needed to take a stand for the King James Bible in our stores.

When I asked Brian about the response of the community, he replied:

> We were told by other bookstore owners when we first started that we wouldn't be able to make it. They told us there is too much demand for other versions. They cited statistics that show that the NIV out sells the King James, and I am

> sure it does from the Spring Arbor and the larger distributors. But the fact is that there are still more King James Bibles being distributed in the world than the other versions, but they are not necessarily being sold in the Christian bookstores. [There are many other sources for Bibles.] Churches and ministries buy them and give them away for free, etc. We were also told that we would have to sell the Contemporary Christian Music, the Charismatic books, etc. But what we discovered aside from the blessings of the Lord—and we attribute all our success to the Lord—is that we hit upon a niche in the market that is not being fulfilled, that there are Bible believing Christians (especially here in the South, in the Bible Belt), that were being neglected and ostracized by the chain bookstores that promote the rock music, the new versions, and so forth. It began with individuals learning about and supporting us because we were taking a stand, and it has grown to the extent that Bible believing churches from long distances away will visit us because the pastors want the people to be able to have good materials they can trust. Some come in buses and spend several hours in the stores. So from a business perspective we have probably been more successful because of the stand we have taken. Otherwise we would be just another run-of-the-mill bookstore, and I know that the mom and pop bookstores are suffering because of the chain stores.

I also asked Brian if he has any specific books on the Bible version issue that he recommends to people. He replied:

> For a general good overview, I especially recommend Dr. D.A. Waite' book, *Defending the King James Version*. It is very well laid out, with the four-fold superiority of the King James: superior in its text, its translators, its translation technique, and its language. It does an excellent job of presenting the subject in a balanced, scholarly way. He doesn't give unfounded allegations.

Brian said that he recommends the following basic Bible study library to people: A King James Bible, a Strong's concordance, a commentary on the whole Bible, such as Matthew Henry or J. Vernon McGee, and the *Way of Life Encyclopedia of the Bible & Christianity*.

HILLS, EDWARD F.

See chapter four.

HOLLAND, THOMAS

Dr. Thomas Holland (b. 1956) is the author of *Crowned With Glory: The Bible from Ancient Text to Authorized Version* (New York: Writers Club Press, 2000, 291 p.). The back cover says, "For over twenty years, Dr. Thomas Holland has been a pastor and scholar. He has taught courses on the subject of biblical textual criticism and preservation, theology, and Christian apologetics at various Bible Institutes. Dr. Holland is an ordained minister with the American Baptist Churches (ABC-USA)."

This book is an unapologetic defense of the Received Text and the King James Bible. Holland expertly traces the Alexandrian readings preferred by modern Bible translators to heretics in the first two centuries after the apostles, including Tatian, Clement of Alexander, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome. He observes that some scholars, including Tischendorf, Hort, and Souter, believe the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are two of the 50 manuscripts prepared by Eusebius in the fourth century. Eusebius, who questioned the inspiration of James, 2 Peter, 3 John, and the book of Jude, promoted the heretical views of Origen and helped establish a library of Origen's works. When examining more recent fathers of textual criticism, Dr. Holland concludes that Westcott and Hort were unorthodox in their theology and therefore spiritually undependable, and also that the editors of the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament are enemies of the apostolic faith. Dr. Holland looks at the doctrine of preservation, and cites evidence for viewing Psalm 12:7 as a promise of divine preservation of Scripture.

In chapter 5, Dr. Holland gives a history of the translation of the King James Bible and defends the scholarship of its translators. He explores the use of the Septuagent in Bible translation work and supports the translators of the KJV in their use of the Massoretic Hebrew text over against the Greek Septuagent.

In chapter 8, Dr. Holland deals with some of the chief textual challenges of the eclectic Greek text. One of these is Mark 16:9-20, which most textual critics reject. Dr. Holland observes: "The conclusion held by most textual scholars, whether liberal or conservative, that the original ending has been lost over the passage of time certainly denies the doctrine of biblical preservation." Dr. Holland also reviews the evidence pro and con for 1 John 5:7 and concludes that it is authentic Scripture.

In chapter 9, "Translational Considerations," Holland defends the King James Bible linguistically against the modern versions. He observes that the KJV is only a little more difficult to read than the New American Standard Version (citing research by Dr. Linda H. Parrish and Dr. Donna Norton of Texas A & M University). In concluding that section, Holland says: "We have seen in these few examples how some express a certain amount of disdain for the Authorized Version with meaningless objections. They do not like this or that reading and therefore seek to find a flaw in this literary masterpiece. It is easy to find fault, especially if one does not like a certain rendering. However, upon closer examination it usually can be shown that the difference has more to do with the manner of how words or phrases are understood and not the correctness of the translation itself" (p. 194).

HUGHES, RAY

Ray Hughes (b. 1924), Chairman of the Evangelical Tract Society, Norwich, England, was saved in 1943 and has worked for many years in "supplying Bible

bookstores with books, greeting cards and other items" through a company called Hughes & Coleman. He retired in 1994, and his children are carrying on the family business. He says, "One of my retirement interests in a small way has been the promotion of the King James Version." In addition to distributing leaflets on this subject, he distributes books such as *The King James Version Defended* by E.F. Hills, *Defending the King James Bible* by D.A. Waite, and *Mountains of Myths* by E.S. Turnbull. In a letter dated May 9, 1995, he said:

> Most evangelical churches have taken the N.I.V on board here. Some are questioning it but ministers and leaders are reluctant to look at the question of versions. I suspect that they would lose face if they needed to admit that they were wrong in accepting what theologians and church leaders they follow took on board. *The Evangelical Times* here ... has up to now avoided a serious discussion. However in the last issue there were letters on both sides of the question. ... Older people in the church want the old Authorised Version but are not generally standing up when the N.I.V. is imposed on them as the version the church is now to use.

ILLINOIS LUTHERAN CONFERENCE

The Illinois Lutheran Conference stands by the following statement of faith:

> 1. We teach that the original manuscripts (*autographa*) alone are verbally inspired (II Peter 1:21, II Timothy 3:16) being preserved through copies to this day in their full integrity by the Holy Spirit who gave them (John 17:20, Matt. 28:20, 24:35).
>
> We teach that through the family of manuscripts called the Majority ("M") texts which form the basis of the K.J.V. of 1611 (Textus Receptus) as well as Luther's German Translation, the Scriptures have been brought to us today in their pristine (original) integrity in spite of the variant readings in the Majority manuscripts.
>
> 2. We teach that there is a difference between textual criticism and higher textual criticism, the former being a valid method of comparing manuscript evidence (1 Cor. 2:13) and this only by men who believe in the plenary verbal inspiration of the Bible.
>
> 3. **We teach that the Bible K.J.V. of 1611** based on the aforesaid manuscripts ("M") **is by far the most faithful English translation of the Bible in use today.**
>
> 4. We reject the teaching that the Holy Spirit verbally inspired any translation of the Holy Scripture (II Peter 1:21, II Timothy 3:16, Eph. 2:20, Heb. 1:1,1).
>
> 5. We reject the teaching that because we do not presently possess the original manuscripts (autographa) the true text cannot be known (John 17:20; Ps. 119:89, Mt. 5:18).
>
> 6. **We reject the method of higher textual criticism because it subjects the sacred texts to the canons of subjective human reason** (such as eclectism, conjectural emendation, historical criticism, etc.) in which the theologizing subject is permitted to criticize the Holy Spirit of God.

7. **We reject the use of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus (B and Aleph) manuscripts** as the basis for any New Testament version because they omit or change many readings found in the Majority texts and they do this in major doctrinal points, particularly in the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ (Deut. 4:2, Pr. 30:6; 1 John 4:2-3).

8. **Consequently, we reject the public use of all modern Bible translations which have B and Aleph as their source and also warn against any private reading of them**.

Thus it is obvious that this group of Lutherans rejects modern textual criticism and holds to the Received Text as the preserved Word of God. See also Lutheran Churches of the Reformation.

INSTITUTE FOR BIBLICAL TEXTUAL STUDIES

The Institute for Biblical Textual Studies (IBTS) (also known as the Which Bible? Society) was founded as an extension of David Otis Fuller' burden to address the version issue and textual debate on a broader scale. According to its statement of purpose, it is committed to the following:

- the immediate, verbal, plenary inspiration of the original writings of Scripture and that they are therefore inerrant and infallible. This inspiration is unique, applicable both to the process of giving the original writings and the writings themselves which are that product;

- the verbal preservation of the Greek Received Text as published by the Trinitarian Bible Society;

- The verbal preservation of the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text of Daniel Bomberg, as edited by Jacob ben Chayim;

- the position that **TRANSLATION IS NOT AN INHERENT BOUNDARY TO VERBAL PRESERVATION**. **THE BREATH OF GOD, PRODUCT, NOT PROCESS, CONVEYED BY TRANSLATION FROM THE IMMEDIATELY INSPIRED LANGUAGE COPIES OF SCRIPTURE INTO ANY PROVIDENTIALLY PREPARED RECEPTOR LANGUAGE WILL IMPART TO THAT LANGUAGE INFALLIBLE AUTHORITY AND DOCTRINAL INERRANCY INHERENT IN THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE COPIES**. Such a translation by the internal witness of the Holy Spirit, both with and through that translation, will evidence to the believer its own self-attestation and self-authentication whereby God asserts himself as the supreme Authority to that culture. For the English-speaking world this revelation of God's authority is preserved in the Authorized Version.

The objectives of the Institute are carried out through correspondence, counseling, preaching, lectures, and literature. The President of the Institute for Biblical Studies is **Russ Spees**. The Associate Director of the Institute from 1990 to 1994 was **Peter W. Van Kleeck** (b. 1956). Van Kleeck earned an M.A.R. from Westminster Theological Seminary and a Th.M. from Calvin College. He has therefore studied textual criticism and related disciplines from some of the men

who translated the New International Version. In 1994, Peter accepted the call as Senior Pastor of the Wealthy Park (formerly Wealthy Street) Baptist Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan (the church D.O. Fuller pastored for 40 years). In 1999 he took the pastorate of Evangel Baptist Church in Dale City, Virginia. In an e-mail to me dated September 11, 2008, he said: "I am still keeping my fingers in Bible Defense. Just finished 2 hour college level series of lectures at the Georgia Baptist College and Seminary in Senoia, Georgia, with pastor David Dickerson."

Van Kleeck has stood toe to toe with proponents of the modern versions and has defended the King James Bible without hesitation. His bold stand for the Old Bible in today's world of higher education has encouraged the hearts of many believers. His lectures in churches across Michigan and other states has fortified God's people to have faith in the Authorized Bible.

His father gave an excellent description of Peter's defense of the King James Bible: "He approaches the entire battle from a faith/Bible position. I have yet to ever see anyone, anytime, successfully refute his argument regarding this issue. He has spoken at some of our largest Baptist colleges (and scores of churches) and faced the questions of novice and expert alike and has never been backed down."

In the process of pursuing a Th.M. at Calvin Theological Seminary, Peter Van Kleeck produced a report on the history of the translation and interpretation of Psalm 12:6, 7. He shows that the testimony is divided. Some interpreters have viewed Psalm 12:7 as applying to the preservation of God's Word; others have viewed it as applying to the preservation of God's people; others have viewed it as having a double application. When correctly translated, the passage allows this diversity. Van Kleeck speaks of "the genius of ambiguity." Consider some excerpts from this excellent study:

> The appropriate interpretation of Psalm 12:7 is not without question in the churchly tradition. Problems arise from the textual base chosen for the translation, Greek-Latin or Hebrew ... Contemporary Bible versions and the reciprocating confirmation of each other's validity give the dogmatic impression that as a result of new and better methodologies, the modern rendering is best and that past problems have been resolved. A casual perusal of the popular literature on the subject of Bible texts and versions will show, however, that the Reformational Churches' expression of their common faith in Scripture's providential preservation of the texts in their possession is evaluated in an unsympathetic and pejorative manner. Scholars such as Bruce M. Metzger and Kurt Aland discredit the value of the Reformation Greek texts and subsequently the English Bibles on textual grounds. Metzger, giving a standard reply writes,
>
> 'Partly because of this catchword [Textus Receptus] the form of the Greek text incorporated in the editions that Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs had published succeeded in establishing itself as 'the only true text' of the New Testament, and was slavishly reprinted in hundreds of subsequent editions. It lies at the basis of the King James Version and of all the principal Protestant translations in the languages of Europe prior to 1881. So superstitious has been the reverence accorded the Textus Receptus that in some cases attempts to

criticize or emend it have been regarded as akin to sacrilege' (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, Oxford University Press, 1968, p. 106).

What these writers fail to say is that the Authorized Version is not an ad hoc English translation, but stands at the end of the 16th-century English Bible tradition. ... To deny the Authorized Version on textual grounds is to do the same for the Bishops, Geneva, Great, Coverdale, Matthews and Tyndale Bibles going back to 1524. It also questions the scholarship of the Protestant exiles of Mary's romanish persecution who had escaped to the safe haven of Geneva as well as the value of every 16th- and 17th-century commentator who based his work on Erasmus' Greek New Testament.

The bifurcation of the Reformation Bible tradition and the post-19th-century English Bibles is seen in the New Revised Standard Version render[ing of] Psalm 12:7, 'You O Lord, will protect us; you will guard us from this generation forever.' In a similar manner, the New International Version translates verse 7, 'O Lord, you will keep us safe and protect us from such people forever.' In spite of Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia reading 'keep them' and 'preserve him,' both the NRSV and NIV have elected not to translate the Hebrew and have, in its place, substituted a translation from the Greek and Latin rendering of these two pronouns. By so doing, the editors of these translations have endorsed one exegetical tradition, the Greek-Latin, to the exclusion of the other, the Hebraic, and by doing so have censured any further debate within the Hebrew exegetical tradition itself. ...

This essay will show the diversity of the textual and exegetical tradition of Psalm 12:6-7 ... By so doing, the inadequacy of modern renditions of Psalm 12:7 will be exposed...

Michael Ayguan (1340-1416) ... On Psalm 12:7 Ayguan comments, *Keep them*: that is, not as the passage is generally taken, Keep or guard Thy people, but Thou shalt keep, or make good, Thy words: and by doing so, shalt preserve him—him, the needy, him, the poor—from this generation...

Martin Luther's German Bible ... Following the arrangement of this Psalm, Luther penned a hymn, two stanzas of which reflect his understanding of verse 6 and 7: ... 'Thy truth thou wilt preserve, O Lord, from this vile generation...' In poetic form, Luther grasps the significance of this verse both for the preservation of those who are oppressed and for the Word of God. The two-pronged significance of this interpretation to both people and God's words in Luther's Psalter was to have wide-ranging significance in the English Bible tradition.

Calvin's Commentary on the Psalms ... in the body of the commentary he writes, 'Some give this exposition of the passage, Thou wilt keep them, namely, thy words; but this does not seem to me to be suitable.' [Editor: Thus while Calvin did not believe Psalm 12:7 referred to the Word of God, he admits that others did hold this view in his day.]

Coverdale Bible, 1535 ... reads for [verse 7] of Psalm 12: 'Keep them therefore (O Lord) and preserve us from this generation for ever.' With the absence of 'Thou shalt' to begin verse 7, there is a direct connection between 'words' and 'keep them.' In the first clause, Coverdale intended the words to be kept; in the

second clause people are in view...'

The Matthew Bible, 1537. ... In Psalm 12:6, 7 Rogers translated, 'The words of the Lord are pure words as the silver, which from the earth is tried and purified vii times in the fire. Keep them therefore (O Lord) and preserve us from this generation for ever.' Following Coverdale, Rogers makes a clear connection in his translation between the words being the antecedent to 'them.' ... The significance of Roger's marginal note is that two of the greatest Hebrew scholars referred to by the Reformation writers differed on the interpretation of "them" in Psalms 12:7. [Editor: Thus we see that the interpretation of this verse was also divided among Jewish scholars.]

The Third Part of the Bible, 1550. Taken from Becke's text of 1549 this edition of the scriptures contains the Psalter, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs. ... In verse 7 there is a note at 'them' which states, 'some understand here certain men, some others word.' Again, the translators and exegetes allowed breadth of interpretation of 'them' to include people and words. [Editor: Again we see the acknowledgment that some in 1550 interpreted Psalm 12:7 to apply to the preservation of God's Words.]

The Geneva Bible, 1560. ... The preface reads, 'Then comforting himself and others with the assurance of God's help, he commendeth the constant vigil that God observeth in keeping his promises.' The text reads, 'The words of the Lord are pure words, as the silver, tried in a furnace of earth, fined seven fold. Thou wilt keep them, O Lord: Thou wilt preserve him from this generation forever.' [Editor: The margin reads, 'Because the Lord's word and promise is true and unchangeable, he will perform it and preserve the poor from this wicked generation.' Thus the Geneva took a position that verse 7 applies both to the preservation of the Bible and of God's people.]

Annotations by Henry Ainsworth, 1626. Briggs commends Ainsworth as the 'prince of Puritan commentators' and that his commentary on the Psalms is a 'monument of learning.' ... Ainsworth states that 'the sayings' [of Psalm 12:7] are 'words' or 'promises' that are 'tried' or 'examined' 'as in a fire.' He cross references the reader to Psalm 18:31; 119:140; and Proverbs 30:5, each reference having to do with the purity of the word.

Matthew Poole's 1685 Commentary of the Psalms ... writes at verse seven, 'Thou shalt keep them'; either, 1. The poor and needy, ver. 5 ... Or, 2. Thy words or promises last mentioned, ver. 6. ...

In summary ... [t]he only sure conclusion is that there is no consensus within the English Bible tradition for the interpretation of 'them' in Psalm 12:7 and it was precisely this lack of agreement within the tradition which was the genius of the ambiguity of the King James Version's rendering. ... by choosing a Greek-Latin basis the modern versions elect to overlook the Reformation's Hebrew basis for translation in Psalm 12:6-7; and the churchly tradition in the new versions is censored by not including a translation that is broad enough to include both interpretations—oppressed people and God's words (Peter Van Kleeck, *The Translational and Exegetical Rendering of Psalm 12:7 Primarily Considered in the Churchly Tradition of the 16th and 17th Centuries and Its Expression in the Reformation English Bibles: The Genius of Ambiguity*, March 1993).

Peter's father, **William W. Van Kleeck** (1935-1999), formerly pastor of the Immanuel Baptist Church of Roscommon, Michigan, for 22 years, as the Associate Director of the Institute for Biblical Textual Studies in the last years of his life. In a letter dated March 28, 1995, the elder Van Kleeck gave the following testimony:

> I personally got into this battle by accident (1979?). For some reason I wrote a letter to one of my old professors at Grand Rapids Baptist College (now Cornerstone) asking why they did not teach me (at least I did not remember them teaching me) that there were two lines of Greek text. To this simple question I received a somewhat scolding five-page letter. I was accused of reading Pickering's book and I did not even know about it. So I went shopping and bought it. After that I read Hills' book and *Which Bible?* by Fuller. Then I went to hear Dr. Fuller speak on the subject of Bible preservation.
>
> After serving with the Regular Baptist Missions for ten years I received a call to pastor the Immanuel Baptist Church (Independent/Fundamental) of Roscommon, Michigan. I served there for the last twenty-two and one-half years until taking the position of Associate Director of the Institute (IBTS) where I have been for just the last six months. Dr. Fuller was the foundation of IBTS as he was and is known around the world. My son Peter gave IBTS depth with excellent research on many difficult texts. Now, while I do research, I have the contacts made of 34+ years in the ministry and it seems to be working out well. IBTS has never expanded so fast as it has this past six months. To God be all the glory.
>
> Even 50 years ago our Bible was not questioned as now. Satan attacked our Lord's Person [and] His work and now [is attacking] His Word as never before (letter from William Van Kleeck).

JASMIN, DON

Dr. Don Jasmin (b. 1936) is an Evangelist and a respected Bible conference preacher. He heads up the Fundamental Ministries and is the editor of the bi-monthly *Fundamentalist Digest*. His ministry was based for many years in the Maranatha Baptist Church of Elkton, Maryland, under Pastor Allen Dickerson, who has been mentioned earlier in these studies. Today he is based in Michigan. In his years of public ministry, Brother Jasmin has pastored churches for 27 years and has labored in full-time evangelism for 20. The burden of his ministry is the Old Paths and the Old Book. In the *Fundamentalist Digest* for January/ February 1995, Dr. Jasmin testified: "In 34 years of public ministry, both in the pastorate and full-time itinerant labors, he [Jasmin] has maintained an implicit confidence in the accuracy and reliability of the KJV text, NEVER wavering from that stance. He is NOT going to change that stance now simply to avoid the erroneous label and libel as a 'Ruckmanite, whose heretical teachings he has vigorously exposed from their inception!"

The following is from a letter to us dated May 23, 1995:

During my teen years, I was greatly and positively influenced by my local church youth group as well as by the Youth for Christ movement, with which my home church was associated through the Detroit Voice of Christian Youth (VCY), the area YFC rally.

I attended the Detroit Bible Institute for one semester, receiving excellent Bible training there, and then transferred to Bob Jones University due to its strong evangelistic emphasis and its reputation as a spiritual 'hotbed' for training aggressive soul-winning preachers.

At BJU, I received an A.B. with major in Bible and the B.D. (equivalent to today's Master of Divinity) from their graduate theological division. ... [I received] an honorary Doctor of Divinity (D.D.) from the now defunct San Francisco Baptist Theological Seminary. This seminary also placed my name in the 'Fundamentalist Hall of Fame.' My alma mater, Bob Jones University, honored me in 1979 with its 'Defense of the Scriptures' award, an award from the Bob Jones family, in honor of the BJU founder, Dr. Bob Jones Sr., and later granted me an honorary Doctor of Literature (L.L.D.) degree. ...

Regarding the KJV: Since childhood, I have maintained an implicit faith in the integrity and accuracy of the A.V., having been taught confidence in its contents by my parents, pastor and home church.

In the churches I pastored, the KJV was used exclusively in the pulpit, classroom and activities, this position being clearly delineated both in preaching and printed stated practice. A KJV only clause was inserted into revised church constitutions where I pastored.

A letter written to Dr. David Otis Fuller (published in the Jan.-Feb. 1995 *Fundamentalist Digest*) confirms this longstanding position. However, I never was involved in the textual background controversy until about five years ago, always stating that I left this 'issue' to scholars to debate, simply defending and proclaiming the veracity of the KJV.

My initial concerns about the background text were aroused about 15 years ago, when I picked up the Nestle's text that I had used in Greek classes at my alma mater and read the English introduction. To put it mildly, I was shocked by the destructive comments made by this noted Greek scholar concerning the textual basis of the KJV. It was then I began to take special note concerning the background texts underlying the various translations.

Since that time, my confidence (which has always been strong) in the A.V. has been immeasurably strengthened as I have pondered the fallacies of the Westcott-Hort text versus the time-tested reliability of the traditional 'Majority' manuscripts.

After further consideration, about five years ago, **as I witnessed the deluge of unreliable modern translations being published, and saw the deteriorating confidence in and disuse of the KJV among former defenders (a trend that appears to have developed into almost an open antipathy) I decided it was time to openly defend and promote the textual background basis of the A.V.**

One of the purposes in beginning *The Fundamentalist Digest* was to help foster confidence in the KJV and its historical origins, as well as expose the pro-

ecumenical, pro-apostate basis of the modern translations based upon the Westcott-Hort text.

It is my firm conviction, that the KJV, based upon what has become known as the 'Received Text' is the ONLY Bible that retains ALL the fundamental doctrines of our Lord Jesus Christ, without any deletion, being a faithful translation of the text upon which it is based. This fidelity is due to a trustworthy text as its source, and the superior translation work of the orthodox scholars who produced this version.

While I am an ardent defender of the Received Text and the Authorized Version (A.V.), my ministry is not devoted exclusively to this theme: my main ministry being one of preaching in Bible conferences and evangelistic endeavors. Through the printed page, I seek to defend 'the faith once delivered unto the saints,' providing instruction and inspiration as well.

The March-April 1994 and January-February 1995 issues of *The Fundamentalist Digest* were devoted almost exclusively to the defense and promotion of the KJV.

As we approach the end of the 20th century and the potential advent of another millennium, I do not believe if the Lord tarries, that any of the organized professing fundamentalist fellowships of this generation (FBF, IBFNA, BBF, WBF, etc.) will hold the line on the important issues of the Bible texts or Biblical separation, believing they have already, in essence, capitulated to the pressures of the age.

The position of openness or silence in the above matters will turn, as it already now is, to antipathy and antagonism towards defenders of these vital two twin and corollary truths.

I further believe that Satan, counterfeiting every possible phase of God's work he possibly can, will produce his counterfeit ecumenical Bible. It appears entirely possible that the NI or a successor to it, founded upon it, may accomplish that objective. A false Christ will lead humanity into a false faith, based upon a false text acceptable to all, but with a distinctly evangelical face, in order to deceive the last holdout against the 'New World Order'—the professing conservative 'evangelical' or fundamentalist Christian.

It appears entirely possible, from this viewer's perspective, that the majority of professing fundamentalism may incorporate many of the characteristics of the apostasy into its practical operations by the turn of the century, while still claiming allegiance to fundamentalism.

I do NOT believe that a stand only on the KJV and its underlying text is sufficient to ward off this encroaching apostasy. I believe, to maintain a pure faith, free from all taint of apostasy, we must ADHERE TO THE PRACTICAL DAILY AUTHORITY OF GOD'S WORD, particularly in the area of conventional standards and music, as well as ACCEPTING ITS PRESERVED AUTHENTICITY.

It appears there are many professing fundamentalists who will 'wave' adherence to their KJV, but NOT accept its authoritative standards in DAILY living: marriage, family living, standards, music, etc. Some churches promoting the 'KJV ONLY,' in the writer's opinion, are as close to the apostasy as others who openly deny its veracity, a sad, deplorable but factual reality. **THE WRITER OF THESE WORDS**

> **DESIRES TO STAND BOTH FOR ITS PRINTED AUTHENTICITY AND ITS PRACTICAL AUTHORITY UNTIL OUR LORD RETURNS OR HIS EARTHLY PILGRIMAGE IS COMPLETED** (emphasis in the original) (Don Jasmin, Letter, May 23, 1995).

That Jasmin's position on the King James Bible is longstanding is evident from a letter he wrote to D.O. Fuller in March 13, 1973. This letter was printed in the January-February 1995 issue of Jasmin's paper. The capitalizations are as in the original letter:

> Dear Dr. Fuller:
>
> I have a copy of your book and have loaned it to friends. It has helped to strengthen their faith in the Inspired Word in the midst of the many 'perverted' translations that are floating about these days.
>
> Praise God that you are not afraid to speak on this matter; if only we had 1,000 more voices like yours on this issue. IT'S ABOUT TIME SOMEONE STOOD UP FOR THE BIBLE AND THE BEST TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE AVAILABLE TODAY—THE KJV.
>
> These 'mod,' 'loose' translations are not only PERVERTING, CHANGING, DELETING AND ADDING TO GOD'S WORD, BUT ARE MAKING LAZY CHRISTIANS! My sympathy lies with youth who are being sold a 'false bill of goods' on these paraphrases. Are these the Bibles that our future GARB youth will use as deacons and pastors? GOD HELP US!

In a sermon in Minnesota in February 2000, Jasmin recalled his training at Bob Jones University:

> It is true that we used the Westcott-Hort text, but the emphasis on the King James was so strong that it overrode any of that. I came out of seven years believing that the King James was God's Word and I believed every bit of it, because the emphasis was so strong. It was not until 15 years later that I dusted off my Greek lexicon to do a word study, and I happened to read the introduction to Nestle's text, which I had never read when I was taking Greek for four years at Bob Jones. When I read that introduction, I was amazed. I thought, 'They didn't tell me this when I took Greek, and no wonder they didn't.' So I had my first introduction to that. I've always been King James, but I never wanted to get into the text controversy. I said that was for the scholars. I just have an implicit faith. I believe that what I have is the accurate, realiable translation of the Greek and Hebrew text, and by faith I accept that. You can spend all the hundreds of hours you want to doing the research and the background, and when you're all through I'm still coming back to this position that by faith what I have in my hands is God's Word preserved in the English language. That's my bottom line.
>
> Rod Bell [pastor of Tabernacle Baptist Church, Virginia Beach, Virginia] was the one who first got me interested in this thing, by the way. One day he said, 'Don, what do you think about the Westcott-Hort text?' I said, 'I don't pay attention to that stuff, I let the scholars handle that. I just preach the King James and do some Greek word studies. I'm not interested in that battle; let those other fellows take care of that.' Then one day, after seven years of pastoring, I went back into evangelism and Bible conference work to what I thought were going to be my

> former friends in my former fellowship [Fundamental Baptist Fellowship], and I discovered that my convictions on the King James Bible hadn't changed, but my friends had. The very man who told me I ought to study this controversy was embracing those who take an opposite position to what he says he believes (Don Jasmin, "Peril of Secular Oriented Schools," preached in Minnesota, February 2000).

At the annual Dean Burgon Society meeting, July 2001, Jasmin presented a message titled "Preservation: Faith, Fact, Fellowship." He observed:

> We have a reliable translation of the preserved text in the King James Bible. Your willingness to defend the Bible proves how much you love it. I believe both inspiration and preservation are doctrines. Don't put the doctrine of preservation on a lower level. Without preservation, inspiration is meaningless. … It is impossible to be neutral toward any doctrine of the Bible. The most dangerous position is neutrality. Men who refuse to defend the doctrine they say they believe are disobedient. Partial obedience is whole disobedience. … A pseudo-fundamentalist betrays himself by his silence in the face of the intrusion of error. … It is only a short step from being a passive fundamentalist to being an active new evangelical. … A position that is not worth defending is not worth declaring.

JOHNSON, KEN

Pastor Ken Johnson (b. 1936) of Victory Baptist Church, Ft. Collins, Colorado, has been preaching against the modern versions since the 1960s. He was saved in 1947 and has been pastoring in Colorado since 1983. Before that he pastored churches and did evangelistic work in Texas, Colorado, Georgia, and Canada. He says his first message on the subject of Bible versions was preached in Georgia and was occasioned by the Georgia Baptist Convention's decision to send a copy of the Today's English Version to every church in that state. The message was entitled, "Today's English Version—Give It Away or Throw It Away," and his conclusion was to toss it. He published a pamphlet in the 1960s entitled *The Paraffin Sword,* exposing the corruption of the Living Bible. This is distributed by E.L. Bynum's *Plains Baptist Challenge* ministry in Lubbock, Texas. Johnson has written a number of other articles and booklets on this subject, including *The Real Truth about the Waldense Bible and the Old Latin Version: A Refutation of Kutilek's "The Truth about the Waldenses Bible and the Old Latin Version,"* and *A Response to J.H. Melton's Forum Re. the King James Version and Inspiration*.

In a letter dated April 18, 1995, Pastor Johnson made the following statement:

> I am troubled with the battle concerning the Bible today. The reason for this is I am seeing 'Fundamentalist-Independent-Baptists' (? on some) who have thrown in the towel and surrendered to the critical theories. I judge this is due more than anything to their desire for credibility in scholarship and distancing of themselves from the position of men such as Ruckman. I am encouraged in some ways in that I see some who are taking the time to study the matter, the consequences, and the costs. These men are not ashamed to stand and still proclaim the Baptists' position that has been historically present in the churches that are loyal

to our continued doctrine expressed in the ancient confessions of our faith. I might add for my personal position: I will not let this die, and I will not permit men to compromise for the sake of fellowship or reputation. I don't mean to say I have all the answers, but I do mean to say there is a cause! I will study to find the answers.

In *A Response to J.H. Melton's Forum* Johnson describes the harsh attitude that is developing on the part of many fundamentalists against King James Bible defenders. He also deals with the "snobbery principle" exhibited by many modern version proponents:

A strange mood of conflict permeates the modern inerrancy-inspiration controversy. The stage of conflict is not a drama of unbelievers against believers or fundamentalists versus modernists. It is now the verbal badinage of professing Bible believers attacking any who profess they possess the Word of God in the English language of the King James Version. **The New-age Fundamentalism hurls stones and arrows of such vociferation that all who claim to possess God's perfect Word in English are considered men of 'rabid insistence,' 'rank heresy,' 'obsession,' are 'cult-like or in fury,' and a 'heresy ... arisen only in the last twenty-five to fifty years**.' ...

It is never pleasant to find **A PRINCIPLE OF SNOBBERY** where one individual postures his right to speak on what he feels others do not possess. The snob principle usually finds its basis in the assumption of another man's ignorance and an over estimation of snobbery's intelligence. Bro. Melton denies from the very first the right to say anything relative to the KJV's being the Word of God by describing any such person as 'uninformed (another word is more applicable) or dishonest or both.' ... Bro. Melton treats all the ignorant and uninformed to his qualifications (evidently standards set by himself for he names no other) stating, 'I received my Bachelor of Arts Degree from Baylor in 1942 and my Master of Theology Degree from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1945. I had seventeen courses in Greek and eight courses in Hebrew in Baylor and Southwestern. I taught Greek and Hebrew in College.'

If these qualifications give a person the right to speak, shall we next listen to the remaining class of Baylor and Southwestern graduates who have made their grades and received their degrees yet assure us [that] such instruments as form criticism, J.E.P.D., and the evolutionary hypotheses are valid instruments to judge what constitutes the Word of God? If we permit this step, shall we also accept the Book of Mormon which Dr. Philip Johnson, a Mormon and language teacher [at Baylor], considers the Word of God? After all he is a man with a doctorate and not even 'honorary donated dignity.' (See Norm Ellis, 'Baylor Prof's LDS Beliefs Are Disturbing,' *The Southern Baptist Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 2, July-Sept./86, p. 13). Or, shall we embrace the God-denying concepts of Paul Tillich, because John P. Newport, Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, wrote concerning Tillich's system [that] it 'is surely one of the most significant contributions to Christian thought in this century.' (See James D. Bales and Herman Otten, 'Newport and Atheist Tillich,' *The Southern Baptist Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 3, p. 1).

Bro. Melton's position is clearly that which moves to create a new 'priesthood' for Baptists. Baptists under this kind of thinking must have a

> **priest of 'scholarly qualifications' to interpret and translate for all the uninformed and dishonest**. This Baptist rejects in total the innuendo of Bro. Melton, the principle of snobbery, and the very idea that education begats Truth (1 Cor. 8:1) (Ken Johnson, *A Response to J.H. Melton's Forum,* pp. 1, 2).

LACKEY, BRUCE

Bruce Lackey (1930-1988) was a great blessing in my life and I count it a privilege to offer the following biographical sketch of this man of God. Dr.* Lackey was a Baptist pastor, educator, and Bible conference preacher.

When he was young he attended a weak Baptist church by himself and made a profession of faith, but no one dealt with him carefully about salvation or discipled him, and it is uncertain whether he was actually saved then. His father died in a fire when Bruce was a boy. After attending community college he played piano at dances on Saturday nights for about three years.

In 1954 Bruce got right with the Lord. Gene Payne, the preacher who invited Bruce to church in those days, described his memory of this event to me in April 2007 as follows:

> When I met Bruce Lackey, I was Minister of Music and Youth at First Baptist Church in Thomaston, Georgia. Thomaston is approximately 75 miles south of Atlanta. Bruce worked in the bank which was located on the city square. The church building where I worked was a half block off the square, and every Monday morning I would go up to the bank where Bruce worked and deposit my check. Bruce was the teller, and I would invite him to church. In those days they had a few bars at the window. I have often stated when in a church service with Bruce, that when I met him he was behind bars. Of course I was referring to the bars at the bank window! At that time, Bruce was playing in a dance band in some kind of a night club in Griffin, Georgia, which was located approximately twenty miles north of Thomaston. Bruce would get home late at night and that was an excuse he used for a few weeks for not coming to church. Finally, he came and if my memory serves me correctly he got right with the Lord in the first service. He began to attend church regularly, and I got him to go to jail services with me where he would give his testimony. I dare say that the first soul that Bruce ever led to the Lord was one of those inmates.

The same year that Bruce got right with the Lord he married Helen Gilbert, who was an employee at the same bank where he worked in Thomaston.

He pastored two churches: Hardison Baptist Church in Byron, Georgia, for a couple of years, and Lakewood Baptist Church in Harrison, Tennessee, for eight years.

He taught at Tennessee Temple for 19 years and was the Dean of the Bible School for about 10 years. He was the Dean when my wife studied there from 1968-1972 and when I was there from 1974-1977. (I didn't get saved until I was 23, whereas my wife went to Bible College right after high school.)

Dr. Lackey trained many classes of "preacher boys" who revere his name to this

day and who thank the Lord for the godly influence that this "man of the Book" had in their lives and ministries. A high percentage of the students at the Tennessee Temple Bible School from its inception in the 1950s through the late 1970s were men who were saved and called to preach in manhood, many coming to Temple from the military. A high percentage of the graduates went on to plant churches throughout the world and today these men form a significant circle within the Independent Baptist fold.

Dr. Lackey was the best Bible teacher I have ever had the privilege of sitting under. If I remember correctly, I took five of his courses -- New Testament Survey, Bible Prophecy, Romans, Hebrews, and Revelation. Attending his Bible lectures was like sitting down to a top grade steak dinner every day! Sadly, the courses (to my knowledge) were not tape-recorded and have not been preserved for posterity.

One of the hallmarks of Bruce Lackey's life, as can be attested by anyone who knew him, was his deep love for the Word of God. He had no sympathy with Bible ignorance on the part of Christians.

Though he was a profound Bible teacher and commentator, he always "put the cookies on the lower shelf." His doctrine was always practical. His theology was not the theorizing, "armchair" variety. He had the heart of a pastor and his goal was never to entertain or tickle the ears or to impress his hearers with his knowledge, but "warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus" (Col. 1:28). Dr. Lackey's preaching was exceedingly challenging and edifying and had the effect of building Christians who are spiritually healthy and zealous for the service of God.

Dr. Lackey loved to preach expositorily. At Lakewood Baptist he preached through Ruth, Psalms, Galatians, Colossians, Philippians, James, and Jude, and possibly other books. Many of these expository sermons are available in the *Life Changing Sermons* CD series published by Way of Life Literature.

He was a conscientious soul-winner. My wife, Linda, told me a story of how he led a man to Christ in the hospital. She was working as a nurse in the intensive care unit at Erlanger Hospital in Chattanooga when a man was brought in with a serious gunshot wound. He had been shot in the head while trying to break into a house, and after his operation he was admitted to ICU. Though he was coherent he was paralyzed on one side. After Linda witnessed to him for a few days, he told her that he wanted get saved and that he wanted to talk to a preacher. She called Dr. Lackey, and he drove over the next day and led the man to Christ. She said that Dr. Lackey contacted her later and thanked her for calling him.

He never failed to preach the gospel somewhere in his message and to give a salvation invitation, even when he was preaching to the faithful church crowd on Wednesday evening.

He was a master of sacred music styles on the piano. After he got right with the

Lord he dedicated his skills for the Lord's service and glory and continued to develop as a musician throughout his life. Before Contemporary Christian Music became popular he was teaching his students that it was not right to use a dance style of music in the service of a holy God.

In the 1980s Dr. Lackey traveled widely as a Bible conference preacher. His "preacher boys" were pastoring churches across North America and many other parts of the world, and he had more invitations than he could fill.

Dr. Lackey was one of the few teachers at Tennessee Temple in the 1970s that had any sort of conviction about the authenticity of the Greek Received Text and the King James Bible. While most of the teachers used only the King James Bible in the classroom and only the KJV was used in preaching, the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament was used in the Greek courses. Most of the teachers were either neutral on the subject of texts and versions, or they were openly sympathetic to the critical Greek text and modern versions. One of my teachers used the New American Standard Version in the classroom in the mid-1970s.

I do not know exactly when Bruce Lackey came to a conviction about the King James Bible, but by the late 1970s he was teaching a course in Bible texts that defended the King James Bible as the preserved Word of God. He also encouraged his students to purchase an edition of the Greek Received Text, such as Berry's Interlinear or the Trinitarian Bible Society's Greek New Testament.

He read his Greek New Testament every day and taught and preached from the King James Bible, being convinced that it was expertly translated from the correct Hebrew and Greek manuscripts and believing that it needed no correction.

Bruce Lackey published two books in defense of the KJV: *Can You Trust Your Bible?* (1980) and *Why I Believe the Old King James Bible* (1987). Consider an excerpt from *Can You Trust Your Bible?*

> The King James Version was the only Bible available to most English-speaking people for centuries. The manuscripts from which it was translated were used by the majority of believers through the centuries. Thus they represent the Word of God which He promised to preserve for all generations. 'The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever' (Psalm 12:-7). 'For the Lord is good; his mercy is everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations' (Psalm 100:5).
>
> Almost every modern version has been made from manuscripts which were rather recently discovered, though they claim to be more ancient. These are highly touted to be more accurate than those from which the King James Version came, and have led to the charge that many errors exist in the KJV. It is the author's experience that this has caused many people to doubt whether there is any Bible in the world today that is accurate, infallible, or dependable. ...

> When the so-called facts of textual criticism produce doubt in the Bible which people have had for centuries, they should be considered as no better than the so-called facts of evolution. In reality, there are very few "facts" in textual criticism today. It is very difficult to get textual critics to agree on their conclusions which are drawn from the principles which most of them accept. Even a cursory study of the material available on the subject today reveals that there is much personal opinion and bias regarding which manuscripts are the oldest or best. ...
>
> The most serious problem created by the multiplicity of versions and half-truths from textual critics is that many believe that we have no accurate, infallible Bible anywhere in the world today. To say that it exists in all the versions is to say, in effect, that you can not find it, since no one can agree on the best way to resolve all the differences in the versions.
>
> To say that the various differences in versions are unimportant is to raise a basic question: Why make them? If there is no basic difference, why do we need them? ... Every version claims to be 'more accurate ... more understandable,' but when faced with the problem of difference with others, almost every scholar, professor, translator, and textual critic says that no major doctrine is affected, and that the differences are minor and relatively unimportant. One wonders if the motive for more and more translations might not be commercial, rather than spiritual.
>
> The fact is that many a Christian has had doubts, fears, and skepticism instilled in his mind by these claims of discovering 'more accurate manuscripts.' ...
>
> If we believe God's promises of preservation, we must believe that the Bible which has been available to all generations is that which God has preserved. Conversely, that which was hidden was not God's truth, 'which endureth to all generations' (Lackey, *Can You Trust Your Bible?*, Chattanooga, Tenn., BIMI Publications, copyright 1980, pp. 48-52).

Dr. Lackey gave a good answer to those who claim there is error in the King James Bible. He made a clear distinction between translational *error* and translational *preference*.

> 'Atonement,' in Romans 5:11, is said to be another error, since it comes from the Greek word (KATALLAGE) which is always translated 'reconciliation' in other places. It is also supposed to show doctrinal error, since 'atonement' describes a temporary condition which the Old Testament saint had, whereas 'reconciliation' describes the permanent condition of the New Testament believer. If all this is so, why did the KJV translator choose a different word in this place, from all others in the New Testament? The word 'now' indicates that they evidently believed the Old Testament doctrine of atonement to be fulfilled in the one great sacrifice of the Lord Jesus. We have 'now' received that which was only foreshadowed and promised in every bloody sacrifice that was made before the cross. There is no error here; if the KJV translators were intelligent enough to use 'reconciliation' every other instance in the New Testament, they surely must have had a good reason for choosing 'atonement' in Rom. 5:11. Every translator knows that in all translation there will be some interpretation. Such is unavoidable. This instance is obviously a matter of their interpretation, which, by the way, is clearly a correct one. Every Bible-believer knows that the sacrifice of Christ fulfilled all that was

foreshadowed in the many sacrifices of the Old Testament. **Again we see that, before one charges error, it is a good idea to stop and think about what is actually being said and try to find a reason why a different word was chosen. When such is done, there will always be a great and precious truth learned.**

'Devils' is another word that the critics delight in pouncing on, as a wrong translation. Everyone knows, they say, that there is only one devil (Satan), but many demons. Also, the Greek word from which 'devils' comes (DAIMON, and cognates) is different from that which refers to Satan (DIABOLOS). Again, a little investigation will prove this charge to be foolish, to say the least, and ignorant, at the most. Consider:

(1) The word translated 'devil,' when referring to Satan, does not always refer to him; DIABOLOS is translated 'slanderers' in 1 Timothy 3:11, 'false accusers' in 2 Tim. 3:3 and Tit. 2:3. In all three places, it refers to human beings. Again, we see the necessity of translating in a manner which will be understood by the readers.

(2) Devil in the English language has multiple meanings; it may refer to Satan, demons, a very wicked person, an unlikely person (that poor devil), a printer's devil (apprentice or errand boy), and various other persons, as any good English dictionary would show. To say that 'devil' is an erroneous translation, because it can only refer to Satan, is to ignore the dictionary!

We must say, again, that no translation always renders a particular Greek word with the same English word in all places. In all translations there is some interpretation. Translators must use words which the people will understand. To say that calling a demon a devil is an error is to show ignorance of the English language.

Then, someone is always trying to show that a particular verb tense has been wrongly translated. It has been well said that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing, and this can correctly be applied to a little knowledge of Greek. To assume that the aorist tense, for instance, always means punctiliar action, is to ignore what Greek grammars teach: Greek tenses have flexible meanings and must be interpreted according to context. For example, the word 'building' in John 2:20 is aorist, but it cannot describe action which happened 'at once,' as some people insist that the aorist always does. In that sentence, the Jews were referring to the 46 years which were required for the building of the temple. Forty-six years is certainly not 'at once'!

2 Corinthians 11:4 is supposed to be one of those places where a verb tense is wrongly translated, when it says, 'ye might well bear with him.' The tense is imperfect, which some people insist always means continuous action in the past. Why then does the KJV put this in the future? Is that an error? *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, by Dana and Mantey, gives several uses of the imperfect tense in just the way it is used here, saying that it may refer to 'the lack of a sense of attainment.' In other words, it may refer to something which has not yet been attained, therefore, future! In this light, no error exists in the KJV. They chose these words carefully, because the context shows that Paul was concerned about what might happen, rather than what had already occurred. In v. 3, he was afraid that their minds might be corrupted; in v. 4, he referred to the possibility of false preachers coming to them when he said, 'For if he that

> cometh...' the word 'if' clearly shows a possibility in the future. Once again we see that a careful examination of grammar and the context would show any honest inquirer that there is no error. Although the translation may be unusual, it is a possible one and cannot be called a mistake. **Anyone has the privilege of disagreeing with a translator's interpretation, but if the translation be grammatically and contextually possible, it cannot be called an error**....
>
> Of course, this list could go on and on, but there is no real need. Some people will never be convinced. This author, however, has learned many precious truths through the years by meditating on these and other such places, trying to find out why an unusual translation was made. **Rather than treat these places as errors, why not remember that the KJV translator were intelligent and reverent scholars, and try to find out why they did a particular thing in the way that they did?** (Bruce Lackey, *Why I Believe the Old King James Bible*, pp. 44-48).

Dr. Lackey died in 1988 while preaching in Ocala, Florida, of an undiagnosed tumor on the adrenal gland. I have heard several accounts of how he died, but the following was given to me by his son:

> "Dad had an undiagnosed tumor on the adrenal gland. A degenerative eye problem which was causing him to see double had forced him to have many medical tests run yet none had detected the tumor. The adrenal tumor causes the body to go into overdrive for a few seconds, periodically. The doctor said that before he died an adrenal episode occurred and his body just said that was it and shut down. Death was instantaneous and painless."

When Dr. Lackey died, I was a missionary in South Asia. Earlier that year I wrote to him and challenged him to write more books so that his teaching would be more readily available to posterity. He replied and told me his plans to write more and to produce some teaching materials on video. Alas, it was not to be, for he died before he could accomplish those goals. He was only 58 years old. I have often been challenged by this to make every day count, because we don't know when the Lord will call us home.

Through his pastorate, Bible school courses, itinerant preaching, extensive correspondence, tape ministry, books, and through the ministries of those he trained, Dr. Lackey has influenced multiplied thousands.

[* Dr. Lackey's doctorate was an honorary one granted by Tennessee Temple.]

LOGSDON, FRANKLIN

Franklin S. Logsdon (1906-87) was a respected old-line evangelical pastor, Bible teacher, and popular Bible conference speaker. He pastored Moody Memorial Church in Chicago (following Harry Ironside), as well as Central Baptist Church in London, Ontario, and Immanuel Church of Holland, Michigan. He also pastored a church in Erie, Pennsylvania. In *The Story of Moody Church*, Robert Flood says Logsdon was "highly respected as a Bible expositor." He taught for a number of years at London Bible Institute in Ontario, Canada. He preached at Bible

conferences (such as Moody Founder's Week) with well-known evangelists and pastors, including Billy Graham and Paul Smith of People's Church in Toronto. He was awarded an honorary doctorate by Wheaton College in 1951. In the latter years of his life he conducted a traveling teaching ministry.

Logsdon authored a number of popular books published by Zondervan and other well-known publishing houses. A notice on the cover of his book *Lest Ye Faint*, copyright 1949, stated, "One of the most popular and best loved pastors is the author of this book. Mr. Logsdon is an uncompromising defender of the faith once delivered to the saints, and each Sunday in Moody Memorial Church in Chicago, thousands of people gather to have their souls refreshed from the divine springs of Christian truth."

In the 1950s Logsdon was invited by his businessman friend Franklin Dewey Lockman to prepare a feasibility study that led to the production of the New American Standard Bible. He also helped interview some of the men that served as translators for this version and he wrote the foreword that appears in the New American Standard Bible. But in the later years of his life Logsdon publicly renounced his association with the modern versions and stood unhesitatingly for the King James Bible.

In a letter dated June 9, 1977, Logsdon wrote the following to Cecil Carter of Prince George, British Columbia:

> As an honorary member of the Lockman Foundation, producers of the Amplified New Testament and the New American Standard Version, I was invited to California back in the fifties to do a feasibility on utilizing the copyright of the 1901 which was as loose as a fumbled football. I was delighted and went.
>
> When it was decided to proceed with a revised publication, I assisted Mr. Lockman in interviewing a few of the men who served as 'translators.' What was finally used as the Foreword was taken from the feasibility report written before the actual work had begun. Apart from this I had little to do with its production. Incidentally, you CANNOT get a list of the names of the 'translators.' Forbidden!
>
> I received #7 of the Deluxe copies, but did not for years even look inside it. It was too cumbersome to carry with me on the road. When questions began to reach me [pertaining to the NASV], at first I was quite offended. However, in attempting to answer, I began to sense that something was not right about the NASV. Upon investigation, I wrote my very dear friend, Mr. Lockman, explaining that I was forced to renounce all attachment to the NASV.
>
> ... I can aver that the project was produced by thoroughly sincere men who had the best of intentions. The product, however, is grievous to my heart and **helps to complicate matters in these already troublous times.**

After reading David Otis Fuller' books *Which Bible?* and *True or False,* Logsdon wrote as follows:

> I carried these titles with me all the summer long, and immersed myself in them. I have never underscored books so much as I have done in them. They enhanced

> my appreciation of the K.J.V. as the true revelation of God as no other writings. As a member of the committee in the production of the Amplified New Testament, we conscientiously and honestly felt it was a mark of intelligence to follow 'Westcott and Hort.' Now what you have in these books strikes terror to my heart. It proves alarmingly that being conscientiously wrong is a most dangerous state of being. God help us to be more cautious, lest we fall into the snare of the arch deceiver.

In a letter dated September 5, 1973, Logsdon wrote to Fuller as follows:

> As a member of the editorial committee in the production of the Amplified New Testament, we honestly and conscientiously felt it was a mark of intelligence to follow 'Westcott and Hort.' Now, what you have in these books [Dr. Fuller's books] strikes terror to my heart. It proves alarmingly that being conscientiously wrong is a most dangerous state of being. God help us to be more cautious lest we fall into the snares of the arch deceiver."

In another letter to Fuller, on October 15, 1973, Logsdon said:

> Duke, think of it, conceivably, by virtue of circumstance, I was in a position to have prevented the publication of the NASV. I'm definitely certain I could have, had I had in my possession the facts I now possess. If I could have read to Dewey Lockman the enclosed paper when he called me out there to help him lay the groundwork for the NASV, because he was so exceedingly conscientious, and so desirous of honoring God and His Word, he most surely would not have launched forth in it. I may be in trouble with the Lord. I didn't know, but I should have known to qualify for so important and so serious a matter of putting out a volume and calling it God's Word.

In his senior years Logsdon moved to Largo, Florida, and died there on August 13, 1987.

MADDEN, D.K.

D.K. Madden (b. 1926), of Tasmania, Australia, has written a number of papers in defense of the Authorized Bible. He shared his testimony with me in a letter dated May 30, 1995:

> Having been baptized and confirmed in the Church of England, I long thought I was a Christian; however in 1950 our great and gracious Sovereign God, in loving mercy to my soul, opened the eyes of my understanding to know and acknowledge that in fact I was a lost sinner on my way to hell, and then granted me faith (see Ephesians 2:8,9) to believe upon and be cast upon that Blessed One. 'In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace' (Ephesians 1:7) ...
>
> About 1972 I first became seriously involved in contending for the pure Holy Word of God. A new pastor who came to our church claimed that the RS was correct, at Isaiah 7:14, in translating the Hebrew word 'almah' as 'young woman,' rather than 'virgin' as in our faithful old KJV. This was the beginning of a rather long controversy; however after about six months, I am pleased to say, he acknowledged that the old KJV 'virgin' is correct.

> Living as I do in Tasmania, a small island state, I have little direct contact with godly men who are also well informed on Bible textual matters. However God, in His gracious providence, has supplied me with many excellent books, and in particular I should mention the following: The works of the old 17th-century English Puritan John Owen, a very earnest godly and learned contender for the God-inspired and God-preserved Word of God—the Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament, and the Textus Receptus Greek New Testament. ... In the 19th century God raised up John William Burgon to defend the precious Textus Receptus Greek and our old Authorised Version (KJV) against the corrupt Westcott and Hort Greek text and the mutilated English translation, the Revised Version. I am much indebted to Burgon's works. ... Coming now to the 20th century, I must give first place to Edward F. Hills' *The King James Version Defended*. Other helpful books include Wilbur N. Pickering' *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, Everett W. Fowler's *Evaluating Versions of the New Testament*, [and] Jakob Van Bruggen's *The Ancient Text of the New Testament* ... the many excellent booklets and leaflets on textual and modern version Bible matters produced by the Trinitarian Bible Society. ...
>
> In 1974 a church which was troubled by the fact that some of their members wanted to introduce modern versions invited me to address a meeting convened to discuss the matter, and the dear Lord was pleased to open their eyes to the danger of departing from the precious old KJV. Following this meeting, some of these dear folk asked if I could put in writing the substance of my address. This I was pleased to do, and by the Lord's enabling grace I produced my first article, a typed and duplicated eight-page paper entitled 'Modern Versions No Substitute for the Authorised Version of the Bible.'

Madden has published a number of pamphlets on the Bible version question. These include the following: *A Critical Examination of the New American Standard Bible* (1976), *How Shall the Child of God Know Which Is the Word of God*? (1981), *Remarks on the New King James Version and Revised Authorised Version* (1984), *Modern Bible Versions: What about the New King James Version* (1993), and *A Brief Review of the 21st Century King James Version* (1994).

LUTHERAN CHURCHES OF THE REFORMATION

The Lutheran Churches of the Reformation (LCR)is a conservative group that stands on the old Lutheran statements of faith, including the Book of Concord, the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, and the Large catechism of Luther. They also stand for the Received Text and oppose modern textual criticism, using only the English King James Bible or the old Lutheran German Bible. I communicated with Dr. Jeffrey Young who pastors one of these congregations, the Salvation Evangelical Lutheran Church in Harrisonville, Missouri. The seminary in Decatur, Indiana, where Pastor Young was trained, holds a firm position on the verbal inspiration and preservation of the Scriptures. The school is operated by Pastor Kenneth K. Miller. In an e-mail of January 10, 2001, Young said:

> We stick with the teachings of the Lutheran church which were popularly

> accepted in the late 1800's before Westcott and Hort put their grip on the American seminaries. . . . Unfortunately, then a wave of change swept through the Lutherans and they began to tolerate the attitude of the reformed in their midst. This was called 'pietism.' Bengel was the first one to put text variants in the margin of his Bible, and he believed in many cases that they were the authentic text. He was a Lutheran pietist. In 1841 C.F.W. Walther had a controversy in his congregation that allowed him to overcome pietism. Genuine Lutheranism was reborn in this country and thrived through his death in 1887. It continued until about 1908 when another leading theologian died. In their wake came a crop that didn't appreciate what he had rediscovered, and alas the large bodies of Lutheranism are pietistic once again. But there are many who know the truth among them (LCMS, WELS). These are the large bodies that derive their origin from him. But there are many splinter groups that have separated due to the gross error which they now allow, and many of these still stick to the KJV or Luther's German version which is translated from the same original text. The LCR is one such splinter group. Others include Illinois Lutheran Conference (ILC, Concordia Lutheran Conference (CLC. There is another in Australia, and there is one large group in America whose name escapes me at the moment.

Another of the conservative Lutheran groups mentioned by Dr. Young is the Apostolic Lutheran Church, a Finnish group.

Dr. Young has written some essays defending the Received Text against modern textual criticism and tracing the history and influence of textual criticism among Lutherans. Two of these are *Anatomy of a Division* (April 13, 1998) and Text Criticism Is a Doctrinal Issue (November 19, 1998).

MAYNARD, MICHAEL

In July 1995, Michael Maynard (b. 1955) published *A History of the Debate Over 1 John 5:7-8* (Comma Publications, Tempe, AZ). This 383-page volume carefully traces the evidence pro and con regarding the Trinitarian statement in 1 John 5:7-8 through the centuries. The author demonstrates the theological apostasy of many of those who have despised this passage.

Maynard was saved in 1977 and became a Baptist soon thereafter. He earned an A.A.S. in Engineering Technology at Phoenix College and a B.A. in German at Arizona State University. As a graduate student, he studied classical philology in Tucson at the University of Arizona, where the Classics Department awarded him an appointment as Graduate Assistant in Teaching Classics. He did research at the University in Leipzig, Germany, and engaged in graduate studies at the University in Tübingen, where he completed a course in Textual Criticism, "taught by the foremost scholar of Latin manuscripts of the Bible, Walter Thiele." He has completed 14 hours of classical Greek, 6 hours of Koine Greek, 18 hours of Latin, 22 hours of French, and over 50 hours of German. He has also studied Russian, Spanish, and Italian. In 1992 he earned the Master of Library Science degree from the Graduate Library School in Tucson, Arizona.

In the research for his book on 1 John 5:7 Maynard compiled 137 bibliographic

items (37 journal articles, 50 essays from books, and 50 entire books). Those who think there is no textual defense of 1 John 5:7 should read this book.

There is also much more in this volume than the history of the debate of 1 John 5:7-8. The book, in fact, is full of interesting material related to the subject of Bible texts and versions. Maynard includes a great deal of information about Baptist and Anabaptist texts and versions prior to the Protestant Reformation. He also traces the history of apostasy as it has blossomed in the various churches and ecclesiastical institutions since the mid-nineteenth century.

Maynard gives an interesting reply to the question of why 1 John 5:7 does not appear in many of the Greek manuscripts.

> The second reason that the absence of 1 John v.7f in Greek MSS before the sixteenth century does not constitute disproof, is that God is not obligated to have a regular transmission through Greek MSS for every authentic verse. ... John Owen suggested that God, while preserving the whole scripture entire, allowed a certain variety 'to fall out, in or among the copies we have, for the quickening and exercising of our diligence in our search into his Word' ('The Divine Original of the Scripture,' *Works of John Owen*, Banner of Truth, 1980, 16: 301).
>
> The context of Owen's idea, deals with Hebrew texts with 'things of less, indeed of no importance.' But his ideas can surely be applied to the Greek text, with matters of great significance, such as the Trinity. Why then would God decree to allow 1 John v.7f to fall out of 14 relatively early Greek MSS and in many ancient versions? His purpose may have been to draw attention (or to highlight) the importance of the doctrines of the deity and of the Trinity. **That almost all the objections to the inclusion of the verse (as Adam Clarke said in 1807) came from 'Unitarians of all classes' demonstrates that it indeed did draw attention to these doctrines.** (It would explain the dispute over *theos* vs. *os* in 1 Timothy 3:1). **It is difficult to suppose that it was merely incidental that the objections to such a verse came from so many Unitarians** (Maynard, *A History of the Debate Over 1 John 5:7-8*, pp. 286, 87).]

Maynard also explodes a number of myths that are commonly promoted by modern version proponents. Consider an example:

> Kenyon said of Codex Vaticanus, 'A few readings from it were supplied to Erasmus by his correspondent Sepulveda, but too late for use in his editions of the New Testament.' In this claim, **Kenyon made two serious errors**. It was not 'too late' because Erasmus' 5th edition appeared in 1535 [two years later]. Nor was it merely a 'few readings,' for in this letter, Sepulveda furnished Erasmus 'with 365 readings as a convincing argument in support of his statements' that Codex Vaticanus is 'a weighty proof of excellence with the Latin version'... (Maynard, p. 88).

A recent myth (originated by Erika Rummel in 1986, and parroted by James R. White in 1995) is that Erasmus challenged Edward Lee to find a Greek manuscript that included 1 John 5:7. An older myth is that Erasmus promised to insert the verse if such a Greek manuscript were produced. Maynard stated that the Dean of the Faculty of Theology, at Rijksuniversiteit, (Leiden, The Netherlands) has

refuted both myths. The Dean, H.J. de Jonge, is a recognized specialist in Erasmian studies. H.J. de Jonge refuted the old myth of a promise in 1980, and he refuted the new myth of a challenge (which Rummel devised in reaction to the burial of the promise myth) as follows in a letter to Maynard on June 13, 1995.

> I have checked again Erasmus' words quoted by Erika Rummel and her comments on them in her book *Erasmus' Annotations*. This is what Erasmus writes [on] in his *Liber tertius quo respondet ... Ed. Lei*: Erasmus first records that Lee had reproached him with neglect of the MSS. of 1 John because Er. (according to Lee) had consulted only one MS. **Erasmus replies that he had certainly not used only one ms., but many copies, first in England, then in Brabant, and finally at Basle**. He cannot accept, therefore, Lee's reproach of negligence and impiety.
>
> 'Is it negligence and impiety, if I did not consult manuscripts which were simply not within my reach? I have at least assembled whatever I could assemble. Let Lee produce a Greek MS. which contains what my edition does not contain and let him show that that manuscript was within my reach. Only then can he reproach me with negligence in sacred matters.'
>
> From this passage you can see that Erasmus does not challenge Lee to produce a manuscript etc. What Erasmus argues is that Lee may only reproach Erasmus with negligence of MSS if he demonstrates that Erasmus could have consulted any MS. in which the Comma Johanneum figured. Erasmus does not at all ask for a MS. containing the Comma Johanneum. He denies Lee the right to call him negligent and impious if the latter does not prove that Erasmus neglected a manuscript to which he had access.
>
> In short, Rummel's interpretation is simply wrong. The passage she quotes has nothing to do with a challenge. Also, she cuts the quotation short, so that the real sense of the passage becomes unrecognizable. She is absolutely not justified in speaking of a challenge in this case or in the case of any other passage on the subject (Maynard, p. 383).

In his conclusion, Maynard associates modern textual corruption with Romanism and end-time ecumenism.

> Romanists corrupt the text for the goal of ecumenism. The strategy is not new. As shown above Erasmus believed that the Ecumenical Council of 1438-1445 modified Greek MSS to conform to the Latin to effect 'reunion of the Latin and Greek churches.' ... No one denies that Satan is the Enemy. ... It may be observed that the strategy of Satan shifts in nearly every century. He does use cults, etc., but Romanism always seems to be his major tool. His present intent is ecumenism. The principle factor for the means to this end is textual corruption. Since this is at the basis of ecumenism, then the present debate over Bible versions is not unnecessary as many claim. Since the Scriptures are the basis to settle all doctrinal controversies, then when compared with all other serious challenges that face Christians today, it is surely the single most crucial issue (Maynard, p. 291).

A History of the Debate over 1 John 5:7,8 is currently (August 2008) out of print, but in an e-mail to me in late August 2008 Maynard said that he is working on a second edition.

Maynard is also the author of an article entitled "The Origin of 'KJV-Only a New Term of Slander." Following is an excerpt from this:

> Evidently, all throughout the life of Edward F. Hills (d. 1981) no one lumped him with Ruckman. That situation changed nine years after he died. In 1989, James Arnold Price worked on his dissertation, with a title in which the term 'KJV Only' is no longer used alone as predicate nominative, but now as a adjective modifying a noun! The title of J. A. Price's dissertation is 'The King James Only Controversy in American fundamentalism Since 1950.' He submitted this in May 1990 to Temple Baptist Theological Seminary. This so-called Th.D. dissertation is characterized by shallowness throughout. Further it is quite unspiritual. Consider that he slanders J. J. Ray without due cause. It does not matter to Price that Ray never believed the KJV is perfect. In fact Ray said, 'There are a few mis -translations in the King James English...' (*God Wrote Only One Bible*, p. 102), James A. Price still called Ray a heretic. Why? Let us see how he arrived at this:
>
> 'Ray and those who have followed him have often been regarded as well-intentioned brothers in Christ who should be treated kindly or just ignored. The idea seems to have been that although they are wrong, they really are not hurting anyone. After all, they do believe the Bible. This approach is grossly incorrect. Ray is a heretic who must be rebuked for what he is' (James A Price, 1990, Temple Baptist Theological Seminary, dissertation, p. 85).
>
> What then was his reasoning for slandering Ray as a heretic? There was no reasoning. It was an emotional statement. Nor does it matter to Price that E. F. Hills never claimed the Authorized Version as perfect, inspired, or inerrant. He also slanders Hills' position as the 'King James Only View of Edward F. Hills.' Finally in section four, he attacks the position of Peter Ruckman.
>
> Thus, it appears that 1990 is the earliest that anyone tried to associate Hills and Ray with the eccentric position of Ruckman. The strategy of J. A. Price involved the new use of KJV-Only as an adjective, and guilt by association.
>
> In the Fall 1990 issue of *Baptist Biblical Heritage*, whose editor was Gary R. Hudson and contributing editor was Doug Kutilek, we note on page 8 an advertisement for 'Gift Offers.' Included in this list is a tract with the title and authors listed as *Questions for the KJV Cult* by Hudson & McHugh (tract), 2 copies, $1.00.
>
> It is significant that of this 8-page issue, over two pages are devoted to 'Debate Follow Up' that lists details of the Hudson-Ruckman debate of July 1990. Hudson, in this article, spoke of the 'vindictive and caustic manner' (p. 2, col. 3) of Ruckman's article in *Bible Believer's Bulletin* of September 1990. Apparently to retaliate, Hudson & McHugh chose the term 'KJV Cult' in the title of this above-mentioned tract. Because of the exposure of Wilkinson's plagiarism, and the exposure of Ruckman's errors, the terms 'KJV Cult,' and the term 'KJV-Only' now became clearly derogatory and offensive to any who believed the Authorized Version was superior.
>
> It seemed that J. A. Price fanned the flames sufficiently so that now Gary Hudson followed the pattern of Price and began using 'KJV-Only' as an adjective. On page 2 in the very next issue of *Baptist Biblical Heritage*, Winter 1990-91, Gary used the term as an adjective: 'the KJV-only establishment.' The clue that

Hudson was influenced by J. A. Price, to use the term now as an adjective and as a term of reproach, is found in the editorial by Hudson, where he specifically cited the above-named dissertation by Price. Gary writes, 'Dr. Price did a masterful dissertation on this important issue...' (BBH, p. 2). Note also an advertisement on page 7 of this winter issue of *Baptist Biblical Heritage*, listed as follows: '[New Video] The King James Only Controversy.' These two one-hour programs are by Gary R Hudson with Bob L. Ross and J. Boyett.

In 1990 Gary R. Hudson was a guest speaker at the Dean Burgon Society. In the space of a little over one year, Hudson's position changed from Ruckmanite. to TR advocate, to Majority Text advocate, to NU text advocate. In a form letter to members of the Majority Text Society, dated November 29. 1990, Wilbur Pickering welcomed Gary Hudson into the Majority Text Society

In 1992 D. A. Waite published his *Defending the King James Bible*. Within its 307 pages he never claimed the King James Version was inspired, perfect, or inerrant. Rather he placed the emphasis on the original Greek and Hebrew texts and said they were 'inerrant, inspired, and infallible' (p. 246). ...

In 1993, yet another derogatory termed was coined, viz., 'KJV Onlyite.' It made its first appearance in the tract *Kutilek Replies to KJV-Onlyite*. Kutilek used the term against John Cereghin in the June 1993 issue of *Baptist Biblical Heritage*. ... Cereghin informed the present author in December 1996 that he repudiates Ruckman's position. Despite that, Kutilek still slandered him with this newly coined term of reproach, 'KJV Onlyite.'

Just what is King James Onlyism? Bob L. Ross, an editor of the former BBH, would be an adequate source to inquire from. In his undated tract 'What Is King James Onlyism?' he provides four traits. He says the KJV Only people believe:

1. That only one translation (A.V. 1611) is the Word of God.

2. No one has any right to do any further study of the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts.

3. Denial of the Eternal Sonship of Jesus Christ.

4. 'Free Willism' of the Pelagian/Arminian variety is invariably the thinking of KJV Onlyites. ...

But let us not only consult Ross, let us also consult the definition of the term KJV Onlyism from Bruce Oyen's April '94 article in the *Baptist Biblical Heritage*, 'Why I Cannot Follow KJV-Onlyism.' Pastor Oyen, who says the KJV 'is the Word of God,' defines KJV Onlyism as a system whereby

1. it implies that the Bible was not in English prior to the KJV.

2. they seem to ignore that the KJV generally used today is different in substance from the the 1611 KJV. (On this point, Oyen quotes E. F. Hills, who discusses this difference in substance. Hence, by Oyen's definition, Hills is not part of KJV-Onlyism!)

3. they attribute infallibility to the KJV, something not done by its Translators.

Neither Ray, nor Hills, nor Cloud, nor Waite holds any of these views. These views are of Ruckman. In fact, Cloud even wrote *What About Ruckman?* in 1985

and exposed Ruckman's views. ...

A bit of credit ought to be extended to Bob L. Ross, whose definition did not allow for one to lump E. F. Hills with Ruckman. Further Ross clarifies that he only wants to oppose the type of 'KJV-Onlyism' which is of 'the cultic variety' (BBH, 3rd Q, 1995, p. 3). He wants to make it clear that he is

1. not repudiating the KJV, and

2. not promoting other versions

From their own writings, neither Cloud, nor Hills, nor Ray, nor Waite, nor Conjurske, are of the cultic variety. If Ross refrains from lumping them with Ruckman, we can commend him.

Then in 1995 James R. White, who advocates the Parallel Version-Only view, claimed that the term 'KJV Only' defies precise definition, and even ran 'the risk of offending individuals' by making broad generalizations. He claimed he could not avoid these generalizations and expanded the definition to include five classes. He does even not allow others the freedom to choose their Greek text (TR or Majority text) without labeling them with this new term of reproach which actually refers to an English (not a Greek) text!

1. Those who like the KJV. 'These individuals are only marginally KJV Only' (p. 1)

2. 'One group that would strongly reject the term KJV Only ... would be the 'Majority Text' advocates'. [Whatever is the precedent for this definition?]!

3. The 'Received Text Only' advocates! [Nolan, Malan, and Hoskier are now KJV -Only!]

4. 'The Inspired KJV Group' (p. 3)

5. 'The KJV as New Revelation.' [How is this group any different than group 4?]

In other words, all who refuse to use the N-U text (Nestle-UBS) are slandered as types of KJV-Only people! Similar to a sweeping condemnation that Ruckman often makes, White has condemned nearly all English-speaking believers of the last 300 years by calling them 'marginally KJV Only.'

What is amusing, is that James White failed to mention that Gary Hudson, who began using the term specifically to oppose Ruckman, had joined the MTS in November 1990! Five years later, White expanded the definition, which forces Gary Hudson into a KJV Only person! But Hudson directly opposed Ruckman in July 1990! Also, for the first time ever, John Burgon is now tarred as marginally KJV Only! Even while admitting that the Majority text advocates, such as Hodges and Farstad would 'strongly reject the term' he nevertheless included them under this slanderous term. ...

YET ANOTHER NEW TERM: "KJV Groups"? John Ankerberg and John Weldon authored the 48-page booklet entitled *King James Version Controversy*. These two authors modified White's definition. They ask, 'What are the basic issues in the King James Only (KJO)?' These are

1. 'people who prefer the KJV above all others Bibles, but could not be classified as KJV only.'

2. ‘people who argue that the underlying Greek and Hebrew texts used by the KJV translators are superior to all other texts.’

3. ‘those who argue that only the Textus Receptus (TR) has been supernaturally preserved and inspired and is therefore inerrant.’

4. ‘those who argue that the KJV translation itself constitutes an inspired and inerrant text.’

The authors continue that ‘Categories 3 and 4 comprise the core of the controversy and are our principle concern’ (p. 8). Since they specifically list alleged error after error within the KJV, they believe the KTV is errant, and cannot be a Bible, since they emphasize that the ‘Bible’ is inerrant. ...

Generally, only those who promote modern versions engage in name-calling with their new favorite term ‘KJV Only,’ which they hurl at anyone who prefers the King James Version. But now there is even a new phenomenon. Formerly, only modern version advocates casts this term at their opponents. Now. even some who love the Authorized Version follow this new path and publicly label their like-minded brethren with this term of reproach even though they both agree (as for what is best) on the very same English version! ...

Dean J. W. Burgon appreciated good brethren and wrote *Lives of Twelve Good Men*. But some brethren, in direct contrast to Burgon, demonstrate a very bitter spirit toward like-minded brethren, by borrowing these new terms of opprobrium and labeling brethren who agree on the very same version!

The Sacred Scriptures say that we ought to ‘increase and abound in love one towards another’ (KJV) I Thess. 3:12. They also say we ought to be ‘tenderhearted, forgiving one another’ Eph. 4:32.

In summary, after 1971, when the NASB was published and the version controversy was introduced into fundamentalism, churches reacted, using ads saying, ‘Preaching the KJV only,’ where the KJV served as either a predicate nominative or a direct object with the adverb ‘only ‘ following. Then the first record of ‘KJV-Only’ used as an adjective appears to be in May 1990 in the thesis by James A. Price, who called J. J. Ray a heretic. From that point Gary Hudson used the term against Ruckman. From 1990-1994 various conflicting definitions were used for the term. In 1995, James R. White expanded the definition and threw his lasso around absolutely everyone who preferred the Authorized Version. The most obvious conclusion of this paper is that one element is common within all these conflicting definitions of ‘KJV-Only,’ that is, the eccentric views of the Bible held by Peter S. Ruckman.

‘Some ... persist in identifying every King James [Version] defender as a follower of some cultist, or of Peter Ruckman’ (*For Love of the Bible*, p. 10) (Michael Maynard, “The Origin of ‘KJV-Only’ a New Term of Slander,” n.d.).

MOORMAN, JACK

Jack Moorman (b. 1941)has written six books and a number of articles in defense of the King James Bible. *Forever Settled* is a 300-page hardbound survey of the Bible version issue. It was originally prepared as a course for Gethsemane Bible College in Johannesburg, South Africa. In the foreword, which is dated October

1985, Moorman said, "I believe that God laid a hot coal on my heart concerning this subject some sixteen years ago, and the present survey is a systematizing of material gathered during that time."

Other books by Moorman are

A Closer Look: Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version
Conies, Brass, and Easter: Answers to 'Problem' Passages in the Authorized Version
Early Church Fathers and the Authorized Version: A Demonstration.
8,000 Differences between the Textus Receptus and the Nestle-Aland NT Greek Texts
Missing in Modern Bibles: Is the Full Story Being Told?
Samuel Tregelles: The Man Who Made the Critical Text Acceptable to Bible Believers
When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text: A New Twist in the Continuing Attack on the Authorized Version

All of Moorman's books are available from The Bible for Today (900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ 08108).

Moorman graduated from Tennessee Temple Bible College in the 1960s and traveled to South Africa to begin a missionary church-planting ministry. He was there from 1968-88. They started five churches, a Bible Institute, and a tract printing ministry. In 1988 they moved to England, and since November 1993 he has preached in London and carried on a tract ministry to more than fifty market areas across the city. He started Bethel Baptist Church in Wimbledon in 1994. It was during his years in South Africa that Moorman began an earnest examination of the Bible version issue.

> As with most who left Bible colleges (Tennessee Temple) in the 1960's for the mission field, I knew nothing of the text and translation issue. In [1969 or 1970] I became interested, and from the considerable libraries in Johannesburg, began to build up a file of textual material. This, in addition to separate volumes, is contained in 67 ring binders and has provided a good pool to work from. Today, as then, there is little formal training available in this area for those of our conviction and as most of the first-hand research is done by our opponents, it has been a case of getting as much as we can on our own and 'out of the eater came forth meat' (Letter, February 14, 1994).

In contrast to many that claim there is no harm in the multiplicity of Bible versions, Moorman understands just how important the Bible version issue is:

> **THE DEBATE OVER THE KING JAMES BIBLE IS AS CRUCIAL AS ANY WE FACE TODAY. A NATION, CHURCH, OR INDIVIDUAL IS ONLY AS STRONG AS ITS BIBLE.** The harvest can only be as good and full as the seed sown. The final court of appeal is no longer final if there are others of equal standing. **MANY OF GOD'S PEOPLE NO LONGER HAVE AN ULTIMATE AUTHORITY. 'WHAT DOES GOD'S WORD SAY,' HAS BEEN REPLACED BY AN ANEMIC, 'HOW DOES THIS VERSION RENDER THE PASSAGE.'** ... Those who defend the God-honored version are made to appear divisive, while the ones introducing the new and criticising the old 'have a more balanced view.' And so it goes.
>
> **The attacks against the Book have become more virulent and sophisticated. Some of the heaviest blows have come from within the halls**

> **of evangelicalism and fundamentalism, and there is a strange peer pressure to conform**. Faithfulness to a school, church, mission board is often placed above faithfulness to that Book which brought these institutions into being (Jack Moorman, *When the KJV Departs from the 'Majority' Text: A New Twist in the Continuing Attack on the Authorized Version*, Preface, July 1988, p. iii).

The thing that most impresses me about Jack Moorman's writings is his confidence in God's promise of preservation. Consider this excerpt from his article "Modern Bibles—the Dark Secret," which first appeared in *Foundation* magazine, September-October 1992:

> One hundred years ago John Burgon wrote: 'If you and I believe that the original writings of the Scriptures were verbally inspired by God, then of necessity they must have been providentially preserved through the ages.' This is the crux of the matter; does God preserve that Word which He originally inspired? And if so, to what extent? Is it merely the concepts and basic message that is kept intact; or does preservation, as inspiration, extend to the words themselves? ... We have a strange anomaly today; Christians claim to believe what the Bible says about its own inspiration but virtually ignore the equally direct statements concerning preservation. **TO SAY THAT YOU BELIEVE IN THE FULL INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE WHILE AT THE SAME TIME ACCEPTING THE TEXTUAL THEORIES INHERENT IN THE MODERN VERSIONS, IS ABOUT AS INCONGRUOUS AS TAKING GENESIS ONE LITERALLY WHILE HOLDING TO THE THEORIES OF DARWIN**.

Moorman's "Modern Bibles—the Dark Secret" contains an excellent overview of the Bible's teaching on the Preservation of Scripture. It is available from Plain Paths Publishers, P.O. Box 830, Columbus, NC 28722, http://www.plainpath.org, 828-863-2736, plain@juno.com.

We want to mention one more of Moorman's books: *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text: A New Twist in the Continuing Attack on the Authorized Version*. Consider some excerpts from this important book:

> Until recently the defense of the King James Version was a one-on-one debate with the Critical Text (Nestle-Aland, UBS, etc.). Much has been written. In recent days new arguments for and against have been raised. But the issue is still the same—the vast majority of MSS on the KJV side versus a few old ones for the critical texts and modern versions.
>
> Now a new element has been introduced (though certain aspects of it have long been recognized), with the publication of 'The Greek New Testament according to the Majority Text' (1982), published by Thomas Nelson, under the editorship of Zane Hodges and A.L. Farstad.
>
> **The Majority Text Edition concludes that the Greek text of our Authorised Version is represented by minority MS support in over 1800 readings and therefore is defective in these places.** Thus our opponents (Critical Text, Modern Versions) say the AV New Testament is wrong in 5,300 places, and now our friends say it's off in 1,800.
>
> Zane Hodges has been a good ally. Several of the consulting editors, Harry Sturz, Jakob Van Bruggen, Alfred Martin, and Wilbur Pickering have contributed

strongly to the defense of the Traditional Text. But, **with this production they have left us with a 'tentative' Bible**.

This is plainly stated on the jacket (second edition): 'Scholarly discipline permeates the editor's logic and conclusions; yet Hodges and Farstad make no claim that this text in all its particulars is the exact form of the originals.' On page x we are told: 'The editors do not imagine that the text of this edition represents in all particulars the exact form of the originals ... It should therefore be kept in mind that the present work ... is both preliminary and provisional.

WE ARE BOUND TO ASK, IF THIS ISN'T [THE PRESERVED WORD OF GOD], IF THE AV-RECEIVED TEXT ISN'T, IF THE CRITICAL TEXT ISN'T; WHERE MUST WE GO TO GET A BIBLE TODAY? IF AFTER THESE CENTURIES WE STILL HAVE ONLY A PROVISIONAL, PRELIMINARY, TENTATIVE BIBLE, WHAT ARE WE TO DO?

Three major errors of judgment have led to this 'provisional' edition:

1. The editors do not want to be seen relying upon God's preservation of the text. 2. They have resorted to a source which cites only a minority of the evidence. 3. They have followed the wrong stream of MSS in the Book of Revelation.

Scrivener and Hoskier in an earlier generation, and Hodges, Pickering with others in our day have made an immeasurable contribution in defending the Received Text against the Hortian theories. They have provided us with a great store of factual material ... But sadly in Hoskier, Scrivener, and the editors of the Majority Text Edition, little or no reference is made to God's promises of preserving Scripture. In fact, Hodges and Farstad make absolutely no mention of it. Thus, the foundation for textual research has been taken away.

Wilbur Pickering is listed as one of the consulting editors. His book *The Identity of the New Testament Text* has done a great deal to clarify and cause a rethink concerning Westcott and Hort. He is careful to state that he believes in preservation, yet in the presentation of his material he says: 'I have deliberately avoided introducing any arguments based upon inspiration and preservation in the preceding discussion in the hope that I may not be misrepresented by critics in the same way that Burgon has been' (p. 153).

But if the critics misrepresent us because we present Biblical truth, and if they become uncomfortable with this, what does it matter? Who are we trying to please, God or man? **Must we participate in their neutrality and unbelief in order to gain a hearing from them?** Must we yield to peer pressure? Must we put our good friends ahead of our good Bible?

WHEN AN INQUIRER INTO THE TEXT OF SCRIPTURE (EVEN A DEFENDER OF THE RECEIVED TEXT) TAKES THIS NEUTRAL APPROACH IN ACCESSING THE EVIDENCE, IT WILL INEVITABLY LEAD DOWN THIS DEAD-END STREET OF HAVING ONLY A TENTATIVE BIBLE.

Notice the disturbing kind of statement Pickering is prepared to make: 'We do not at this moment have the precise wording of the original text' (*The Identity of the New Testament Text* p. 153). 'When all this evidence is in I believe the *Textus Receptus* will be found to differ from the original in something over a thousand places' (pp. 232, 33). 'Most seriously misleading is the representation that I am

calling for a return to the Textus Receptus ... While men like Brown, Fuller and Hills do call for a return to the TR as such, Hodges and I do not. We are advocating what Kurt Aland has called the majority text ('Queen Anne ... and All That': A Response, *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, June 1978, p. 165).

Also listed as a consulting editor to the Majority Text Edition is Harry A. Sturz. ... Sturz presents a number of other not-so-well-known areas of evidence for the Byzantine text. We owe him a great debt for his research. However, when he seeks to deny the theological/supernatural arguments for the preservation of the text he becomes unmoored.

You may be forgiven if you have difficulty understanding the following statement, or think it to be contradictory: 'It should be pointed out that **providential preservation is not a necessary consequence of inspiration**. Preservation of the Word of God is promised in Scripture, and inspiration and preservation are related doctrines, but they are distinct from each other, and there is a danger of making one the necessary corollary of the other. The Scriptures do not do this. **God, having given the perfect revelation by verbal inspiration, was under no special or logical obligation to see that man did not corrupt it'** (emphasis added) (*The Byzantine Text*, p. 38).

Coming now to Zane Hodges: In seeking to deny the charge that he might be leaning a little toward a theological/supernatural stance in textual matters, he gives the following lame reply when questioned about his contribution to the excellent book *Which Bible?* 'Finally, Fee ... seems to wish to continue to tag me with a theological slant that I have explicitly disavowed. The fact that I allowed an article of mine to be reprinted in a volume all of whose perspectives I did not share should not be used against me' ('Modern Textual Criticism and the Majority Text: A Surrejoinder,' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, June 1978, p. 163).

What a refreshing contrast it is to see the following appraisal of Edward Hills' position: 'He integrated the theological perspective with the discipline of New Testament text criticism. This is a taboo that recent Majority Text advocates have attempted not to transgress, preferring to work from within a purely scientific framework' (*King James Version Defended*, p. vi).

So in order to gain a little respectability (the leading and liberal textual critic George Kilpatrick writes a commendation on the jacket), Hodges, Farstad and friends find themselves firmly in a textual half-way house (Jack Moorman, *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text: A New Twist in the Continuing Attack on the Authorized Version).*

In this book Moorman makes the following points: (1) the Hodges-Farstad Majority Text is established upon an insufficient and faulty foundation (the Von Sodom apparatus and the 046 MSS of Revelation); therefore, the conclusion that in 1,800 places the Authorized New Testament lacks majority text support is in error. "These two factors account for the vast majority of readings which they would like to alter in the Received Text." (2) Even most of the remaining passages that do seem to have only a minority of MS support, "nevertheless [have] quite substantial support." Moorman presents this support in 87 pages of listings. (3)

Even the verse that supposedly has less manuscript support than any other in the Authorized Version (1 John 5:7) has a wide variety of support. Moorman gives an overview of the internal and external evidence for this important verse.

MORRIS, HENRY

Dr. Henry M. Morris (1918-2006) was the founder of the Institute of Creation Research (P.O. Box 2667, El Cajon, CA 92021]. His pamphlet *A Creationist's Defense of the King James Bible*, published in 1996, is an important testimony in favor of the KJV. The June 1996 issue of *Back to Genesis*, published by the Institute for Creation Research (ICR), contains an article summarizing Dr. Henry Morris's pamphlet. It is entitled "Should Creationists Abandon the King James Version?" I had known that Dr. Morris loved the KJV and rejects the modern versions. He had told me this in private letters, but this was his first publication on the subject. Dr. Morris described his experiences in using various modern versions, including the American Standard Version, Berkeley, Williams, Phillips, Amplified, Alford, Weymouth, and Goodspeed, yet he always came back to the King James Bible. He was even a member of the North America Overview Committee for the New King James Version, but "even so, after trying to use it and endorse it, I finally went back to the 'old' King James, convinced that it is still the best, in terms of poetic majesty, spiritual power, and over-all clarity and reliability." Not only did Dr. Morris hold to the King James Bible because of its incomparable English language and the high qualifications of its translators, but he also defended its underlying Greek Received Text against the modern critical Greek. Consider the following excerpts:

> Are we to believe that God would entrust the preservation of His eternal Word to men such as these? Would He not more likely have used devout scholars who believed in the absolute inerrancy and authority of the Bible? We must remember that the Bible is not like other books. It was divinely inspired, and both academic integrity and spiritual discernment are required in its transmission and translation.
>
> I believe, thereafter, after studying, teaching, and loving the Bible for over 55 years, that Christians need to hang on to their old King James Bibles as long as they live. God has uniquely blessed it in the history of England and America, in the great revivals, in the worldwide missionary movement, and in the personal lives of believers more than He has through all the rest of the versions put together. The King James Bible is the most beautiful, the most powerful, and (I strongly believe) the most reliable of any that we have or probably ever will have, until Christ returns" (Morris, *A Creationist's Defense of the King James Bible*, pp. 13, 17).

The following is from an article that Morris wrote in 1996:

> In this day when many Christians have started using one of the modern English translations of the Bible, abandoning the King James Version, it may be well to review a few of the reasons why many creationists still prefer the latter. ...

This is not a new question. There have been over 120 English translations of the complete Bible published since the King James, as well as over 200 New Testaments. Even if one really feels that he ought to switch to a modern translation, how can he decide which, if any, is really the inspired word of God? I personally have perused in some depth at least 20 of them.

For a long time, the 'official' version used in each Bible-believing church was the King James, with the others used occasionally for reference study by teachers and pastors. Now, however, confusion reigns. Congregational reading is no longer possible, and Scripture memorization, which has been an incalculable blessing in my own Christian life, is almost a lost art these days. ...

The beautiful prose of the King James is a treasure which should not be lost. It has been acclaimed widely as the greatest example of English literature ever written. Apart from a few archaic words which can be easily clarified in footnotes, it is as easy to understand today as it was four hundred years ago. This is why the common people today still use and love it. It is the 'intelligentsia' who tend to favor the modern versions. The King James uses mostly one and two-syllable words, and formal studies have always shown its readability index to be 10th grade or lower. ...

We have abandoned today many fine points of grammar commonly used in 1600. For example, we forget that 'thee,' 'thou,' and 'thine' were used to express the second person singular, with 'you,' 'ye,' and 'yours' reserved for second person plural. Today we use 'you' indiscriminately for both singular and plural, thereby missing the precise meaning of many texts of Scripture....

I believe, therefore, after studying, teaching, and loving the Bible for over 55 years, that Christians—especially creationists!—need to hang on to their old King James Bibles as long as they live. God has uniquely blessed its use in the great revivals, in the worldwide missionary movement, and in the personal lives of believers, more so than He has with all the rest of the versions put together, and 'by their fruits ye shall know them' (Matthew 7:20).

It is the most beautiful, the most powerful and (I strongly believe) the most reliable of any that we have or ever will have, until Christ returns (Morris, "Should Creationists Abandon the King James Version?" *Back to Genesis*, June 1996).

NORDIC BIBLE SOCIETY

The Nordic Bible Society is a small group that was established in the 1990s with the goal of (1) giving the Scandinavian countries a Bible that is completely based on and translated from the reformation text, that is, the Hebrew and Greek text underlying all the Protestant Bible translations during the Reformation, and (2) informing Scandinavian Christians about the history of the true underlying text of the Bible through distribution of literature and tapes on this subject. In a 1993 letter **Helge Evensen** gave us the following report:

We believe that the original Greek text is intact today through copies of the printed Received Text in Greek, namely the text underlying the Authorized

> Version of 1611, edited today by the Trinitarian Bible Society, England. (Scrivener's reconstruction). We are well aware of the fact that we do not possess the original autographs today. These we do not need, since we have the same Greek text preserved in the TR.
>
> Our main vision is to give the people in the Scandinavian countries information on the preserved text of the NT, the TR. And since all current Bible translations in the Scandinavian countries are not based on that text, we are working on a translation from the TR into the Norwegian language, which will be translated into Swedish, Danish and Finnish. Today we have the Pauline Epistles ready (including Hebrews) in Norwegian and we are publishing these as one book, as the first step.

In a letter dated December 21, 1994, Evensen said:

> Our work here in Scandinavia, both with the translation work and the publication of literature defending the Textus Receptus, is doing better than ever. Right now we are in the middle of a debate concerning the TR-text versus the modern translations. We get some publicity in some of the newspapers too. Some of the conservatives are standing with us in the defence. Continually we receive requests for our materials. All of this shows that this issue is finally beginning to get the attention of the Christian people here in the Scandinavian countries. This issue has not really been debated long enough for people to get hold of here in the north. But we need a reformation, therefore the reformation text must be defended and translated.

In 1995 he said:

> [T]he debate is much similar to that in England and the States. The arguments for the 'critical text' is the same everywhere. It's just the same old 'the worse for wear' arguments which have been disproved many times in the past (Letter, March 15, 1995).

NORRIS, DAVID

David Norris, editor of *Dayspring Magazine* in the United Kingdom, published an unequivocal defense of the KJV and its underlying Hebrew and Greek texts in 2004 under the title of *The Big Picture: The Authority and Integrity of the Authentic Word of God* (Authentic Word, P.O. Box 22, Cannock, Staffordshire, England, U.K. WS12 4HR, http://www.authenticword.co.uk/). This 393-page book has some excellent studies on the essential doctrines of inspiration, revelation, and preservation, with accompanying exposure of how modern man has undermined these. A valuable feature is the author's discussions of popular relativistic theories of linguistics and how these have influenced the field of Bible translation. Norris' keen critiques of these theories is based upon his education in this field and his own translation work. After obtaining a degree in German language and literature from Birmingham University and an M.A. in the history of European thought and culture, he spent a year at the University of Constance in Germany studying literary theory.

In an e-mail dated June 27, 2005, Norris graciously gave me the following interesting biographical sketch and the testimony of how he became a defender of the Traditional Text:

> I was born the first of four brothers when World War 2 was well underway, on 16th March 1941 in the town of Wolverhampton in central England. Our family was nominally Christian. Although I have no direct recollection of my father ever reading the Scriptures or praying with us as a family, we were encouraged to say our prayers at night and taken along to a local Baptist Church several times on Sunday. My mother was Welsh and came from a traditional, if somewhat moribund, Welsh Calvinistic background. My paternal grandfather was a minister of the Primitive Methodists and from the north of England. As a preacher his reputation was that of being something of a firebrand. The Bible from which he preached is in my possession and is treasured family 'relic'. Sadly, he died of pneumonia contracted when out in inclement weather visiting a member of his congregation who was sick. He went to be with his Lord when my father was quite young and I am sorry not to have ever known him.
>
> In my childhood years I enjoyed Church and we were blessed with a truly converted minister at a time when the Baptist Union of Great Britain was already well soaked in liberalism and neo-orthodoxy. The man was a good preacher and I can remember snatches of some of his sermons to this day. He spoke of heaven and hell, of the consequences of rejecting the Lord Jesus, of the love of Christ, and he preached much on the second coming. So much so that as a child I remember being terrified to the point of being unable to sleep, thinking that the Lord would return and I would be one of those left behind! The members of the Church gave him a very difficult time because of his testimony to the Gospel. This godly man moved on before I made a profession of faith in Christ, but his preaching was a significant factor in my turning to Christ for salvation. I never met up with him again before he went to be with Christ to tell him of the debt I owed him. Pastors be encouraged, you will never know the full effects of your ministry in this life. Just be faithful, and leave the rest to God.
>
> Reaching early teenage years I rebelled vehemently against the Gospel. Had not God's grace caught up with me, I dread to think where I would have been today. I hardly like to recall the heartache that my parents suffered at my hand. The wayward path I was treading loomed large before me and I could see that, were I to continue in that direction, tragedy would be inevitable. One night in the quietness of my bedroom at the age of fourteen I yielded to Christ. There were no half-measures and there was an immediate change in all I did and said. I took the Word of God seriously, something I have done throughout my life.
>
> It was not long before the minister of my childhood years had been replaced by one ruined by theological college and I felt it was time to move on. Having been baptised as a believer not long after my conversion to Christ, the only gathering of believers in the town practising believers' baptism was a Brethren Assembly. This Assembly of believers was very well attended and Sunday by Sunday there was a regular preaching of the good old Gospel to a packed congregation. I soon became involved with winning other young folk to the Lord, with preaching in the streets, distribution of tracts and literature, and many other things.

I believed I had a call to serve the Lord and prepared for service on the Continent by attending a Bible College in France. Here I met my German-born wife, Valerie, to whom I have been married now for almost forty years. After some time in the UK, we spent time at a Brethren Bible School at Wiedenest in Germany, where I was to perfect my abilities in German with a view to service in Austria. Sadly, the college was Barthian in many respects, certainly on the inspiration of Scripture. It tried to retain some of the Brethren tradition, especially of one of their early leaders Erich Sauer (who incidentally also had unsound views on Scripture), and yet espouse some of the milder elements of German liberal theology. I would recognise it now as being thoroughly neo-evangelical. There was much raving against fundamentalism and for some reason against Carl McIntire. Such was our desire to reach Austria that we ignored many of these signs. It was a mistake, and we lived to regret it. Again a lesson, ignore nothing, especially unsound doctrine of this magnitude.

Eventually, we reached Austria and were full of joy at being able to serve the Lord in the very Roman Catholic province of Tyrol. Our joy was short-lived. Not long after we arrived colleagues insisted we join with them in evangelistic crusades led by a well-known German evangelist, Anton Schulte. We learnt that Schulte intended sending his 'converts' back into the Roman Catholic Church. This horrified us and when we saw we could get nowhere with these people, we began a very difficult task of withdrawing from the work. One wealthy elder of the Assembly at home was a member of the Billy Graham Association UK national committee. We discovered Schulte was really only taking a leaf out of Graham's book and so any sympathy and support we would have expected at home quickly evaporated. Our actions were misunderstood and misinterpreted at home and had repercussions that remain with us to this day. It became clear to us then, why the Wiedenest people were so scathing of McIntire.

After withdrawing from the work in Austria, I went to work at the University Press in Cambridge. We became members of a well-known Baptist Church in the city and friends of the pastor. We thought we had now found a true spiritual home. It was encouraging to find the congregation, pushed along by the pastor, would support us in a return to Austria. This time we went out with an evangelical missionary fellowship. It soon became clear that funds were going to be tight and much less than we had been led to believe. So bad were our circumstances, that we found it almost impossible to meet everyday expenses – and I can tell you, Valerie can make money stretch further than anyone I know. To ease matters we moved to Germany and lived rent-free in a house owned by Valerie's parents, but we remained with the missionary fellowship.

Whilst in Germany, we began to realise that all was not well in the home Church and nagging doubts always in the back of our minds had become painful reality. It had been the pastor of this Church who had first introduced me to the New International Version (New Testament) when it was first published. Men like Don Carson and Wayne Grudem, then working for Ph.D.s at the university, were frequent visitors to the Church and preached from the pulpit. The full significance of all this was not clear to us at the time. The Basis of Faith of the Church had been changed before we left for Austria. At the time, I trusted the pastor and thought nothing much of the changes, never suspecting he held any unsound views on Scripture or anything else. Looking back now, I can see the

change of the wording, without saying so explicitly, allows anyone denying six-day creation or verbal inspiration to become a member or even officer of the Church. Although we had not spotted everything, it was clear to us a drift away from the truth had started and we began to make our views clear as kindly but as firmly as we could. We once more decided to return to the UK, as it was evident the situation, already becoming difficult, would only deteriorate. ...

Our pastor went to Nigeria to teach theology. A man replaced him who, after many years ministering to the Church, suddenly and unexpectedly for many announced he was a homosexual. It is now clear that the man had a history of homosexual encounters. How the Church missed this, and I am assuming they did, I really do not know. This new pastor, whom we thankfully never met, had been a leading light in the Evangelical Alliance, and friend of John Stott. This second pastor left his wife and family and the Church. The scandal hit the national headline news right across the country, including the evening TV news programmes.

Returning to the UK again, it was going to be difficult to earn a crust. I applied to read German at Birmingham University and much to my own astonishment was readily accepted. I graduated with an honours degree in German language and literature. I followed this up with an M.A. in the history of European thought and culture. During the time of my studies I had developed an interest in literary theory. With this in mind I quite deliberately spent a year at the University of Constance in Germany where Wolfgang Iser and Robert Jaus, fathers of the so-called Constance school of reception aesthetics, were still professors. These studies have stood me in good stead and given me an insight I could not otherwise have gained into what has been done to pervert the Word of God given the translation methodology used for modern Bible versions. It has also given me some insight into where the leaders of many formerly Gospel-orientated Churches are taking their flocks, where the leaders and rulers of our western nations are taking our people – but then, anyone who reads the Bible can find that out!

Armed with my degrees, I was able to earn a living but never make a fortune! I have worked variously as a translator of books for an international publisher – and, as my friends often remind me, I did some translation work for the BBC for a series of programmes on the history of fighter aircraft. Later I obtained a position as a lecturer in German at a college in Birmingham and subsequently became the co-ordinator for modern languages there. One of the most enjoyable tasks was training engineers at the Landrover plant in Solihull near Birmingham in basic German, familiarising them with engineering terms, etc, – when Landrover was owned by BMW – a lot of fun. With the increasing politicisation of education, I encountered more and more difficulties executing my duties in an honest and Christ-honouring way. Last year I retired early.

I have always read the Authorised Version [KJV]. In the fifties there were the translations of J.B. Phillip, but most genuine believers avoided them as they did the RSV. There was something called the Amplified New Testament. I tried it, but eventually ended back with my beloved AV. Few believers I knew were happy with any of the really modern versions that began to appear in the sixties and seventies. Then came the New International Version. I bought a New Testament, but for a long time never looked at it. Then one day I bought the

completed NIV Bible and not being one to waste my money, I began to use it regularly. It seemed fine, but when I came to passages that I knew well, particularly those where I had some familiarity with the Greek text, I became increasingly uneasy. Romans has always blessed my soul and chapter six, seven and eight are particularly precious. I read chapter six over and over in the NIV. It began to dawn on me that I was looking at a confidence trick of colossal proportions. A particular interpretation of the chapter was being superimposed onto the text, that of the 'two natures' of the believer. Whatever we may think of that teaching is not the point here, but that the text should be rewritten in a way to accommodate it was preposterous. All doctrines, if they are truly the teaching of the Word of God, will be evident from a plain reading of an unadulterated text. As I began to look more and more below the surface of the translation, I soon became aware that this translation was a travesty of the Word of God.

A number of books were helpful to me at the time and I mention particularly Edward Hills' *The King James Version Defended*. I came to see what had been the role of Westcott and Hort. What saddened me most of all was to discover that Benjamin Warfield, whose book on the inspiration of Scripture I had so much admired, had also led many astray. It was he who made it impossible to say that we have an inspired Bible in our hands today. His was the view held by most evangelicals. After reading Hills, I took down from my bookshelves the writings of the old puritan, John Owen, and the last volume of his Works. Here was a man who believed that the apographs, or copies, were as inspired as the originals, furthermore that God had preserved His Word in them to this day. He also took views on the Septuagint and the Hebrew vowel points that are not popular with scholars today, scholars who ought better to sit at his feet than call him outmoded! Here was a man who believed that despite the difficulties of translation, God preserves His Word to give it to us in our own language.

To return to the New International Version, I needed to read about the translation methodology used. Picking up the writings of Eugene Nida, I soon found myself on territory familiar in my university days and had little difficulty in condemning the work of these men as a distortion and a perversion of the Scriptures. (To find out why, you must read a copy of my book *THE BIG PICTURE*.) I have said it over and over again and I repeat it here without apology that those who read such translations and preach from them are neither reading nor preaching the authentic Word of God. This has upset many people deeply and angered them, including members of my own family, and I am deeply sorry about that, but what is true is simply true. The NIV is not the Word of God He inspired, no way.

I use only the Authorised Version, I co-operate only with genuine believers in Gospel work. After returning to the UK, we tried to keep in touch with friends who had supported us in Austria and Germany through a regular photocopied newsletter sent to a dozen or so. This eventually developed into a little magazine we called DAYSPRING and issued from time to time. We now print 1000 copies of each issue. Over the years we have lost many friends as they became aware our stance on the AV and other matters such as 'contemporary Christian music', and our complete opposition to the modern tongues (charismatic/Pentecostal) movement. Others, however, have taken their place, as we have gained friends around the world. David Cloud's book *For Love of*

the Bible enabled us to contact others who love the authentic Word of God and we enjoy fellowship with many of them and with others (David Norris's Testimony, from an e-mail to David Cloud, June 27, 2005).

Following are some excerpts from "The Big Picture: The Authority and Integrity of the Authentic Word of God":

> The father of modern linguistics was the Swiss linguist, Ferdinand de Saussure. The book for which he is best known, *Course in General Linguistics*, was put together by his students and colleagues after his death in 1913. Although little-known outside academic circles, his influence in the field of linguistics can be likened to the work of his contemporaries, Emile Durkheim in sociology, Charles Darwin in biology, Karl Marx in economic and political thought, and Sigmund Freud in psychology. The effect of his work was just as devastating as these other men and just as godless. Saussure explicitly denies what the Bible affirms and then sets off in the opposite direction. He vandalises our understanding of language. Were his theories remotely akin to the truth, real communication between men would be impossible, and the possibility of God's Word reaching human hearts a pious dream—which is precisely the point! Having implicitly denied the existence of the non-physical human soul and its inherent self-consciousness, Saussure must, and does deny any place for pre-existing concepts or of anything having a non-material essential nature, being expressed physically through language. Immediately, all grounds of meaning disappear for in that scheme of things there can be no place for an all-embracing plan and purpose of God. ...
>
> Modern version translation methodology does not demand a careful reading of an inspired given text. It is concerned with the subjective response of the reader rather than the infallible transmission of the objective truth of God to the minds of men through the written Word. ... The linguistic analysis methodology in Bible translation was pioneered by the American scholar, Eugene Nida, who was translation secretary for the American Bible Society and the United Bible Societies. He also had connections with the Wycliffe Bible Translators who adopted his methods in their work around the world. He was a leading influence in the production of the *Good News Bible*. His methods are based on Saussure's understanding of language and more specifically on the work of linguist Noam Chomsky's system of 'transformational grammar'. Chomsky was concerned to examine the 'deep structure' of the 'semantic components' below the surface structure of sentences. The New International Version was produced also by this method of translation (Norris, *The Big Picture*, pp. 142, 143, 364, 368).
>
> Only someone with faith worked in his heart by God can say with any measure of reality, 'Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path' (Psalm 119:105). Blind men see nothing, not even with a lamp in their hand. A light in the hand of a blind man does not help him to see where he is going. To the spiritually blind, what God has revealed of Himself in the Bible and in nature is obscured, even as those privileged to witness the coming of His Son in the flesh knew Him not (John 1:10-11). They ought to see what is plain, but they do not because of their blindness. 'Modernising' the language of the Bible will do nothing to make it more understandable. What spiritually blind men need is the healing touch of the Lord Jesus upon their eyes! Something He is more than

willing to perform when they ask Him (Norris, *The Big Picture*, p. 159).

All created reality was brought into being and continues to be determined in every detail by the will of God—and this therefore, above all, will include the giving of Scripture! The transmission of the sacred Word into languages understood by others beyond the original readers, for whom it is also intended, takes place under the providential eye of God, who preserves His Word in every detail that we too may share His thoughts. If the hairs of our head are all numbered and no sparrow falls to the ground without our Father, then it is inconceivable that such a watchful Father should pay no regard when His Word passes from one language to another or that He should have made no provision for this (Norris, *The Big Picture*, p. 187).

One of the most evil effects of the proliferation of modern bible versions, each one claiming to be more authentic than the last, is that the single standard by which we can identify deceivers has been cast aside (Norris, *The Big Picture*, p. 230).

The Word of God is the meaning of meanings, the fulcrum upon which the whole system of truth moves, it is *the* Sign around which all others revolve and which they reflect. For this to be so, the Word of God must have pre-existed all other words (Norris, *The Big Picture*, p. 239).

All modern bible translations, but especially those translated by 'dynamic equivalence, are largely designed for 'dynamic' reading. The reader is not recovering a communication given by God once-for-all-time in the past, but listening for the voice of God from a string of words that have no fixed meaning. They may say one thing to one person and something quite different to someone else, depending upon the circumstances. The same words may even say something different to the same person on different occasions. Truth is in the end what the reader makes it. There is no underlying fixed meaning. No single reading of this bible is right or wrong, just different. The reader is not a passive recipient but an active co-creator to whom the bible text provides reading 'cues'. This is how our children are taught to read in state schools today. Text books used in teacher training colleges throughout the land will say that reading is not about retrieving meaning from the text, it is not decoding, but creating a variety of meanings. There can be no single given meaning for any text only plausible meanings—whatever that means, if it can mean anything at all! ... Today's readers will often find it difficult to read the Authorised Version, not because it is 'old' language, but because they have not been taught to read in the way the structure of its language demands. God, not the reader, is the Creator of the meaning of Scripture and He has something to say to us. Those who approach the Bible with any other conviction than this are condemned to remain sitting in deep darkness. Contemporary linguistic method cast a veil over the Word of God (Norris, *The Big Picture*, pp. 243, 244).

Scripture is not the dictation of a law or doctrine, but is a divine in-breathing of a revelation of God Himself into the world as one element of His redemptive action towards us. Inspiration cannot be isolated from the rest of God's redemptive working in human history, but itself forms part of it. The same grace of God going out to the sinner to save him has also given us an infallible Bible (Norris, *The Big Picture*, p. 250).

Rather believe what the Bible says about men, than what men say about the Bible (Norris, *The Big Picture*, p. 252).

No one's life is going to be radically changed by reading a corrupted version of Shakespeare, but relying on a corrupted version of God's Word has eternal consequences. When the meaning of a verse hangs on a single word or even a single letter, we cannot afford to have an unsure and approximate text. The Bible is not a text penned in the heat of literary and human inspiration, but it was given in words carried into the minds of its human authors on the breath of God, and then written by that same breathing into holy pages. Why should we think that God would take such great care by a divine act of inspiration to secure the perfect recording of His every word, if at the last all is lost? The Word that God gave, He also keeps. Those who treat the text of God's Word like a Shakespeare folio will end up with a text like Shakespeare, a probable text with no certainty at all. It must be obvious that all those, professed friend or patent foe, who treat the Bible as though it were a human text will be unable to give us any more certainty for the Bible than they can for any human book. This is completely inadequate (Norris, *The Big Picture*, p. 292).

If we need to prove it true before we believe it to be true, we have already declared beforehand our lack of faith in it (Norris, *The Big Picture*, p. 293).

There are two ways and two ways only of approaching the whole issue of the preservation of Scripture. Those who seek a middle road delude themselves, there is none. God does not preserve Scripture using men and methods rooted in a denial of what He has said. As the actual autographs written by the prophets and apostles are long since gone, what guarantee can we have then apart from a divine promise that the words once given have been preserved and can be perfectly recovered in the copies, or 'apographs'? The best we can hope for otherwise is to reconstruct something as near as possible to what we imagine the originals to have been like employing methods textual critics would use on Shakespearean manuscripts and the early printed copies of his works. This approach is a total waste of time since all it can give us is a thoroughly human book. It flies in the face of all the Bible itself tells us about its own preservation (Norris, *The Big Picture*, pp. 293, 294).

To profess verbal inspiration and at the same time to subject the Scripture texts to rationalistic critical methodology is to live in a crazed schizoid world, denying on the one hand what is confessed on the other (Norris, *The Big Picture*, p. 294).

Throughout the twentieth century, a view of inspiration gained ascendancy among evangelicals and many fundamentalists that marked a departure from that which was previously confessed by believers since New Testament days. ... Recent scholarship has shown that men like Princeton professor Benjamin Warfield (1851-1921) were not as committed to the biblical doctrine of verbal inspiration as we are sometimes led to believe. Thinking to answer rationalist theologians on their own ground and legitimise textual studies, these men began to suggest that only the autographs (originals) were inspired, apographs (copies) were not. For this reason many of the Statements of Faith issued by various bodies now speak of the Scriptures being inspired 'as originally given' whereas before this time the conviction was that inspired Scripture was

preserved in the copies. All this took place almost unnoticed, but we are being asked to swallow a real whopper! What this means is that as the originals have long since turned to dust, no inspired text exists today. ... Warfield's book on biblical inspiration is still hailed as a 'classic', but his viewpoint has done more to undermine confidence in Scripture than almost any other in the last 150 years or so (Norris, *The Big Picture*, pp. 295, 296).

We have a clear choice between one of two diverging pathways, the road of faith or the road of human reason and unbelief. Do we begin with the Word of God or do we begin with the word of men? This is the question and it has in the first instance little to do with texts, but with the faithfulness of our God. To decide these things we need only a believing heart and the ability to read. Of course, textual scholars will deem all non-academics meddling in what they regard as their exclusive area of work unworthy to tie their bootlaces, still less to steal their clothes! Only after giving a positive answer to this question, do we turn to the manuscripts and texts, and scoop away the dross and scum from the gold, to uncover the authentic Word of God. For it to be of any use, textual study must be grounded upon what the Bible already says about itself. *If we do not begin with the Word of God, we shall never end with it!* (Norris, *The Big Picture*, pp. 321, 322).

Apart from a doctrinal slide away from the truth, a widespread Philistinism and aesthetic illiteracy now dominates much of the professing Christian world. As sophisticated prose is indicative of an advanced culture so decadent language is indicative of one that is disintegrating. Following Hebrew and Greek vocabulary and syntax enables the English reader to enter into the atmosphere and the meaning of the passage as though he were reading the original. Modern versions deprive the reader of this privilege (Norris, *The Big Picture*, p. 358).

The church of Rome, unable to forbid the reading of Scripture, took the next best course available to see as many different bible versions circulate as possible. Humanist theologians will work until their fingertips are calloused to the same end. As long as there are many different bibles, the authority of one can be denied by pointing to another that seems to say something else. The possibility of one authoritative Word has then gone. No sooner is one version off the press than another comes along. With so many different bibles, godless religion or reason remains the final arbiter of the truth. This is why those whose cry is — there is only one Book! — will always be reviled. The argument has little to do with scholarship and everything to do with faith in the one Word God has given us (Norris, *The Big Picture*, p. 359).

The term 'equivalence' of any kind with respect to Bible translation is entirely inappropriate. Following structuralist views of language, it suggests that the translation is something similar but not quite the same. A merely equivalent meaning, formal or dynamic, is not an identical one. It accommodates the notion that the reproduction of the thoughts of one person in the mind of another in another language through translation is not a credible purpose. ... therefore even the term 'formal equivalency' should not, strictly speaking, be applied to the Authorised Version. In accepting this distinction, we legitimise Nida' methodology (Norris, *The Big Picture*, pp. 373-74).

> The task of the Bible translator is to carry the biblical text from the source language to the target language in complete faithfulness (Norris, *The Big Picture*, p. 390).
>
> What we object to most strongly in modern versions is not any inadequacy in the translation, such as may be said of English versions before the Authorised Version, but the deliberate attempt to change, pervert, and deceive (Norris, *The Big Picture*, p. 391).

The **PROTESTANT REFORMER CHURCHES IN AMERICA** (PCR), were founded in 1924, continue to use only the King James Bible. In 1995 they had 27 churches with roughly 6,000 members in this group in the United States and Canada. They hold to the old-line Presbyterian faith, maintain a staunch defense of biblical inerrancy, and are separated from the ecumenical movement. We are told that "although there is no synodical decision requiring this, the Protestant Reformed Churches in America use only the King James Version (KJV) of Holy Scripture in their worship services and classes of instruction. Likewise, this is the version used in the Christian schools established by the members of these churches. This is also the Bible read at the daily devotions of the families of these churches" (David Engelsma, *Modern Bible Versions*, preface, p. 1).

In a letter dated March 21, 1995, I was told by Edward Stouwie, Secretary of the Evangelism Committee of the South Holland Protestant Reformed Church (Illinois), "Our individual churches (though there is no official denominational decision on this) use only the KJV; and there is no 'movement' afoot in our churches to do away with the KJV. All of our ministers, professors and church councils are in agreement on this."

This is not to say that every man in the PRC has a consistent stand for the Received Text and the King James Bible. David Engelsma told me in a letter dated March 29, 1995, "The PRC as a denomination has not taken a stand on the Greek text of the New Testament." He also said that at least one professor at the PRC seminary uses the critical text.

David J. Engelsma (b. 1939) is Professor of Dogmatics and Old Testament at the Protestant Reformed Seminary, Grandville, Michigan. For about 30 years he has been defending the Received Text and the King James Bible, holding basically the same position as John Burgon. In 1975 Engelsma delivered a lecture on *Modern Bible Versions* at the Protestant Reformed Church of South Holland, Illinois. This was the annual Winter lecture sponsored by the Men's Society of that church. The material was then published by the church's Evangelism Committee. In 1982 Engelsma delivered a lecture entitled "The English Translation of the Holy Scripture" at a conference of Protestant Reformed ministers in South Holland. The latter was published in the April 1982 issue of the *Protestant Reformed Theological Journal*. These two lectures were subsequently combined into one booklet.

In the preface to the publication of the 1975 lecture, Engelsma testified:

> The purpose of this pamphlet is not intellectual, that is, to merely impart information. As he reads, we are sure the reader will notice from the moving and impelling thrust of the language that this lecture concerns a matter that presses upon our heart. This immediately takes the pamphlet out of the area of the intellectual and places it in the realm of the spiritual. Nothing but love for the truth and love for the church and love for God's people moves us to speak and write as herein recorded. Our appeal is to the sanctified consciences of the Lord's people and to the test of truth as laid down for us by the Holy Prophets and Apostles in the Sacred Scriptures.

In a letter dated March 15, 1995, Engelsma gave this summary of how he came to his present position on Bible versions:

> I began studying the issue of versions carefully about 20 years ago. I was trained in seminary to regard the Westcott-Hort critical text as authoritative, although the Protestant Reformed Church in which I am a minister, used, and still uses, the KJV. I became increasingly disturbed with the modern versions and began reading Van Bruggen, Hills, Burgon, and others. Asked to give a lecture to the ministers in my denomination on the subject, I gave the lecture that was later published in the form you read. My education is an A.B. from Calvin College, a B.D. from the Protestant Reformed Seminary, and a Th.M. from Calvin Theological Seminary.

Engelsma believes the Bible version issue touches the authority of God's Word in the hearts of God's people:

> It should be evident to all that what version the Church uses is an important matter. In opposing corrupt versions, we are fighting essentially the same battle that our spiritual ancestors fought in the Reformation: the battle for the presence and authority of the Word of God. The only difference is that then the Bible was withheld from the church, whereas now it is buried and distorted by multitudes of bad versions (Engelsma, *Modern Bible Versions*, p. 9).

Engelsma focuses on the preservation of Holy Scripture in his defense of the Received Text and the King James Bible:

> Christ promised His church that she would always have His Word: 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away' (Matt. 24:35). This is necessarily implied in the doctrine of Scripture. If Scripture is God-breathed, as 2 Timothy 3:16 teaches, God in His Providence will surely preserve Scripture for His church in all ages....
>
> How widely this text has prevailed in the actual use of the church, Bruce M. Metzger, himself no advocate of the TT [Traditional Text], indicates. It 'spread widely throughout Greek speaking lands.' It was the text of the first translation of the Bible into Teutonic language, by Ulfilas, 'apostle to the Goths,' in the second half of the fourth century. It was the text of the first translation of the Bible into a Slavic language, thus forming 'the basis of the New Testament ... for millions of Slavic peoples.' Metzger concludes:
>
> 'As regards the history of the printed form of the Greek New Testament, the so-called Textus Receptus, which was based chiefly on manuscripts of the

> Antiochian recension [Metzger here repeats the Westcott-Hort myth that the Received Text was created in the fourth century], has been reprinted, with only minor modifications, in almost one thousand editions from 1514 down to the twentieth century. When one considers how many translations into the vernaculars of Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America have been based on the Greek Textus Receptus of the New Testament (such as the King James version or Luther's translation), it will be appreciated how enormous has been the influence of Lucian's recension [again he refers to the Westcott-Hort myth], made in Antioch about the turn of the third and fourth centuries of the Christian era' (Bruce Metzger, *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*, 1963, pp. 19, 20).
>
> Although the defenders of the text of W-H and of the modern versions are severely critical of the argument from Providence, it is striking that W-H could never account for the use of the TT by the church after A.D. 300, along with the disuse of the text of B and Aleph. Nor can the present critic of the TT give satisfactory explanation.
>
> It is, at the very least, difficult to imagine that the genuine text went unused and largely unknown for some 1500 years, only to be picked out of a waste-basket on Mt. Sinai and discovered in the Pope's library in the nineteenth century (as Burgon sarcastically put it) (Engelsma, pp. 32, 33).

Engelsma has a clear vision as to the providential transmission of the preserved Scriptures through the centuries. We praise the Lord that he did not follow the rationalistic line he was given in seminary, and we are glad to see him encouraging others to have confidence in the King James Bible.

Another Protestant Reformed man that has written in defense of the King James Bible is Pastor **Steven Houck** of the Peace Protestant Reformed Church in Lansing, Illinois. He has written *The King James Version of the Bible* (first printing November 1990). The preface sets the tone for the whole:

> It is imperative that every child of God take great care that the Bible version which he uses, defends, and promotes in the world is a faithful translation of the Word of God. On this point, however, there is much confusion. There are many versions available today and they are all promoted as the best. Some are advertised as the most accurate. Others are advanced as the easiest to understand. All of them are justified by the supposed inferiority of the King James Version.
>
> The truth of the matter, however, is quite different. **The King James Version, although it is almost 400 years old, is still the best translation available today**. It was translated by men who were both intellectually and spiritually qualified for the work. The great version which they produced is faithful to the originals, accurate, incomparable in its style, and easily understood by all those who are serious about reading and studying God's Word.

Ronald Cammenga of the Southwest Protestant Reformed Church of Grandville, Michigan, has published *NIV or KJV? Comparison and Evaluation of These Two Bible Versions*. His conclusion is as follows:

> **We ought not to replace the KJV by another version, the NIV or any other. We ought not to use another version alongside the KJV, a thing confusing for instruction and worship.** There are many reasons why the KJV ought to remain the preferred version. First, and this chiefly, it is a faithful translation. It is a translation based solidly on the original text of Scripture. And it is a translation that faithfully renders into the English language the words of the text of Scripture. **No one need doubt that when he holds in his hand the KJV, he holds in his hand the Word of God**. Secondly, the KJV is clear. All the critics of the KJV to the contrary notwithstanding, the KJV is characterized by clarity. ... Third, the KJV is eminently readable—not only understandable but readable. There is a dignified, eloquent, free-flowing style about the KJV that makes it readable, in distinction, on the one hand, from the stiffness of some of the modern versions, and, on the other hand, from the jerky slang of the paraphrases. There is a beauty about the KJV that puts it in a class by itself. Fourth, besides being understandable and readable, the KJV is, more than any other version, suited for memorization. ...
>
> Let us retain the KJV. Let us retain it in such a way that we use it. Let us use it ourselves in our personal study of and searching of the Scriptures. Let us use it in our homes, for our family devotions and for the teaching of our children. Let us use it in the Christian schools, in the instruction given there. Let us use it in our worship, in the preaching and teaching of the church. Let us use it in the seminary and on the mission field. And using it, let us continue to enjoy the blessed fruit of its use enjoyed by the church now for nearly four centuries (Ronald Cammenga, *NIV or KJV?,* pp. 14-16).

Robert Harbach has written a number of articles in defense of the King James Bible and in opposition to various modern versions. Some of these have appeared in *Beacon Light*, a monthly magazine for young people published by the Protestant Reformed Churches, and in *The Standard Bearer*, a semi-monthly magazine recognized as the voice of the PRC. In a booklet entitled *Bible Archaism and Modern Versions*, Harbach contends that many of the archaisms of the King James Bible are actually accurate translations of the Greek and Hebrew text into English.

> [T]hese archaisms were archaic even to the King James translators and to their times. This came about as the result of translating the Old Testament Hebrew and the New Testament Greek, not in the then current vernacular, but in the best English language demanded by these original Scriptures. This means that the language of the Authorized Version was not so much 'the language of the people' as it was the language of the Bible! (*Bible Archaisms and Modern Versions*, p. 2).

In the fascinating conclusion to this book, Harbach identifies "the Scriptures" referred to in the Belgic Confession with the Authorized English Bible:

> **THE CONCLUSION WE COME TO IS THAT THE WHOLE WORD OF GOD IS PRESERVED IN OUR BELOVED KING JAMES BIBLE**. The Lord God had and ever has 'a special care' for His 'holy and divine Scriptures' (Belgic Confession, III). Exactly what these 'Scriptures' are the next article in the confession (IV) makes plain. They are the sixty-six 'canonical books of the Holy

> Scripture.' Then these books are named and listed by their titles. These very books are all found in our King James Bibles. **We, therefore, rightly conclude that the King James Bible in 'all these books' is nothing less than 'the Holy Scriptures'** (Art. V). So the King James Bible 'fully contain(s) the will of God, and that whatsoever man ought to believe unto salvation is sufficiently taught therein' (Art. VIII). **WE CONCLUDE, THEN, THAT WE KNOW THAT WE HOLD THE VERY WORD OF GOD RIGHT IN OUR HANDS**. Let us prayerfully memorize it, praying by the grace of the Holy Spirit, 'Thy Word have I hid in mine heart that I might not sin against Thee' (Ps. 119:11) (Robert Harbach, *Bible Archaism and Modern Versions*, p. 26).

PROTESTANTS TODAY is the present-day name of the Women's Protestant Union, founded in 1891 in Britain. The name was changed in 1992. One of its goals is to "teach the understanding of, and to inform on current events within a Biblical, Reformed, Protestant framework, paying particular attention to the multiplicity of errors that continually increase under the guise of Christianity Today." One of the functions of this society is to maintain a large Bible & Christian Heritage Exhibition that is displayed throughout the British Isles in churches, schools, libraries, museums, and wherever an invitation is extended. The presentation includes 40 illustrated descriptive panels which trace the story of the Bible from its inception and follows its path through England's history. It contains over 200 supporting exhibits dating from 1270 to present. Miss M. Morphew, Secretary of Protestants Today, gave the following information in a letter dated June 23, 1995:

> The Society has been based on the King James Bible since its inception. ... We do not exhibit any of the modern versions, whatsoever. ... At the Exhibition and also at all bookstalls we have books dealing with the King James Bible and those opposed to it. We do not publish booklets on the subject but take a stand for its veracity whenever called upon. ... As we are travelling around we are finding in some areas the beginning of a dissatisfaction with modern versions and a turning back to the King James Bible which is a slight encouragement. At some future date we are hoping to make a video of the Exhibition and also to produce an illustrated booklet of the panels that are in the Exhibition. Thus, we are praying that the truths of the Word of God will be presented in such a way that there will be no doubt that the modern versions are erroneous.

The Winter 1994 issue of Protestants Today's quarterly magazine, *Our Inheritance*, contained an article defending the Authorized Bible. This excerpt leaves no doubt about this Society's position:

> **Interestingly, the one Bible version not usually found on a papist bookstall, is the Authorised Version. That significance should not be missed.** Far wiser is it, and more spiritually acceptable, to acknowledge that God in His sovereign care for His covenant people has provided us with the comfort that the original Word is still with us [1 Samuel 12:22]. We hold aloft the Authorised Version of 1611, and thrill to the realisation that within its pages can be read the Received Text—the text recognised as God's revealed Word in the ancient Greek and Syriac churches, in Europe in the second century and produced in the

'good old AV' text through the Protestant Reformers (Peter Trumper, "Do We Have the Word of God?" *Our Inheritance*, Winter 1994, p. 17).

RAY, JASPER JAMES

James Jasper Ray (1894-1985) founded a ministry called Eye Opener Publisher, based in Eugene, Oregon. The promotional literature says, "Our only purpose is to help true believers to know for certain which version is the true word of God."

Ray published *God Wrote Only One Bible* in 1955. A key feature of this book was Ray's list of 162 serious omissions in the new texts. In a section comprising one-third of the book, Ray compared these 162 omissions in 44 different versions.

It has been alleged that Ray plagiarized from Benjamin Wilkinson' 1930 book *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, but since I have not done a personal comparison of the two volumes I cannot say if this is true or false. Wilkinson was a Seventh-day Adventist who quoted Ellen G. White's prophecies as authoritative. (See the section on David Otis Fuller for more about Wilkinson.)

Ray later published a pamphlet called the *New Eye Opener* which has had a wide influence. It lists 200 key passages in the modern versions that contain omissions from the Received Text underlying the KJV.

Ray did not contend that the KJV is perfect. He said: "Everyone should know that the King James Version of the Bible is a translation, and not the original words given by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. There are a few mis-translations in the King James English, but every word is based upon a Greek word in the Textus Receptus which was given by the inspiration of God, and has been providentially preserved for us today" (*God Wrote Only One Bible*, pp. 101,102).

Ray's chief aim was to defend the Received Text against the critical text. In the *New Eye Opener* he said:

> Here's the acid test: Any version of the Bible that does not agree with the Greek Textus Receptus, from which the King James Bible was translated in 1611, is certainly to be founded upon corrupted manuscripts. Origen, being a textual critic, is supposed to have corrected numerous portions of the sacred manuscripts. Evidence to the contrary shows he changed them to agree with his own human philosophy of mystical and allegorical ideas. Thus, through deceptive scholarship of this kind, certain manuscripts became corrupt. Evidently from this course our modern revised version Bibles and paraphrases have come.

As for the source of Ray's information, he claims that it came through diligent study.

> For years the writer was held in this net of diabolical trickery. Then, one wonderful day, God opened his eyes to behold a ray of light which led out of the dark dilemma. Months and years of research followed, and this book is the

result. Conclusions are not based upon the author's judgment, but upon the investigation of more trustworthy sources which are referred to in the footnotes where applicable (*God Wrote Only One Bible*, Introduction).

J.J. Ray died in 1985. In a letter to Robert Barnett in 1981 he said, "I was baptized in the Weiser river over in Idaho by a Baptist pastor. Before I became a missionary, I was a pastor of a Baptist church in Idaho." When Pastor Barnett talked with Ray on the phone in 1981, Ray was 86 or 87 years old. His wife had died and he was living alone.

ROCKWOOD, PERRY

We have already looked at Perry Rockwood's stand for the King James Bible in Chapter Four: 1950-1970. He continued to oppose the modern versions to the end of his life. Rockwood's People's Gospel Hour published many books and articles defending the King James Bible.

ROLOFF, LESTER

Evangelist Lester Roloff (1914-82 was called "a modern-day prophet" by biographer Ed Reese. Having heard Roloff preach many times and having followed his ministry for the last two decades of his life, we agree with that assessment. We believe that he was a man who walked with God and loved God and served God in a manner similar to that of the prophets of old. Roloff came to Christ in a little country church during a revival meeting in July 1926. He graduated from Baylor University in 1937 and from Southwestern Seminary in 1940. When some claimed that he was an ignorant backwoods preacher, Roloff reminded them that he had spent 19 years of his life pursuing an education. His glory, though, was not in his education, but in his knowledge of the inspired Word of God. He pastored Southern Baptist churches from 1941 until 1951, when he entered full time evangelism. He began preaching on the radio in 1944, and his Family Altar Program eventually was heard on more than 150 stations. In 1954, due to his conviction that churches should be independent and not denominational, he founded Alameda Baptist Church in Corpus Christi, Texas, and was the pastor of this church until 1961. In 1955 he began publishing *Faith Enterprise*, a quarterly paper. In 1956 he was invited to speak to the 2,000 students at Baylor University, and he boldly preached against the apostasy and corruption that he believed was destroying the SBC. It might have been the last time that such a sermon was preached at Baylor.

In 1945, Roloff began establishing homes for problem youth, alcoholics, and other types of people in deep need. The Good Samaritan Rescue Mission was started in 1945. The City of Refuge for alcoholics began in 1954. The Lighthouse home for "incorrigible" young men began in 1958. The Peaceful Valley Home for Christian retirees started in 1969. There is also the Anchor Home for troubled boys, the Bethesda Home for pregnant and delinquent girls, and the Rebekah Home for

troubled girls (1967). Roloff specialized in helping boys and girls that other agencies and homes refused to take. In 1967 Roloff founded the People's Church in Corpus Christi, Texas, and in the late 1970s all of his homes were placed under the control of this church.

All of the Roloff homes are run by Bible principles, and only the King James Bible is used. Those who stay in the homes are kept away from worldly influences such as rock music and television and radio, and are saturated with the King James Bible. They read it, memorize it, sing it, are educated with it, and hear it preached. The result has been a steady stream of changed lives.

During the 1970s, the Roloff homes came under attack by the Texas Welfare Department. They demanded that the homes be operated by their humanistic regulations and under their oversight. Roloff replied that the Bible alone was his rule book, and he refused the state's control. He was jailed two times. The Rebekah Home was closed down and was moved out of the state. A small fortune had to be spent on legal fees. The Roloff homes in Texas were closed temporarily in 1978-79. Eventually things settled down and the Roloff Enterprises continues to minister to troubled people to this day.

Lester Roloff's attitude toward the King James Bible is evident from a message he preached at the Southwide Baptist Fellowship's (SBF) 27th annual meeting in October 1982, only a month before he died in a plane crash. The Southwide meeting was held at Highland Park Baptist Church in Chattanooga, Tennessee. This is the home of Tennessee Temple Bible College. Roloff's message was entitled "Hills that Help," and he preached against all of the modern versions, including the New King James Version, and he exalted the Authorized Bible in no uncertain terms. At one point in his message he compared the Bible to his mother, and Bible correctors to someone that would attempt to cut away parts of his mother.

> Suppose somebody knocked on my door. Mama said, 'Lester, son, you better run to the door; somebody is knocking.' I go to the door and say, 'Come on in,' and a great big bruising-looking sort of a fellow walks in with a big butcher knife. I say, 'What's on your mind?' He says, 'I want to see your mother.' I say, 'Yes, sir; I'll be standing between you and my mother as long as you have that butcher knife.' He says, 'Son, I have come to cut away a bunch of your mother. There's too much of her. She's a little cumbersome. I'm gonna cut off her left arm, her right leg, her left ear lobe, and I'm gonna cut out her right eye.' I would say, 'Boy, you'll be lucky to get out of here alive.' Listen, I would climb up to his neck as fast as I could get to it, and choke him till I stopped him from breathing.
>
> Are you catching on now? Then why don't you preachers do something about it!? Don't you realize they are butchering our mother? 'Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever' (1 Peter 1:23). And I'm telling you, don't monkey with my mama!!!! I'll fight you about it!!!! I'm mad!!!! There has never been a revival come out of the Revised Standard Version, Good News for Modern Man, Living Bible— never been anything good come out of them! You say, 'Well, it's because you

> haven't been educated.' I don't want more education than what I have now if I have to get like that. I've been to school 19 years of my life, but I'm glad I went to school when there wasn't nothing but this [King James Bible]. I can remember the time when the preacher said, 'Let's all stand and read in unison.' Try it now! ... That book is the source of everything good that I've ever known in my life.

Roloff's zeal for the preserved Scriptures reminds me of the title of this book: "For Love of the Bible." His defense of the King James Bible was no dry, scholarly exercise. It was a fervor born of a confidence that the Bible that had saved him and the Bible that he had used effectually to the conversion of sinners was the very preserved Word of God.

RUSSIAN BIBLE SOCIETY

The Russian Bible Society, headquartered today in Asheville, North Carolina, was first formed in Russia in 1812 and prospered for 14 years with the cooperation of Czar Alexander I and Prince Galatsin. A good Russia translation of the New Testament was printed and distributed during these years. In 1826, because of opposition stirred up by jealous Russian Orthodox clergy, the society was forced to disband under Czar Nicholas I. It was revived by Basil Malof (1883-1956) in 1944. Malof, a Latvian, was saved at age fifteen in his father's little Baptist house church. Three years later he surrendered to the Lord's call to preach and the door was open for him to be trained at Spurgeon's College in London, England. "Thus the Russian Bible Society has held the biblical doctrine which has traditionally characterized orthodox Baptists in history. With respect to the great doctrines of the Christian faith the Russian Bible Society is fundamental rather than liberal." Malof graduated in 1907 and returned to his homeland where he founded the Moscow Baptist Church. In 1914 he was arrested and sentenced to Siberia. Later he was banished abroad, and he began to evangelize the millions of Russian war prisoners in Germany and Austria. He then came to the United States, founded a Russian Bible Institute and began organizing the Russian Bible Society. The story of Malof's life was written by Evangelist James Stewart and is entitled *A Man in a Hurry*.

Bob Doom has been the Director of the Russian Bible Society since 1975.

The society works primarily in two languages, Russian and Ukrainian, though they have printed portions of the Bible, hymnals, and Bible dictionaries in a number of eastern European languages, including Uzbek, Tatar, Udmar, Bashkir, Kazahk, Karachay, Crimean-Tatar, Tat, Georgian, Bulgarian, Yugoslavian, Rumanian, Estonian, Latvian, and Ossete. Between 1989 and 1995 they distributed 300,000 complete Synodal Russian Bibles, 20,000 complete Ukrainian Bibles, and 240,000 Gospels of John in Russian and Georgian. A ministry closely connected with the Russian Bible Society is the Global Bible Society, which has

reprinted a Choctaw New Testament, a Choctaw dictionary, and is in the process of reprinting a Choctaw Old Testament.

The Russian Bible Society prints only "word for word translations (not paraphrases)" based upon the Received Text. In a letter dated August 9, 1995, Bob Doom said, "The basic text for the translation projects, of course for the Old Testament, is the Masoretic Text. The basis for the translation of the New Testament is the Russian Synodal Version, which is based on the Textus Receptus." In 1989, Revival Literature, which is closely connected to the Russian Bible Society, published two pamphlets defending the King James Bible. These were *The KJV: Tried and Found Triumphant* by Robynn Reno and *The Superiority of the KJV over the NIV* by Chris Johnson.

SAWYER, JOHN WESLEY

John Wesley Sawyer (b. 1936 has published modernized editions of the Tyndale New Testament, the Matthew's New Testament, and the Geneva New Testament. Having access to copies of these during his years as a missionary in England, Sawyer determined to publish editions of these pre-KJV versions for this generation as a witness to the antiquity of the Received Text. He modernized the spelling and punctuation, but the wording of the text is exactly as it appears in the original Bibles. The series of three volumes is called *The Martyrs Bible Series*. The first two of these appeared in 1989. *The Newe Testament by William Tindale 1526* and *Tindale's Triumph, John Rogers' Monument: The New Testament of the Matthew's Bible 1537*. The third appeared in 1990*: Geneva's Gem: The Newe Testament Printed in Geneva in 1557*. Sawyer's modern spelling edition of the Tyndale New Testament was dedicated as follows:

> This work is dedicated to the Lord Jesus Christ and the faithful people of God who through the millennia have suffered for holding to the heavenly message: men such as the holy apostles, Wycliffe, Tindale, Rogers, Coverdale, Cranmer and others of olden days and also defenders of the preservation of the WORD OF GOD in a more tolerable age, such as Terence H. Brown, John W. Burgon, David Otis Fuller, Edward F. Hills, William N. Pickering, Jasper James Ray, and Jewell E. Smith.

In a fax dated April 9, 1995, Brother Sawyer shared the testimony of how he became convinced of the preservation of the Authorized Version:

> In 1956 I met a young preacher named Carl Baugh who was returning to Bible college after a year's absence. He had been a pastor's assistant in a growing church in Lynwood, California. It took him just a few minutes to explain to me that I should not be using the newly published Revised Standard Version, but rather the faithful old Authorized Version. I will be eternally grateful to him for that. I left then to go to Bible college with him.
>
> In 1983, after 19 years as a missionary to Uruguay and during my furlough, there was more than usual concern over the many new bibles published. Among

fundamentalists there had been universal agreement up to then on the Authorized King James Version. We had been in battles with new versions before, especially the Revised Standard Version in the 1960s. Now there was a crack growing in the fundamental ranks, because of new versions that claimed to be produced by Bible-believers. I was briefed on the situation by Jewell Smith and was in agreement with him, but I had some pastors supporting me that were growing 'wobbly' on the issue.

In 1983 we took a trip to South America for an evangelistic tour. We were planning to go to Paraguay after establishing the work in Uruguay, but felt that this was our choice and not the Lord's. During the uncertainty of our going to Paraguay, we made the evangelistic tour in September 1983. On this trip I found that the BBFI missionaries had gone to a new Bible and had accepted it as the Word of God in Spanish. Their people came and said they could not follow me in the old Bible. The missionaries said they could not get the old version and their people had bought the new ones. After investigating the situation, I found that I was the only missionary in my missions group that still used the old Bible exclusively and preached from it. Was I right, or was I out of step? I had to find out for myself. I had been taught the Bible principle that 'one man with the Lord constitutes a majority.' My worry was not that I was alone, but is it right or wrong? I began to investigate the sources I had available.

In February 1984, we went to England as missionaries and were there until October 1993. My first wife was dying of cancer and we returned to the States at that time.

As I stated earlier, the questions of new bibles was troubling me. I did research in the libraries and both in English and Spanish. After deciphering their old spellings and types, I found them to be very easy to read and little changed from the very first editions. In 1989, I began publishing the old New Testaments, Tindale (1526 a.d.), the Matthews (1537 a.d.), and the Geneva (1557 a.d.), with modernized spellings and notes for the defense of the Authorized Version of 1611 (KJV). It is my opinion from these studies, that there is a conspiracy against the Authorized Bible of 1611 by those who feel that the early manuscripts of the Arians (anti-Trinitarians) are the most reliable. And also by publishers of the new bibles, whose main motive is profit, not faith and the glory of God. A new Greek text has been accepted by the larger Bible societies, of which the modernistic element of Christianity is in control. If not exposed by Bible believers, it will result in a new 'dark ages' of Christianity, where the truth is denounced as heresy, should the Lord delay His coming.

In the same fax, Sawyer explained in a nutshell the reason why he published the modernized pre-KJV New Testaments:

I published the *Martyrs Bible Series* New Testaments to show that the early English Bibles were basically the same. **They show a fine tuning of the English wording, not a radical Greek text change as in the twentieth-century versions**. I had read all of the pre-Authorized Version Testaments: Tindal, Coverdale, Matthews, Cranmer's Great Bible, the Geneva, and the Bishop's, and saw a completely different picture than that of the new bibles being published. The miraculous thing to me was that Tindale's work was so good that after six revisions by many that were not partial to his positions, the final result

was about 90% Tindale's. It is evident that the translators were seeking truth rather than seeking to place their own stamp on the revisions (for personal glory). Also they show that our language has not changed much in the last 470 years in relation to biblical subjects [contrary to the claim of] the new version publishers.

Sawyer's list of 13 reasons for reprinting Tindale's New Testament offers a larger glimpse into the heart of this project and also gives a summary of the fascinating history of the first English Bible translated from the biblical languages.

1. [The Tyndale] was the first English New Testament printed. ...

2. It was the first English New Testament from the Greek.

... Tindale's translation ... went back to the original Greek language of the New Testament. There had been a revival of the study of Greek in Europe in the fifteenth century. The conquest of Constantinople (now Istanbul) by the Turks had sent many Greek scholars and their manuscripts into Europe. This was the prelude to the Reformation. Some of these manuscripts were compared and collated by one of the great scholars of the day, Erasmus of Rotterdam. He published his Greek New Testament in 1516. It was the basis of early translations into many languages. The printing press had been invented by Gutenburg in 1445. This had made possible a more rapid dissemination of knowledge. All of these things worked together to make possible an English translation from the Greek.

William Tindale, was the man God called, and [He] preserved him until it was complete. He was of Gloucestershire, England, of noble English blood, the grandson of Hugh, Baron de Tindale, of Langley Castle, Northumberland. His grandfather, years before, escaped from the field of battle when the Yorkists were defeated by the Lancastrians. His grandfather had taken the name Hutchins, to spare his and his family's life, and had moved to Gloucestershire near the Welsh border. This is an area that in later years would produce the great eighteenth-century revivalist, George Whitefield (he was to be a firebrand that would stir America at the time of the revolution and help spare England from such a bloody revolution as France experienced. This area in England had for many years the seed that produced good fruit, but Tindale must have been the greatest of them all. He is considered by many to be the great reformer and apostle of England, because he gave the Bible to the people, and God's Word did the rest.

3. Its translator was martyred for doing it.

In 1523, England was already awake with the stirring news of the reformer of Saxony, Martin Luther. He had challenged the Bishop of Rome and had been excommunicated from the [Roman Catholic] church. The seed of the Word of God had already been sown in England for many years by the Lollards, poor preachers that preached from the Wycliffe Bible and spread the good news of salvation. Persecution was the order of the day for all who did not conform to the 'established' church.

Tindale had left his place of employment with Sir John Walsh to go to London to work on his translation (which he could have begun as early as 1502 in Oxford, according to George Offor). He had sought the approval of Cuthbert Tonstall, the bishop of London, for his translation and failed to obtain it. The only place that he

could go was to the continent. He went to what is now Germany—Cologne, Worms, Hamburg and Wittenburg, the home of Luther. Even in exile he was 'hunted as a hound.' Sir Thomas More, the King's chancellor, sought him with all of his energies, that he might 'do God's service' in burning the heretic.

He published his first edition in 1526. After going over his work thoroughly the second time, he published a revision in 1534. He was well into the translation of the Old Testament from the original Hebrew (having completed from Genesis through 2 Chronicles and probably more), when he was apprehended. This was due to the subtilty of Henry Phillips, an agent of the Romanists and a feigned friend. He suffered imprisonment at Vilvoord, near Brussels, for 16 months, while he possibly continued his translating. He was tried and condemned, and in October 1536, he was tied to a stake, strangled and then his body was burned on that stake to ashes. His last words were, 'Lord, open the King of England's eyes.' His was a glorious life and a glorious death, 'for the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ.'

4. He was the primary translator of the King James Version.

... We do not want to detract in any way from the greatness of the Committee formed by command of the King of England, James . Books have been written that proclaim them to have been the greatest English linguists of Biblical languages ever assembled. Nevertheless, after a thorough reading of Tindale's work, one has to look at them as an editing committee, sometimes an 'amen corner.' Researching the Greek and Hebrew, revising when necessary, correcting the word order for beauty and understanding. Afterwards placing their worldly scholarship and royal authority to what would become the greatest, most powerful book in the history of the world, the English 'Authorized Version' of the Holy Bible (KJV). Although it was a translation of the Greek-Hebrew Scriptures, it would far surpass anything that had been done before, because of the growth of the world population and the exploration of the globe; even though centuries before, the Greek Scriptures and the early Latin Bible had helped topple the great Roman Empire and its idolatry. It has been said that 90 percent of the King James (Authorized) New Testament is from William Tindale. Let the reader judge for himself from this edition. Bear in mind that Tindale's revision of 1534 was improved and corrected typographical errors and is the one that bears even closer resemblance to the King James Version of 1611.

5. It was the model for every early English translation.

6. It is one of the rarest books, only one copy exists.

7. It is the most influential book published in English.

8. The original is difficult to read, because of its spelling and black letter print (old English).

9. It is desirable for the general public to have it.

10. It shows the preservation of the word of God in English.

11. It shows that our language has not greatly changed.

12. It is superior to the Bibles introduced in the twentieth century,

because it is based on the Received Text (the Textus Receptus).

One thing that none of the modern English translators have done is die for translating the Bible, as did fearless Tindale and courageous John Rogers, nor have they produced a better Bible for the plough-man than our King James Version, which is based on this Tindale New Testament.

13. One man bought most of the first edition to burn it.

Cuthbert Tonstall, the Bishop of London, was very zealous to see that Tindale's 'heretical' book did not fall into the hands of the people. On the 23 of October, 1526, he decreed a prohibition against the New Testament in English. ... Bishop Tonstall was not satisfied with only the decree to bring in the 'destructive' books, but sent a mutual acquaintance of his and Tindale's to buy out the proscribed books from the translator. He was willing to pay the merchant Packington whatever price necessary to obtain the volumes. Packington went to Tindale and bought the books and brought them to the Bishop. The bishop kept his promise of burning the books at St. Paul's Cross, probably sometime in 1528. William Tindale had willingly sold them in order to pay his debate and have funds to flood England with New Testaments with the remainder of the money.

John Sawyer has also published *The Legacy of Our English Bible* (1990).

Sawyer returned to the States in the late 1993 because his wife had cancer. After her death he remarried and since August 1994 has been ministering to the Quinault Indians on the Olympic Peninsula in Washington state. As of 2008 they were living in Montesano, Washington.

SCOTT-PEARSON, STEPHEN

Stephen J. Scott-Pearson is pastor of Maulden Baptist Church, Bedford, England, National Organizer of The British Council of Protestant Christian Churches, Council Member of the Protestant Alliance, and Committee Member of the Trinitarian Bible Society. Scott-Pearson is another example of the thousands of responsible Christian men scattered across the world who continue to defend the old English Bible. In his booklet *The Enduring Word of God*, Scott-Pearson leaves no doubt as to his position on Bible preservation:

"**What advantage could it be to God's people if the Almighty had once inspired a Word, of which we are assured, delivered that inspired Word to His Church, and yet not providentially preserved it entire and uncorrupted?** We either do have in our possession the Word that God has revealed for us or we do not. The simple plain question that I as a believer need to have answered is, 'Is my peerless Protestant Authorised Version of the Bible corrupted or uncorrupted?' ... **To suggest that we do not now have all of the divine revelation and that our Bible, which we have hitherto believed to be uncorrupted and trustworthy, contains extraneous material is an assault on our primary beliefs as a Protestant Bible-believing people**" (Scott-Pearson, *The Enduring Word of God: An Assertion of the Providential*

Preservation of the Word of God, Mourne Missionary Trust, 1984, pp. 4, 5).

SEEGER, PAUL

Paul Seeger has taken a persistent stand for the King James Bible in the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS). Mr. Seeger is a dairy farmer in Michigan, and his family has a heritage in the Wisconsin Synod reaching back more than 100 years. His testimony on the Bible version issue is contained in *A Layman's Response to a Most Solemn Resolution by the 45th Biennial Convention Wisc. Evangelical Lutheran Synod*. Since 1976, Mr. Seeger has been speaking out publicly against the adoption of the NIV within WELS congregations and of the critical Greek text in their seminary. Understanding the glorious heritage of the Received Text that is being rejected today, he says:

> **I find it incredible that I should be asked to abandon a Bible based on the authorized or received Greek text which has survived trials by fire and sword, emperor and persecutions, burnings and banishment, pope and inquisitions and come down to us in its purity as a light that shines in darkness, and substitute in its place a Bible based primarily on two questionable documents, which have lived a life of ease, abandoned by men, and finally brought forth as the 'true' Word of God!**

Mr. Seeger points out to his fellow Lutherans that the readings questioned by the NIV have been in the German Luther Bible for more than four centuries. "These words [Acts 8:37] were penned by Martin Luther in the German language from the Greek; and for 450 years they have stood unencumbered and with full authority in the German Bible."

Mr. Seeger offers an interesting exposé of the error of modern textual theories. He analyzes these theories from the standpoint of the "ordinary" Christian, applying old-fashioned common sense to the scholarly-sounding theories underlying the modern versions.

> Are the critics absolutely sure the oldest manuscripts are the best?—and on what grounds? My experience in visiting a home on fire for Christianity is to see a Bible in tatters—one that is used. Likewise in visiting one that is lukewarm or cold I will often see a Bible, if one is visible, beautifully preserved from neglect. ... Is it not logical that the true Bibles would wear out and have to be recopied? ...
>
> Are the critics sure the shortest reading is the best? This is one of the critics' best known rules. They seemingly always prefer the shortest reading. Yet our present day experience is that a careless, tired or disinterested copyist will tend to leave out words, rather than add!
>
> The modern-day critic assumes that he has 'an immense advantage over his counterparts of several centuries ago' (1977 Wisconsin Synod Convention Essay by Prof. John Jeske). Every human experience today is, the farther man is from an event the less are his chances of accurately knowing of it.

Praise the Lord for the wisdom of the "common man." There is a verse in Proverbs that has an application to this. "The rich man is wise in his own conceit; but the poor that hath understanding searcheth him out" (Prov. 28:11). The principle here is that the common man can examine the ways and philosophies of the "rich," or those who have position and prestige in this world. The common man can be saved by repentance and faith in the blood of Jesus Christ and can have an unction from the Holy Spirit (1 John 2:20,27); he can study and understand the Holy Scriptures that express the very mind of Christ; he can "prove all things" (1 Thess. 5:21). He that is spiritual judgeth all things (1 Cor. 2:15). God's people are not dependent upon the pope, nor upon some class of priests, nor upon some group of "scholars." Thank God for it!

I have been constantly amazed at and encouraged by the testimonies I have heard from "common folk" in the process of researching this book. Most of the perhaps 200 men whose testimonies I have read or heard on audio cassette have had some unique insight into the subject at hand. Obviously all share the same basic positions that underlie the defense of the King James Bible, but they also have fresh perspectives that are the product of individual research and meditation. In my opinion, the difference between the testimonies of King James Bible defenders and modern version sympathizers is like night and day. Sure, there are mistakes here and there in these testimonies—on both sides of the issue. Every man makes mistakes. But the overall picture on the side of the King James Bible is down-to-earth, Bible-based wisdom and confidence, whereas the overall picture on the side of the modern versions is humanistic rationalism and uncertainty. On the Authorized Bible side is a living, enthusiastic, deep-convictioned, heart-felt, theologically-based testimony. On the modern version side is a dry, sterile, intellectually-based testimony.

Though Mr. Seeger does not have formal theological training at the seminary level, he was taught the Word of God by pastors who had confidence in the Old Bible.

> In my youth I knew Rev. F.M. Krauss (1871-1955) very well as he was Pastor of Emanuel Lutheran Church in Lansing, Michigan, from 1909-1941; and for 21 years was Pres. of the Michigan District. I can well imagine what his reaction to these previously quoted words by a Wisconsin Synod Seminary Professor [statement appearing in the July 1974 *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* claiming Acts 8:37 should not be in the Bible] would have been; especially by one who came to us from outside our fellowship!
>
> In his view no man dare touch one word of that German Bible, let alone an entire verse. Revelation 22:18-19 held a profound meaning for that man. His conviction was not based on naive or unlearned blind prejudice. On the contrary he was an exceedingly brilliant and learned man; and had great influence on the choice of the King James Version as the English Bible to be used in our Wisconsin Synod churches. He knew all about the so-called modern textual critics who had appeared first in Germany, then England and finally in America. He knew full well it was in large measure the work of these German critics which had caused the

> founders of Confessional Lutheranism in America to leave Germany; bringing with them Luther's German Bible and their conviction regarding its divine inspiration and preservation.
>
> Likewise all the men who instructed me—Rev. Karl F. Krauss, Rev. Leonard Koeninger, Mr. V.J. Schulz, Mr. R.F. Gietzel—all held the same united, unwavering and certain convictions regarding this Book and the Greek and Hebrew texts underlying it.
>
> Two choices are presented to me as I read an increasing number of essays, articles, and letters from our Seminary similar to the previously mentioned quotation regarding Acts 8:37.
>
> I can repudiate all that has been taught me concerning this Book and acknowledge these men as false teachers (who upheld every word of Scripture) when in truth [according to modern version proponents] there are words there which in all honesty are impostors.
>
> Or I can enter the field of textual criticism and challenge our present Seminary. **Without hesitation the latter is my choice.**

Bravo! We salute this man's courageous fight for the preserved Scriptures.

SIGHTLER, HAROLD

Harold Sightler (1914-95) was the pastor of Tabernacle Baptist Church in Greenville, South Carolina, which is the home of Tabernacle Baptist College. We have discussed Harold Sightler's defense of the King James Bible under the section on Schools. See Tabernacle Baptist College, Greenville, South Carolina. **James Sightler** (b. 1937), M.D., Harold's son, is carrying on a defense of the King James Bible.

SMITH, RON

Ron Smith (b. 1924) is the founder of Thy Word Is Truth**,** "an information service commending the Authorised (King James) Version and questioning modern Bible versions." It is based in Kent, England. In describing his ministry, Mr. Smith says:

> I have always used the Authorised Version—as a London City Missionary for 15 years, then as General Secretary of a Christian Society (The Fishers Fellowship) [an evangelistic ministry] for 28 years. ... During my term of office with the Fishers Fellowship—between 1963 and 1991 when I retired, I was increasingly concerned with the increasing numbers of modern versions and their revisions. ... Upon my retirement in 1991, and the Lord providing a successor to continue the ministry of the Fellowship, I was able to devote the next year to a careful study of the whole area of versions. I read extensively books both for and against and became acquainted with leadership in this area on both sides of the Atlantic.
>
> During the latter part of 1992, I was gaining contact with many others who also were concerned about modern versions. Within a short time over 1,000 such contacts were made. In 1993 I started an occasional bulletin, which I called *The Bible Today*—this has since been sent out every three months.

> I see the battle for the Traditional Text and the KJV increasing today! Very much so. We are receiving letters from all over England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales daily. In fact this ministry, Thy Word Is Truth, is almost a full-time occupation.
>
> Increasingly more and more younger Christians are writing in for information and increasingly more are taking up the Authorised (King James) Version and telling us so.
>
> It is just being realised (at long last) modern versions are different from the A.V., different from each other ... The constant claims of publishers of new versions and revised new versions as to being 'closer to the originals' [and] 'more accurate' are being questioned more openly. The new attitude toward the Word of God as not being final but evolving is also being questioned.
>
> We find the 'battle' is conducted on many different fronts. Greek resources, methods of translation, the Word of God being inspired, inerrant, infallible and perfect. Is it evolving, or is it preserved? All these points are being contested—from both sides.
>
> I have discovered that those who 'love the A.V.' have vastly different standpoints themselves ... I have discovered too that high views of the A.V. go right across denomination and modern movement tendencies. ...
>
> Yes, I see strong signs of hope in the revival of the Traditional Text today. I am getting correspondence—much from the States, but also from South Africa, New Zealand and more recently Norway and China—from those who are standing firm for the Traditional Text.
>
> We had a lovely letter from a young lady recently who has been using many versions. She told us as much, and then said: 'I have also been reading the Authorised Version and I have the 'gut conviction' that this is the true Word of God!'

In one of the papers distributed by Thy Word Is Truth, Smith gives the testimony of how he came to understand and appreciate the words of the "antiquate" King James Bible:

> I was born in Bermondsey in 1924, the only child of William and Lilian Smith. When I was nine we moved to Welling in Kent, where I spent my childhood and youth. My parents were typical 'owe no man anything' citizens of the times. Honest, hard working and fun loving. Unfortunately they attended no place of worship and so were unable to lead me in the ways of the Lord.
>
> I had a very tenuous association with the Bible and little knowledge and acquaintance with the Church. In my teens I remember reading portions in connection with growing interest in psychology. Dr. Leslie Weatherhead and others would often refer to the Scriptures in this connection. In my later teens, whilst serving in the Air Force overseas, again I would read portions in connection with my interest then in Philosophy and Poetry. The Bible, however, was otherwise of no great interest in my life.
>
> During my overseas service at Singapore, I found myself sharing a tent with a positive Christian, who first made me think seriously of 'religion.' He was not ashamed to share his faith in Christ with others, or to kneel in prayer by his

> bedside and mosquito net each evening before going to bed. It was through his lifestyle and counsel that I became in turn interested, concerned, convicted. Overnight from my personal commitment to the Lord Jesus Christ the Bible became to me the Word of God. I began to read portions each day, through which I began to grow in my knowledge of truth and my Saviour. The Bible was not just another book, it became my spiritual life line. Yes, it was in an old English language, but in some strange way even this confirmed to me it was the Word of God. There were parts of it I could not understand, and still do not, but there was so much I could. I realised that my interest in the Lord Jesus Christ and knowledge of Him gave me an earnest desire to know God's Word. My love for the Word arose from my love for the author of it. My love for the Author was a natural response of my appreciation of His love to me.
>
> Within a few weeks my newfound Christian had moved on and I was moved to a large barrack room of some 50 other men. The first text I pinned up over my bed was: 'We love Him because he first loved us' (1 John 4:19). Yes, the language of the Bible was old to me then, just as it may appear even older to others today, but it spoke clearly to my heart, just as it does today. My own experience has taught me that [though] there is a language problem, in some peculiar way it is not insurmountable. The 'problem,' if one exists, lies in the human heart, it's unbelief, or unwillingness to accept it for what it claims to be, 'the Word of God.'...
>
> It is my considered opinion that any person, young or old, rich or poor, wise or simple, who expresses this attitude as they read the Bible will find that—to unfold its hidden worth—its mysteries to reveal—the Spirit which first gave it forth—He will God's Word unseal (Ron Smith, *The Question of Language*, pp. 1 -3).

In a paper describing why he believes the KJV is superior to the modern English Versions, Ron Smith says:

> I became conscious of the fact that *all modern versions were implying that we now have no definite Word of God*. ... I have always believed that God's Word is final, complete and perfect—not changing, incomplete and evolving. This view has been that of most true Christians throughout the history of the Church. It is also the clear teaching of the Bible itself. If the Lord has not preserved His Word, then our final authority is insecure (Psalm 11:3). I have also noticed that all modern versions contain faith destructive footnotes, which consistently undermine the authority and trustworthiness of Holy Scripture. ... The admitted apparent gain in the easier to read 'Bibles' is counteracted by the subtle changes in the content, and the omission of so many words and entire verses from the Bible Christians have always recognised as the Word of God (emphasis added).

Among the interesting materials that Mr. Smith sent us is an *A.V. Holida & Business Directory*, listing some of the churches in Britain that use the KJV exclusively. Roughly 350 churches were listed in 1995. The vast majority are Baptist and Presbyterian, with a sprinkling of independent Methodist, Congregational, Free Church, and Pentecostal.

SORENSON, DAVID

David Sorenson (b. 1946), pastor of North Star Baptist Church, Duluth, Minnesota, is a third generation fundamental Baptist pastor. He was educated at Pillsbury Baptist Bible College, Central Baptist Theological Seminary (Master of Divinity, 1972), and Pensacola Theological Seminary (Doctor of Ministry, 2001). He served as an assistant pastor under Richard Clearwater at Fourth Baptist Church in Minneapolis, Minnesota, from 1970-72, and has since pastored three churches. He started North Star in 1989. Sorenson is the author of the 11-volume *Understanding the Bible* commentary set.

In an e-mail of September 10, 2008, he said: "In our constitution, we have a clause that says the church will only and ever use the KJV. We always have my tract 'Why We Use the KJV' on the literature table."

Speaking at the Dean Burgon Society meeting, July 2001, Dr. Sorenson testified that upon graduating from Pillsbury and Central, he did not know that there was an issue with the text. He used the King James Bible in his first pastorate, but when a young couple asked him why, he realized that he did not have a good answer. He began to investigate the Bible version issue and eventually published a pamphlet entitled "Why We Use the King James Version." It concludes with the following words: "We have determined not to remove the ancient landmark in a matter so crucial as the foundation of our faith … the Word of God. And what withal the deletions, dilutions and questionable origins of the modern versions, we will stick to the King James Version!"

In 2001, Dr. Sorenson published the 295-page book entitled *Touch Not the Unclean Thing: The Bible Translation Controversy and the Principle of Separation* (Northstar Baptist Ministries, Duluth, MN 55811, 218-726-0209). Some of the chapter titles are as follows:

"The Double Stream of Biblical Texts"
"Early History of the Received Text"
"Dating, Weighing, and Counting"
"The Scriptural Principle of Separation from Apostasy and its Application to the Textual Issue"
"What about Erasmus, King James, and His Translators?"

In the introduction, Dr. Sorenson gives his personal testimony in regard to the Bible version issue:

> During the years of my seminary training, the 'default' position in which I was trained was that of the critical text and its concomitant use of various modern translations of the Bible, the New American Standard Bible in particular. There were upward of fifteen years in which I routinely referred to the New American Standard Bible in study. I even at times used it from the teaching lectern or the pulpit. I had been trained that any translation of the Bible was acceptable (in theory) as long as it was a 'good' translation. Little or nothing was said regarding

> the significant differences between the two principal textual bases. Hence, by training, I was indoctrinated in the critical text position and taught to be extremely wary of anything which approached using only the King James Version of the Bible as one's biblical base. I thus can honestly say that I have sat where many presently sit on this controversial issue (Sorenson, *Touch Not the Unclean Thing*, p. 2).

Sorenson warns about the confusion and uncertainty that attends modern textual criticism.

> Rather than building faith, the endless minutia and disagreement over variants in the critical text lead to doubt and tend to shake one's faith in the integrity of the Word of God. As this writer in years past waded through the arguments, both pro and con, over a given variant reading, he came away shaking his head wondering what was the true reading. Yet, the very nature of the critical text and its attempt to 'reconstruct' the Word of God lends itself to such doubts. Is God the author of confusion? (*Touch Not the Unclean Thing*, p. 65).

After documenting the theological modernism that has characterized most of the influential names in modern textual criticism from its inception to this day, Sorenson concludes:

> As major text critics have demonstrated themselves to be apostate or at odds with orthodox Bible truths, the principle set forth in Romans 16:17 is clear. Avoid them. By extension, that surely applies to the use or appropriation of their instruction. When major textual editors of the critical text have identified themselves with the theory of evolution, German Rationalism, the World Council of Churches, Unitarians, and the Roman Catholic Church; in the view of this writer, they have caused offences contrary to the doctrine which we have learned. The Holy Spirit has thus directed us to avoid them. It would seem only reasonable that this includes their textual work as well" (*Touch Not the Unclean Thing*, p. 149

Dr. Sorenson makes the following important observation:

> As the twenty-first century has begun, perhaps the most significant reason many fundamentalists are confused is that they have never been exposed to the problems of the critical text. Moreover, most are illiterate as to why the Received Text position is to be preferred. Up until just recently, there were very few fundamentalist institutions of higher learning which questioned the critical text. It was considered to be the domain of extremists and Peter Ruckman to deviate from the critical text position. One classic example of this problem is illustrated in a book released in 1999 entitled *From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man*. The book was published by fundamentalists who purported it to be neutral and a comprehensive statement on the transmission of the Bible. However, the book clearly was an apologetic for the critical text and any modern-language translation of the Bible based on it. Moreover … the bibliographies of that book contained almost no references to works supporting the Received Text. In the last quarter of the twentieth century, there has been a profusion of books written attacking the critical text position, supporting the Received Text, and defending the King James Version. Many of these works have exhibited genuine scholarship and historical research. Yet, because their conclusions have not

supported the prevailing party line, they have largely been ignored. But the evidence has not gone away nor will it. Proper understanding will never come when the truth is suppressed and that is exactly what has gone on for far too long (*Touch Not the Unclean Thing*, pp. 219, 220).

STEWARD, BOB

Bob Steward (1932-2000, long-time pastor of First Baptist Church of Harrison, Michigan, stood in defense of the King James Bible for many years. Steward, Bob Barnett, Peter and William Van Kleeck, and others in association with David Otis Fuller, attempted to influence churches in the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches of Michigan to remain true to the Old Bible. In a letter to this author dated March 8, 1995, Pastor Steward shared his testimony:

> It was around 1971 when my interest heightened greatly as I realized the noticeable contradiction of all the new versions coming on the market. This is when I purchased and read Dr. Fuller's *Which Bible?* At the time I was teaching at the Local Church Bible Institute housed in the Calvary Baptist Church of Gaylord, Michigan. Along with Pastor Bob Barnett of Grayling, Michigan, the subject of versions was involved in our battle against the liberal Ministerial Association. This actually took place at the close of 1972 when the President of the Bible Institute announced that he was going to assist the Ministerial Association with the distribution of 'Good News for Modern Man.' This was for the purpose of winning souls. I wrote him to announce that if he helped these liberals I was done at the institute. At that point in time the version issue was just beginning to emerge. To the credit of this man, he repented truly, called for all teachers in the institute, apologized and set things straight. That takes a good man. With this he invited Dr. David Otis Fuller to speak on the subject of the Bible in answer to a heretic named Dr. Lamsa. Dr. Fuller and two other pastors answered the error on a television program. All of this caused the versions issue to slowly open up for better understanding. This was all in connection with the infamous Key '73 mess.
>
> When I moved to assume the pastorate of my present church in September 1973, I carried with me a more than ordinary interest in the subject of the text. I commenced studying everything I could find so as to clarify some questions that I had accumulated over the years. On June 12, 1974, I invited Dr. Fuller, who had recently retired from Wealthy Street Baptist Church as their pastor after 40 years, to come to Harrison to speak on the subject of Bible Versions. He came on that Wednesday and there were 80 people, many of which were pastors, in the afternoon service. He then preached on Hell for me at the evening prayer meeting. My interest seemed to gain on the textual matter.

Pastor Steward published a number of reports on Bible versions, including *The Absolute Sufficiency of the Scripture, Why I Believe as I Do about Bible Versions, God's Invisible Hand on the KJV, Removing the Landmarks: GARBC Council Removing Certain Verses from Their Statement of Faith*, and *The Mighty Fire Surrounding Bible Versions*.

The fight for the King James Bible within the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches is told in brief by Pastor Steward as follows:

> In 1975 I influenced the Central Michigan Association of Regular Baptist Churches to bring Dr. Fuller in to address the versions subject. At that time I was the youth man for the C.M.A. and thus on the Council of 7. He was invited to the Clare Baptist Church. I was both amazed and ashamed of some of those brethren, at the way they treated Dr. Fuller, who had rendered yeoman service to the GARBC from its very inception in 1932. Further, this great man of God had been the first president of the Grand Rapids Baptist Bible College which he started in the Wealthy Street Baptist Church that he pastored.
>
> During the question time that followed his meeting, it was very obvious that some of the GARB pastors were absolutely opposed to the King James Bible. They asked questions that were designed to ridicule Dr. Fuller's position. Further, a couple of the pastors actually laughed as they posed what they supposed to be difficult questions. It was an eye opener.
>
> I later discovered that the leadership in the GARBC from its outset, though for the most part using the King James Bible, did not believe it to be inerrant. Later I had sent to me confirmation from the very pen of the first National Representative of the GARBC, Dr. H.O. Van Gilder, that he believed in a 'Concept Bible.' On June 22, 1981, Dr. Paul Tassel demonstrated, at the national meeting in Winona Lake, Indiana, that he had the same belief. He elevated the 'Original Manuscripts' and promoted as equal value the New American Standard, the 1901 American Standard, the New International and the King James versions. I well remember Dr. Fuller, who attended that conference, saying to me, 'I felt like getting up and walking out of the meeting.'
>
> Our pleas to return to the position the GARBC had officially voted on at the national meeting in San Diego, California, back in 1972, went unheeded. The new breed of leadership in the GARBC had abandoned the Bible that had been used all these years in favor of the Original Manuscript idea that allowed for any Bible. This was the written position of Dr. H.O. Van Gilder. It was difficult for me to believe at first. That difficulty soon passed when I was not allowed even to advertise in the state paper for a 'Bible Preservation Conference' in my local church. I was told via a letter from the State Moderator that 'the Council of 15 reserves the right to reject ads without saying why' (not exact quote). This was most difficult for me to lay hold of since I had led my church to support both the national and state GARBC programs.
>
> At an annual meeting in Muskegon, Michigan, I had requested to meet with the Council of 15 to ask that they return to the voted position of the GARBC in 1972. Dr. Fuller said he would go with me if I wished. I told him that it might be best if I went alone since he was already known to fervently champion my request. How foolish I was. I should have had this grand champion at my side. As it happened the council only politely allowed me to quickly make my case. Of course this body had previously received my two-page legal-sized presentation of request. These men for the most part would believe that our position for the Authorized Bible was on the fanatical fringe. They did not want to go to such an 'extreme' as those on the Received Text standard and so opted to simply ignore any consideration for what had been officially voted on in 1972.

> It is my own appraisal that there is a definite connection between the weakened GARBC of today as compared to that of the same group prior to the '70s, before there had been a clear cut departure from the KJV position. It was in 1975 that some four verses had been lifted out of the statement of faith that had been in heretofore. Those verses were all questioned and eliminated from the new versions. The slippage began to really show now. I am confident that there was debate at the Grand Rapids Baptist College on the textual issue back in 1958 when I was enrolled. I suspicion that this is the reason that one of my favorite teachers, E. Gordon Wray, stated in class one day, 'If the King James Version was good enough for the Apostle Paul then it is good enough for me.' Of course he was speaking for effect only. As I reflected on the statement 20 years later that was my conclusion. During the 1958-59 school year, one of the men who later became a fervent promoter of the New International Version was the school's librarian and would emerge as one of the leading professors. He was Dr. Joseph Crawford. Of course I am only drawing conclusions via assumption, but then what would provoke a sensible man of God like Dr. E. Gordon Wray, who had been a missionary to the Philippines prior to return as a missions instructor at the Baptist school, to make such a remark, if indeed there had not been differing views in the back room at the school? What I do know for certain is that Grand Rapids Baptist College, now Cornerstone College, always took the position that any version, with perhaps the RS as an exception, would be acceptable. In simple terms a 'Concept Bible' was promoted from the school. Later in that same school over 20 godly pastors would challenge the position of the Bible Department Chairman along with Professor VanHorn because of their denial of a literal Heaven and Hell. I connect the departure from the KJV to this heretical position and the obvious fruit of having no sure foundation (Bob Steward, letter to David Cloud, March 8, 1995).

A more detailed history of the battle for the Bible in the GARBC is related in Pastor Steward's book *The Mighty Fire Surrounding Bible Versions*.

One interesting aspect of Pastor Steward's testimony has to do with the attitude of those who defend the modern versions. So frequently it can almost be counted as a maxim, they have a haughty, mocking attitude toward those who defend the King James Bible. Almost without fail they pretend that King James defenders have weak mental capacities. It will be a sad day when the last of these fellows passes off the scene, for surely wisdom will die with him! Consider Pastor Steward's description of the way the defenders of the old English Bible are treated in many of today's associations and denominations:

> Those who want new versions complain when those who do not speak up on the subject. They begin to call names and foolishly claim that Textus Receptus men are causing a division among the brethren. King James men that will not have deleted Bibles are called 'NEW FUNDAMENTALISTS' and are warned against. Textus Receptus men are placed in the same category as the 'NEW EVANGELICALS.' While a question mark is put on the King James Version, the other side of the issue is promoted. You can endorse new versions along with the K.J.V. and, though there are thousands of differences in the two Greek texts, you are not allowed to point that out. If you do then you are labeled as doing something 'NEW' when in reality you are only holding to that which is old

and has been used for over 381 years.

In the state of Michigan, we are not even allowed to purchase an ad in our state paper to point up the differences and exalt our K.J.V. text over the 'Eclectic' text which is very much in line with Westcott and Hort. What is the result of such action? Without question, it gives the 'Go' sign to new versions and the 'Stop' sign to our Authorized text. The fact is that when we request to even meet with our MARBC Council to talk about why an ad is rejected, we are told 'The Council, as an editorial committee for the Testimony, carefully accepts or rejects advertisements regularly without having to give reasons for such actions.' I understand that, but what I don't understand is the reluctance even to talk about the matter. In God's Name, if these new versions are really all that good then why can't the men that are approving them openly give solid evidence as to their superiority over the King James Version?

The man in the pew who comes to rest his weary soul each Lord's Day needs some clear answers, and for the life of me I have never yet heard a good reason why those who want new versions find them better than what we have. **The attitude from that side appears to be 'Take what we give you in the new translations and keep your mouth shut; after all, we are the scholars and must be trusted.'**

Now I believe in the proper response to proper leadership. I also believe there is a responsibility that goes with leadership. The scholar has as a starter the need to explain, in simple, down-to-earth language, so that Born Again people can understand what you are talking about, just why you can change so much and still be true to God's Word. I have never heard from that side on this issue. **It is utter stupidity to accept something as vital as this issue without having good reasons for doing so.** Paul said, 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good' (1 Thess. 5:21). So prove it to the men in the pews. **My plea is to reason. My plea is, instead of sweeping such an issue under the spiritual rug with a holy cry of 'this will be divisive,' to bring the matter to the forefront.**

I am of a mind to believe, though, that if simple evidences were presented to God's people in our local churches, the conclusions would make red-faced the 'Scholars' that want to quietly get the job done with no outcry but [with] time as their best ally. Time will put new-version-schooled men in the pulpits now occupied by King James Version men (Bob Steward *The Mighty Fire Surrounding Bible Versions*, pp. 34, 35).

There is a lot of powerful, down-to-earth, heavenly-minded truth there, friends!

Pastor Steward mentioned a resolution on the King James Bible that was passed at the June 1972 national meeting of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches. It was worded as follows:

FORASMUCH as the multiplicity of 'new' translations, paraphrases and sometimes perversions of the Bible in recent years has divided Christendom and created uncertainty in the minds of many as to the correctness and authority of the Word of God in the English language; AND

FORASMUCH as there is a tremendous increase among those who have

demonstrated an unscholarly, often dishonest attitude toward the inerrancy of the Word of God by their careless handling of the Word; AND

FORASMUCH as the King James Version of the Holy Scriptures has stood the test of more than three centuries in its presentation of the Word of God in English;

BE IT RESOLVED: That we, the messengers of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches, meeting in annual session in San Diego, California, June 27, 1972, do heartily recommend the King James Version for use in public worship and in our preaching, teaching and writing;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That great care be given to the study and use of any and all 'new translations' lest we be found to add to or take from the words of this book and be guilty before God for misuse of His Holy Word.

This resolution was not as strong as it could have been, because it did not deal with the corruption of the critical Greek texts and of the modern versions. It leaves room for the bizarre, illogical position taken by those who, while professing to love the Authorized English Bible, prefer the critical Greek text that undermines it.

Pastor Steward, in the previous testimony, referred to Van Gilder's "Concept Bible." He gave more information on this heresy in his book *The Mighty Fire Surrounding Bible Versions*. It is important to understand that Van Gilder's "Concept Bible" is the Bible which *many* fundamentalists believe in, though not all of them will admit it:

Dr. H.O. Van Gilder, an early National Representative of the GARBC, in a letter to a believer in Bethalto, Illinois, dated October 5, 1981, stands where other men who champion four versions as being equally the Word of God stand. The difference is he comes out honestly on the subject while others deny the concept approach. Please read three paragraphs from his letter. While we do not agree with Dr. Van Gilder's concept theory, we are thankful for his bedrock honesty in the matter. He writes:

'I appreciate your paper. It bears evidence of extensive reading and study. It appears to me that your problem in the area of Biblical Inspiration arises from a failure to distinguish between verbal and CONCEPTUAL inspiration.

'The word *inspiration* is a translation of a Greek word meaning 'God-breathed' or 'God-Spirited' (Theopneustos). We believe God directed each writer in the choice of words within the vocabulary of each so that the CONCEPT, truth, idea was most accurately conveyed. That accomplished in the original manuscript, the copying of that manuscript, or even the carrying over of the CONCEPT into another language, did not require the miraculous ministry of the Holy Spirit.

'Let me conclude by saying that there is no Scripture today (unless, perhaps, in a museum) the words of which were communicated directly by the Holy Spirit, nor is there any of which I am aware which do not convey the truth, the 'God breathed CONCEPT' contained in the original manuscript. In my library I have fourteen different translations of the New Testament. I also have on a shelf over my desk a copy of the Hebrew Bible, and one of the Greek New Testament. I

> studied both languages in my preparation for the ministry, and I have yet to find any significant departure from the CONCEPT, the truth, in any one of the contemporary translations' (*The Mighty Fire Surrounding Bible Versions,* pp. 37, 38).

This Regular Baptist leader's concept of biblical inspiration is HERETICAL. God did not give mere concepts; He gave words (1 Cor. 2:10-13; Psa. 12:6; Prov. 30:4; Rev. 22:18,19). Further, even the "concept" itself is different between the versions. For example, 1 Timothy 3:1 does not have the same concept in the KJV as it does in the NI .

On May 2, 1993, Pastor Steward (who joined the GARBC in 1957) led First Baptist Church of Harrison, Michigan, in a vote to sever its relationship with the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches. This was "because of the heresy allowed in the Grand Rapids Baptist Bible College, coupled with the introduction of Rock Music Concerts in GARBC Circles, with no official rebuke from the GARBC leadership." Pastor Steward said: "It should be clearly noted that the official position of the GARBC leadership is that of passivity regarding the textual issue. Let me go on record and say that I believe this is certainly a root cause for their move to New Evangelicalism" (*The Mighty Fire Surrounding Bible Versions*, p. 46).

I praise God for Pastor Steward's willingness to stand up and be counted. It's rare, but it's still out there, friends. Hallelujah and glory to God, Who alone can give a man an uncompromising spiritual backbone! Here is a man who had grandchildren and could have been sitting in a rocking chair and not worrying about such things as Bible texts and versions and compromise in church associations. May the Lord multiply those brave soldiers who are more concerned for truth than for position and prestige and comfort.

STREETER, LLOYD

Lloyd Streeter (b. 1943),of LaSalle, Illinois, published an excellent book in 2001 that defends the King James Bible from the attack of some of today's fundamentalists. The book is *Seventy-five Problems with Central Baptist Theological Seminary's Book The Bible Version Debate* (815-223-1333, street@theramp.net).

Streeter has pastored the First Baptist Church of LaSalle, Illinois, since 1977, and he pastored two other Baptist churches before that. He received Christ as his Savior at Calvary Baptist Church in Mikado, Michigan, when he was 16 and holds both university and seminary degrees. He has been married for more than 40 years to the wife of his youth, Karen, and they have three children and six grandchildren.

Streeter's book is helpful for three categories of believers: (1) It will be helpful for those who defend the King James Bible, because the author provides almost a handbook for answering the challenges of the modern Bible version defenders and for clearing up misconceptions pertaining to this important subject. (2) It will be

helpful for those who are confused by the Bible version issue and do not know who to believe. By using this book, the reader can analyze for himself the modern version position side-by-side with the King James Bible position. (3) It will be helpful to those who are leaning toward the critical text, because they will see that many of the standard arguments in its favor are indefensible, or at the very least, they will see that "King James Onlyism" is not what they thought it was.

Though this book is written for a general audience, it is obvious that Pastor Streeter has studied the issue diligently for many years. He is passionate about his subject, zealous for the Word of God, and unhesitating in its defense, while at the same time kind and patient toward those who are opposed to his view. I believe this attitude pleases the Lord.

The author is blessed with the ability to get to the heart of an issue and to simplify difficult concepts.

Following are some of the questions that are answered in the book:

Do the textual variants impact theology?
Have most fundamentalists been KJV only?
Do we believe that all non-English Bibles must be translated from the KJV?
Is a good new English version possible?
Are inspired translations possible?
Were any miracles involved in Bible preservation?
Is "baptism" a mistake in the KJV?
Who owns the term fundamentalist?
Is something wrong with the Masoretic Hebrew text?
Do historical negative factors make a perfect KJV impossible?
Is modern textual criticism destructive?
Was Erasmus a Catholic humanist?
Does God depend on natural processes for preservation?
Was the Traditional Text in the majority throughout history?
Was the first Traditional Text version made at the end of the Fourth Century?
Do we believe in "reinspiration"?
Do we opt for simplistic answers?
Do Dead Sea Scrolls vindicate emendations on the basis of conjecture?
Didn't the KJV have the Apocrypha?
Has the KJV been revised?
Is the NASB the best translation?
Is the NIV a good translation?
Is the KJV hard to read?
Is there ever a time to separate over Bible versions?

Streeter concludes the book with an Appendix containing an insightful 29-page review of "From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man."

Consider some excepts from this timely book:

> The Bible says that 'in the last days perilous times shall come … evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived' (2 Tim. 3:1 and 13). And yet we have fundamentalists who believe that in the last days there will be better and better Bible versions! I do not think so. This is the age of apostasy … Nothing better is going to develop during this age of apostasy—not better evangelism, scholarship, or organization; not better churches, culture, or standards; and certainly not better Bible versions (p. 37).
>
> We are not arguing here for so called 'double inspiration' i.e., that the translators of the KJV were used by God to 'reinspire' the Word of God. The fact is that the words of God were ALREADY INSPIRED before the KJV translators ever handled them or read them. Those words did not have to be 'reinspired' in order for us to have an inspired Bible in the KJV. As Dr. Ian Paisley, the Free Presbyterian fundamentalist from Ulster, has said, 'The inspiration of the Bible DID NOT EVAPORATE' just because it was translated (p. 47).
>
> [The word baptism] was an English word in 1611. … It had been an English word for hundreds of years before the King James translators were born. … *Baptisid* and *baptysm* were found in Wycliffe's Bible in A.D. 1380. This was 220 years before the King James translators used the word. … The word baptize does indeed mean to immerse, or to dip. That is the very literal meaning of the word. However, in using the word baptize FOR THE ORDINANCE OF WATER BAPTISM, the Holy Spirit obviously meant more than that. The ordinance of baptism is more than a burial. It is also a resurrection (Romans 6:4). … Therefore, we must conclude that the Holy Spirit helped the KJV translator to wisely use the word baptize rather than immerse. … Every new version we checked says 'baptize.' Not a single one of them says 'immerse.' Why do you suppose that the professor did not criticize the new versions on this point? (pp. 57, 58).
>
> Of course, fundamentalists are not necessarily King James only. No one, to our knowledge, ever said they were. But, FUNDAMENTALISTS ARE NOT NECESSARILY NOT KING JAMES ONLY, EITHER. This is a fact that Central seems to be having a difficult time accepting. … The issue of the text was never a huge issue in fundamentalism until about thirty years ago. fundamentalists just trusted what they were taught by conservative scholars, who, in turn, had been misled by liberal scholars. In the past thirty years, as the subject of the text and translations has been studied more, thousands of fundamentalists have come to the position that God has preserved His Word perfectly in the Traditional Texts of Scripture and the KJV (p. 61).
>
> Yes, it requires faith to believe that we have God's Word when we consider the fact that some books of the Bible were written at least fifteen hundred years before Christ's first advent and that until the Dead Sea Scroll were discovered there were no copies of any Old Testament book copied before A.D. 900. … since there are no copies of the Old Testament between 1500 B.C. and A.D. 900 we must have faith in God that He preserved His Word through those 2,400 years. … Those 2,400 years constitute a huge gap of time. In whom will you have faith for the preservation of Scripture during that gap? You can either have faith in God or you can have faith in man. … The Dead Sea Scrolls are not much

help, except in the case of the book of Isaiah. … Almost all of the biblical literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls [except for Isaiah] consists of small fragments of animal skins and paper. The manuscripts had for the most part fallen apart, and the 60,000 fragments cannot even be handled to this day lest they disintegrate. … I have complete faith in the Old Testament as we have it in the King James Bible and in the process by which it came down from the Masoretic Text in Hebrew. This faith is not based on man's scholarship or intelligence. … The Lord God promised to preserve His Word, and I believe He has done it (pp. 76-78).

This new form of textual criticism, which has given us all these new versions, has caused division and confusion in the church. Many churches have been split. Schools and fellowships have been torn asunder because it is insisted that new versions (with their huge differences in text) must be considered as superior to the Bible which God's people have used all along (for the past 400 years!). Contrary to what some have said in this regard, IT IS THOSE WHO BRING IN THE NEW TEACHING TO A GROUP WHO CAUSE THE DIVISION, not those who walk in the old paths (p. 88).

There is an extreme 'scarcity' of pre-sixth century Greek manuscript evidence for either the Critical Text or the Traditional Text [that underlying the KJV]. … The truth is that most of the extant Greek manuscripts were copied in the sixth through the twelfth centuries. … And the truth is that the vast majority of these [five to six thousand] manuscripts (between eighty-five and ninety-five percent), whether uncial or cursive, whether vellum or paper, are of the Traditional Text and agree with the King James Bible. Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Alexandrinus are not enough to overturn all of the other evidence for the King James Bible. … The New Testament could be almost completely reconstructed from the quotations of the early church fathers' sermon and writings. Many parts of the New Testament could be reconstructed several times using this source. Those quotations favor the Traditional Text (pp. 94, 95).

We have no original language manuscripts for the book of Job except those copied in A.D. 900 by Massorite scribes. That is a gap of approximately 3000 years. Actually, we do not even know the language in which Job was originally written. Think of it, dear reader—3000 YEARS WITH NO MANUSCRIPTS? How would you know that Job is God's Word if you had to depend on 'early manuscripts'? There is ONE way to know and that is by faith. God said He would preserve His Word and He kept His promise (p. 98).

[I]t is not really necessary for us to defend Erasmus because the King James Version of the Bible is not based on the work of Erasmus alone. The Textus Receptus of Erasmus went through many improvements A.D. 1516 through A.D. 1611. Theodore Beza, John Calvin's scholarly and able associate, brought forth ten editions of the Receptus. Beza, who also served on the translation committee of the Geneva Bible (1560, worked tirelessly to make refinements in Erasmus' work. So what the King James translators had was not simply Erasmus' Greek text, but also Beza's text, Robert Stephanus' four editions of the Receptus, and other manuscript material. … The perfection and trustworthiness of the King James Bible should be looked upon as a winnowing or refining process extending from Tyndale through 1769 (pp. 99, 104).

> Nothing in the Dead Sea Scrolls or anywhere else argues against the Masoretic Hebrew text. As a matter of fact, the Isaiah scroll from cave one, and the Minor Prophets scroll from Wadi Murabba'at support the authenticity of the Masoretic Text and the King James Version. The Isaiah scroll is exactly the same as the Masoretic text, except for some of the spelling and grammar, even though 1,000 years separate the two (p. 154).
>
> Everyone has 'problems' about the Bible. I would not trade my problems for the problems of the Critical Text person. Those who believe the Critical Text do not believe that there is an inspired, infallible book anywhere on earth! They have been trying to reconstruct the Bible for 150 years, and they know they still do not have it! … Those who believe in the Critical Text have no final authority. … And they find themselves embracing the text which the faithful people of God (including Anabaptists, Waldensians, Albiginsians, Luther, Calvin, Knox, and Tyndale) have stood against all through the centuries. Now, those are problems!" (p. 161).
>
> The Greek manuscript evidence for the NAS is very slim. There are only about forty to forty-five pieces of manuscript evidence supporting that version. Most of those pieces of evidence are only fragments containing a few words or a few verses. Fewer than ten of those manuscripts contain any whole books of the Bible. Only three of those manuscripts contain most of the New Testament … By contrast, there are more than 5,200 Greek manuscripts which favor the KJV against the NASV. The Greek church and the independent churches through the ages copied the Traditional Text which underlies the KJV because they recognized it as superior. No one bothered much to copy the Critical Text underlying the NASV after the sixth century because it was known to be inferior (p. 188).
>
> Now I have a recommendation of my own for Central Seminary and for all who hold her position on the Bible text and on Bible versions: IF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NEW TRANSLATIONS AND THE KJV ARE AS MINOR AS YOU SAY (when you are trying to convince people that the new translations are not dangerous and should be used) WHY DON'T YOU JUST STICK WITH THE KJV AND AVOID ALL THE CONFUSION AND TROUBLE? (p. 257).

TRADITIONAL TEXT SOCIETY

The Traditional Text Society was established in Scotland in 1994 under the name of the Dean Burgon Society. Because of confusion over having the same name as the society in the States directed by D.A. Waite, they changed the name to Traditional Text Society. **David Blunt** and **James Frew**, members of the Free Church of Scotland, are the organizers, and they envision "a loose network of interested persons, rather than a society with constitution, members, office-bearers, etc." They are primarily concerned about disseminating information in defense of the TR and the KJV. In a letter of November 26, 1994, they described their goals:

> We are committed to the preserved Hebrew and Greek Texts underlying the Authorized Version as being the true Word of God. We view with alarm the

spread of modern versions based on another Text. ... It is pleasing to see a number of bodies raised up in recent years to uphold the Authorised Version, and of course we have no wish to duplicate their work and witness. ... It is our intention, God willing, to produce and circulate articles relevant to our general position: we envisage some suitable for ministers and students for the ministry, and others at a more 'popular' level. There is a great need for God's people to be informed about their Faith, and so to be able to contend for it. A vital part is the doctrine of Scripture—for the Word of God is the ground of all our knowledge and hope. **TO BE UNSURE OF THE BIBLE IS TO BE BUILDING ON A SHAKY FOUNDATION**.

The Traditional Text Society had published two pamphlets in 1995. Article No. 1, by David Blunt, is titled *The Differences between the Greek Texts of the New Testament*. Article No. 2 is by Douglas W. Taylor and is titled *The Words of Inspiration: John William Burgon and the Traditional Text of the New Testament*. The latter is an essay that won first prize in the second Martyn Lloyd-Jones Essay competition. It first appeared in *The Evangelical Library Bulletin*, Spring 1992 (No. 88).

In a letter to this author in April 1995, David Blunt shared the following interesting testimony, which gives a brief overview of the defense of the King James Bible in the United Kingdom:

I was converted in August 1983. I had very little Christian background and had not attended church in my youth. I had been reading the Scriptures in the A.V. A Christian friend who used the NI was influential in my conversion and he directed me to a church which used the Good News Bible (GNB) [also called the Today's English Version] in its services and to a charismatically-inclined 'housegroup' which favoured the NIV in the main. I began to use these versions at these meetings. I was also keenly reading Christian literature, particularly Banner of Truth literature, including a number of Puritan authors. ... What I noticed was that when I checked Scripture references cited by these authors (invariably from the A.V.) in my NIV or GBN, these references would often be missing entirely, altered significantly in the text, or translated in a way that gave me a different meaning. I believe that this set me thinking deeply about the whole matter. Also, I found that the Christians I began to respect most for their knowledge and lifestyle, and whose piety I wished to emulate, tended to be those using the A.V. There was a more 'reverential' attitude in them.

I obtained literature from the Trinitarian Bible Society of London (which I joined, I believe, in 1986) which was of help regarding the problem of the text. Pickering's book 'The Identity of the New Testament Text' was important in this respect.

The battle for the Traditional Text is essentially over the Biblical doctrine of providential preservation of Scripture. It is also to do with the requirement for formal or verbal equivalence in translations. **THERE IS A GREAT WORK TO BE DONE IN INFORMING AND EDUCATING THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC ABOUT THESE MATTERS**.

My feeling at present is that few ministers who use the A.V. are thoroughly informed as to the reasons why they should use it, and consequently are

weak to withstand the criticisms of the eclectic school. Many ministers, desiring to appear scholarly and learned, dismiss the case for the TR because they have been convinced by leading evangelicals that the case is 'intellectually untenable.' As if 'intellect' were to determine our doctrinal standpoint, and not faith resting upon the Word! The doctrine of creation may be 'intellectually untenable' (in the minds of the evolutionists) but faith receives it as true.

I do see, I think, a rising interest among the Lord's people in the churches in the matter of text and translation. I believe that many Christians have become very disturbed by the multiplying of versions, each one designed to make more money for its publisher. Informed Christians in the pews can have a great influence for good in their congregations.

The denomination to which we belong (the Free Church of Scotland) does not have an official view or policy regarding Bible versions. Its college for the training of its ministers uses the UBS Greek text; probably the majority of the ministers still use the AV in their pulpits, although many of the younger ministers now use the NIV or NKJV.

A number of denominations in the U.K. are committed to the exclusive use of the A.V.: The Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, The Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster, the Independent Methodist Church (mainly found in Northern Ireland), and the Gospel Standard Strict Baptist Churches. In addition to these groupings, there are obviously many independent churches, generally Baptist, which are committed to the A.V.

A number of organisations have arisen in recent years to defend the A.V., to add to the long-existing bodies which have taken that stand. I list those I know of: Trinitarian Bible Society, London; The Bible League, Salisbury, Wittshire; Thy Word Is Truth, Bromley, Kent; Plumbline Publications, Carlisle, Cumberland; Authorised Version Preservation Venture, Chatteris, Cambridgeshire.

TRINITARIAN BIBLE SOCIETY

We have already dealt with the Trinitarian Bible Society's defense of the Received Text and the King James Bible. (See chapter three.) The Society has been opposing the modern Bibles since the late nineteenth century. We mention them again in this chapter because they continue to defend the King James Bible in the twenty-first century, and their materials on this subject are distributed widely.

TRINITARIAN BIBLE SOCIETY, CANADA. In this section dealing with the period 1970 to present it would be fitting to include Trinitarian Bible Society Canada, which was formed in 1968. Gordon Mellish was the first General Director. **Robert A. Baker**, formerly a Baptist pastor, became General Director in October 1984. Because of strong differences with the society in England, the Canada branch broke that association in 2001 and changed the name to The GraceWay Bible Society. Trinitarian Bible Society formed their own organization in Canada.

The vice president of The Graceway Bible Society is **Jerry Matson** (b. 1940),

pastor of Harbour Light Baptist Church in Norfolk, Virginia. As of 2008, he has been a board member of TBS Canada and GraceWay for over 25 years. Brother Matson is the founder and director of a gospel ministry to the international merchant ships that serve Norfolk. In September 2, 2001, he published the following testimony about why he stands for the Received Text:

> In order to give you a better understanding of my position, I must tell you a little of my history. I grew up in the South and one of the things I believed from my earliest days was that the Bible was indeed the WORD OF GOD, without error. This I believed, though I was not saved until I was twenty-six years old. In my earliest days there was no great controversy about the Bible. The King James Bible was the WORD OF GOD and that is all there was to it. It was not until the late 40s that the National Council Of Churches introduced their version of the Bible called the "Revised Standard Version" (RSV). After the grace of God reached this sinner, God called me to prepare for the ministry and my wife and I moved away from our hometown to attend Bible college. At this school I was introduced to the American Standard Version (ASV) of 1901. This was the text we were to use for all our studies. I entered whole-heartedly into my studies and into the adoption of the ASV as my Bible.
>
> After finishing the studies, which my Lord called me to, Janet and I began our first "full-time' ministry in 1973 in Richmond, Virginia. I just happened to pick up a tract one day that showed the reasons why Christians should reject the Revised Standard Version. To my alarm, I found that many of the reasons to reject the RSV would also apply to the American Standard Version of 1901. This began to deeply trouble my soul and I wrestled with this dilemma for a number of years. In 1979 I began a very intense study of the Book of The Revelation. I shall not go into the blessings my LORD graciously gave to me through this great BOOK. However, my studies presented me with a real cross-roads concerning the BIBLE, the WORD OF GOD.
>
> The last chapter of this last BOOK of the BIBLE troubled my soul to its very foundations. Read the following with great care; "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy; God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." Revelation 22:19-19. Brethren, I never doubted the WORD OF GOD! I suddenly had come face to face with the awful fact that the ASV and the King James Bible were very, very different and that GOD had pronounced HIS harshest judgments upon those who would tamper with HIS HOLY WORD! This was a matter of extreme seriousness to me and I had to come to a decision. I no longer could try to remain "neutral" and play both sides of the fence. I was at a great cross-roads and I had to earnestly seek my LORD in order to choose the right road to take.
>
> My alarm was heightened when I began to compare the ASV with the King James Bible. To my horror I found words and even phrases that were in the King James Bible but had been left out of the ASV. Just as those spoken of in Romans 1:22-23, who corrupted the knowledge of God, so had men, professing themselves to be wise, actually demonstrated that they were but fools for

> corrupting the Holy Word of God. Psalm 12:6 says, "The words of the LORD are pure words." The holy, pure God must have a holy, pure revelation. When words, phrases and even entire verses and passages are left out of the WORD OF GOD, that which is left is corruption. God has not left us with corruption in the place of HIS WORD! Any departure from the pure Word Of God ought to alarm a child of God.
>
> Each time I stand to preach, I stand with the utmost confidence that I have in my hands the VERY WORD OF GOD, without error and without contradiction. How else could I obey the commands of God found in His Holy Word, "Diminish not a word" and "Preach the word"? If I stand with the ASV, or the NASV, or the NIV, or the RSV, or any other corruption of GOD'S HOLY WORD, I cannot say that I am obeying the commands of God. I cannot say, without fear of contradiction, that I have the very WORD OF THE HOLY GOD!
>
> Brethren, the fact of the matter is that the King James Bible is the only English Bible in popular use today that is based on the Received Text. The corruptions of the Bible that are popular this day are based on corrupt Greek texts. And this is why I firmly stand on the Received Text, and do so without apology. I trust my ever-gracious LORD to richly bless you, especially as your "preach the Word" this LORD'S DAY.
>
> I am yours in living union with the Lord Jesus Christ, Jerry H. Matson

During the latter half of the 1980s TBS Editorial Secretary Andrew Brown was giving some cautious support to the so-called Majority Text revisions of the Received Text. The Canadian society, as well as many others within the Trinitarian Bible Society, resisted all efforts to depart from the text underlying the KJV. In 1990 Andrew Brown was dismissed from the TBS. In a letter dated February 19, 1990, Robert Baker gave an overview of this situation:

> Mr. Andrew Brown has been relieved of his duties by the London, England, committee of T.B.S. He is no longer with the society. On Tuesday, February 13, 1990, in Toronto, Ontario, our North American Committee (Canadian Executive Committee made up of both Americans and Canadians) met with two representatives of the London, England, Committee. Though Andrew Brown held views other than what we did, the Trinitarian Bible Society still remains steadfast. We have been assured by the London Committee that they are adhering 'to the old paths,' as we have all along, namely to uphold and defend the position we have held these many years regarding the Masoretic Text, the Received Text (T.R.) and the Authorized Version 1611. T.B.S. rejects the Farstad and Hodges so-called new Majority Text with its cousin the NKJV/RAV and all other unreliable translations and texts."

The London headquarters of the TB also used this occasion to reaffirm its position on the Received Text and the King James Bible:

> [O]ne thing has NOT changed: the Committee adheres firmly to the Hebrew Masoretic Text and the Greek Received Text (as published by the Society) underlying the Authorised (King James) Version as the basis of its translation work, and continues to circulate in the English language, only the Authorised (King James) Version of the Bible, believing it is still the soundest and best

English translation available (*Quarterly Record*, April 1990).

VOCAL PROTESTANTS' INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP

The Vocal Protestants' International Fellowship, based in Clwyd, England, has stood for the King James Bible from its inception in 1987. The VPIF is an old-fashioned Protestant outreach, seeking to promote Protestant truth and resist error on an international basis. "We aim to encourage other Christians of like mind, across the linguistic and national boundaries, to continue in their public testimony for Biblical Truth, in an age when Christians are sliding away from the old well-worn pathways." Dr. **Peter Trumper** is founder of the Vocal Protestants' International Fellowship and the editor of their paper, *1521*, named in honor of the year Luther made his "Here I Stand Speech" at Worms.

According to the VPIF, the global battle today rages over three vital issues: (1) The uniqueness of Christ as Lord over all other pretenders. (2) The uniqueness of Christ's unrepeatable sacrifice at Calvary. (3) The uniqueness of faith as the only way to justify the sinner in God's sight. Among other things, the VPIF engages in open air preaching throughout Great Britain.

Its materials state unequivocally, "We always and only use the Authorised Version of the Scriptures."

In a letter from Dr. Trumper, July 13, 1995, we received this interesting bit of information:

> We have stood for the KJV since we began in 1987. I have been battling for the gospel since I entered the ministry in 1962, but **the stand against the many versions began in 1982, when I realised that virtually every Christian in Britain refusing to oppose the papal visit was connected to Bible versions other than the KJV. Conversely, those who stood firm were almost without exception in my experience strong KJV supporters.** I recognized in this the great divide which had opened up between KJV support, and a liberal compromise. The encouragements lie, in a strange way, because of the divide. The battle lines are clearly drawn; the fellowship of those of like mind deep.

An excerpt from a message by Dr. Trumper defending the KJV can be seen under the entry in this chapter on "Protestants Today."

WAHNERT, JOHN

John Wahnert was educated at Moody Bible Institute in Chicago before going on to study at Northwestern Bible School, Trinity Bible College, and the American Divinity School in Pineland, Florida, where he earned the B.Th., Th.M., and Th.D. Wahnert was President of the Evangelical Christian Churches Synod of California. In that station, he presented a message before the Evangelical Theological Society Bicentennial Meeting, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary,

in 1978, on the subject of "America's Priceless Heritage, the King James Version of the Bible." He surveyed the history of the King James Bible and the modern texts and versions and concluded with the following summary:

> From the foregoing discussion we see that there are five reasons why those believing Bible students who retain the King James Version and reject its modern rivals are not blind, backward-looking obscurantists, but responsible Christians who are striving to solve in the most intelligent way the problems of our new Space Age.
>
> 1. **The King James Version was prepared by believing scholars who recognized the divine uniqueness of the sacred Scriptures**. Its modern rivals have been prepared by naturalistic scholars who deny or ignore this divine uniqueness and treat the text of the Holy Bible like that of any other book. Therefore, to change from the King James Version to any of these modern versions is to change from a believing attitude toward the Bible to an unbelieving, naturalistic attitude. We may not want to admit this at first, but, the more we think the matter over, the more we see that this is so. For to approve of a version of the Bible is to approve the basic viewpoint of the men who prepared it, at least as far as questions of translation and textual criticism are concerned.
>
> 2. **To hold to the King James Version is to believe that God in His providence guided the Church to preserve the true text of the Bible down through the ages**. To adopt one of these modern versions is to renounce this belief and side with the naturalistic critics who assert that the New Testament text preserved by the Church is the worst of all. This prepares the way for skepticism.
>
> 3. **To hold to the King James Version is to agree that the evidence is correctly evaluated**. To change to one of the modern versions is to misinterpret this evidence and to adopt all manner of false and heretical readings.
>
> 4. **The superb literary beauty of the King James prompts us to memorize it** ourselves and to encourage our children to do so. Thus the Word of God is stored up in the hearts of His people. But the multiplicity of modern versions discourages memorization and thus contributes to the present lamentable ignorance of God's holy word.
>
> 5. **Modern versions come and go, but the King James Version is still the Bible of the common man in English-speaking nations**. It requires no changes to be understood except, perhaps, a few minor ones. **This permanence is manifestly the work of the same providenc of God that has preserved the Holy Scriptures down through the ages**. **IT IS INTELLIGENT, THEREFORE, AND REVERENT TO *WORK* WITH THIS PROVIDENCE AND NOT AGAINST IT.** And this is what we should do as Bible-believing Christians. Instead of increasing the confusion by producing one more modern version, we should retain the King James Version, making those few revisions which seem necessary (John Wahnert*, America's Priceless Heritage: The King James Version of the Bible*, 1978, pp. 34, 35).

WAITE, DONALD

Donald A. Waite, (b. 1927) is a Baptist scholar who has written in the defense of the Received Text and the King James Bible since 1971. Dr. Waite has 118 semester hours (1,888 class hours) of training in the biblical and other foreign languages, plus countless hours of teaching and personal research in the use of these languages. He obtained a B.A. in classical Greek and Latin from the University of Michigan in 1948; a Th.M. with high honors in New Testament Greek Literature and Exegesis from Dallas Theological Seminary in 1952; an M.A. in Speech from Southern Methodist University in 1953; a Th.D. with honors in Bible Exposition from Dallas Seminary in 1955; and a Ph.D. in Speech from Purdue University in 1961. He holds both New Jersey and Pennsylvania teacher certificates in Greek and Language Arts, and taught Greek, Hebrew, Bible, Speech, and English for over thirty-five years in nine schools.

Dr. Waite founded the **Bible For Today** (BFT) ministry in 1971, the year he published his first book on the subject of Bible versions. He has produced over 700 studies, booklets, cassettes, and VCR's that he distributes through BFT, along with hundreds of titles by other men on a wide variety of subjects.

As we have seen, some pretend that today's King James defenders are intellectual pygmies and crackpots who merely parrot things they have received from someone else. Such a view is far from the truth. Dr. Waite, for example, has produced a number of exacting studies in the field of Bible versions. *I can understand how someone might disagree with the King James defender's conclusions and how he might be able to find some errors in his writings, but to gloss over or ignore entirely the diligent research behind the positions of men such as this and to pretend that they could not possibly be true scholars is a farce.*

To find out for himself the exact number and nature of changes that have been made in the critical Greek text, Waite went through the Westcott-Hort text and compared it with the Received Text. He counted every single word difference and weighed its significance. When Waite says there are 9,970 Greek words either added, subtracted, or changed from the TR in the Westcott-Hort text, he is not merely parroting what he read somewhere. He has done this with at least three of the modern English versions (the NASV, NIV, and the NKJV), comparing them word for word with the King James Bible and the Received Text, noting the number and significance of the differences.

I repeat, it is one thing to disagree with Dr. Waite's conclusions. It is quite another thing to pretend that he and others like him are some sort of crackpot cultists.

The following is from a testimony Dr. Waite graciously recorded for us on audio cassette in January 1992:

For about twenty years I was in darkness about this issue. I knew almost nothing of it from roughly 1951 to 1971. I was at Dallas Theological Seminary from 1948 to 1952. That was my Master of Theology. Then I stayed an extra year, 1953. Throughout those years we were simply told to use the Westcott and Hort Greek New Testament, which we did in the Greek classes. It was the actual text Westcott and Hort developed. It was not simply another text—the Nestles Text or the Souter Text—but it was the Westcott and Hort. And I didn't know there was any other Greek text.

I majored in classic Greek and Latin at the University of Michigan, 1945-48. I took three years to get my four years of work. I went summer and winter, so that I could marry my wife, Mrs. Waite. Then I came to Dallas Seminary. I was learning New Testament Greek, and I didn't pay much heed to the text. I didn't care. I just wanted to learn the forms and get good grades, which I did. But I did not examine the textual base that we were using. I just assumed that was the only one to use.

I have always read from the King James Bible. I've always preached from the King James Bible. I've always studied from the King James Bible. I've never used any other Bible, even though at Dallas Theological Seminary they requested that we use the American Standard Version of 1901, the ASV. I never used it. I looked at it a couple of times. I bought a copy and still have a copy of it. But the teachers there, Dr. J. Elwood Evans, and the practical theology department, the preaching department, and others said that that's the most accurate version there is in English—much more accurate than the King James Bible. They didn't say why, but I believe the reason why is that it conforms to the Westcott and Hort Greek Text. It adds words that the Westcott and Hort adds; it subtracts words that the Westcott and Hort subtracts; and it changes words that the Westcott and Hort changes. This, then, was the reason.

Crossing out verses in the Scofield Bible: I guess I was too stupid to understand it, too thick, or something, But I didn't change. I kept going with the King James Bible. I used the Old Scofield 1917 edition, and I was so committed to the excellence of the Scofield Reference Bible and their 'wisdom,' that every time the editors suggested a change in the Greek text, and a change in the English translation of that text, I went along with it. I accepted it. This is now roughly from 1951 to 1971. Actually this dates from when I became a Christian. I was saved in 1944.

I had no doubts about the notes, but after having learned the truth of the Textus Receptus and the value of it, I noticed in the Preface of the Scofield Reference Bible that Dr. Scofield prefers the B and Aleph, the Vatican and Sinai manuscripts. He says that these are the more up-to-date manuscripts, and they are really the ones to follow, and they really are better than the manuscripts that the King James Bible translators used. And I notice that for this reason he makes these notes in the margins. Now he says that he's not going to use any other version, because the King James Version is the one that is accepted by the people today. You remember that quotation in the Preface of the Old Scofield Bible. But I was so enamored with this editorial development and editorial comment, that every time they suggested a change I would pencil out any words that they said did not belong in the text. In fact even in the Bible that I still have, that my wife gave to me in 1947 before we were married in 1948, these are penciled out.

For example, in 1 Cor. 11:23, where it says, 'This is my body which is broken for you.' The marginal reference says, 'Which is for you.' They take out 'broken,' so in my own copy of the Bible, the Old Scofield Bible, I have penciled out the word 'broken.' And so I have done throughout all the changes that they suggest in the margin. This shows how committed I was to following what these people said who were committed totally to the Westcott and Hort Greek Text.

How I came to understand this issue: You ask the question, then, how I came to understand the Bible version issue. I guess the first thing I read about, or knew about, my mother-in-law to be, Mrs. Gertrude Grace Sanborn, gave me a book *God Wrote Only One Bible*. I didn't say or think too much about it. I didn't study it at the time, but that was my first introduction. Then as I was teaching as professor of Greek at Shelton College in Cape May, New Jersey, I had one of my pupils, Sandra Devos—Sandra Phillips, I think, was her name then. She married Bill Devos, also one of my Greek students and speech students that I taught at Shelton College. Sandy said that there is a book in our library at Shelton by Dean John William Burgon that defends not only the King James Bible, but also the Greek text, the Received Text that underlies that Bible.

'Have you ever seen that book, Dr. Waite?' she asked me.

I said, 'Well, no, I haven't.'

I think I might have looked at it; I might have glanced at it. I thought to myself, 'Here is an interesting thing. Here is the first book that I have seen that says there is a difference in the Greek text that the modern versions are using, and that the King James Bible text that underlies it, the Textus Receptus, is superior to the Westcott and Hort-type text, or to the critical text.' ...

Then about that time, I think it was about 1969 or 1970, along in there, Dr. Fuller came out with his book *Which Bible?* I read that. Also, I looked at, at least one of the books by Dr. Edward F. Hills, *Believing Bible Study*. I don't think I saw at the time his other book, *The King James Bible Defended*.

So in 1971, having read these various books, I was deeply convicted and convinced that the King James Bible and the Greek text that underlies it, as well as the Hebrew text—although I got into the Hebrew text a little bit later—but I was convinced that the Greek text that underlies the New Testament of the King James Bible was the accurate text to use.

Writing my first book on the subject: Thus I wrote my first paper on this thing. It was 1971. I combined, you might say, just trying to get a digest of these three books—*God Wrote Only One Bible* by Jasper James Ray; *Which Bible?,* edited by Dr. David Otis Fuller, who was a good friend of mine at that time and was until the day of his death; and *Believing Bible Study* by Dr. Edward F. Hills. The 1971 book was called *The Case for the Received Text of Hebrew and Greek underlying the King James Version: A Summary of the Evidence and Argument*. This was the book that I put out first, in 1971.

You can say the first twenty years, from 1951-71, I was in somewhat of a daze, somewhat of a darkness, concerning the issues. Then from 1971-91, twenty more years, I have been writing, I have been studying, I have been preaching, I

have been teaching, I have been debating, I have been arguing, I have been talking about, I have been preaching from, I have continued to memorize from and believe the King James Bible and the text that underlies that Bible. So for twenty years I've been a stalwart defender of that Book.

I have studiously stayed away from the extreme position, however, of Dr. Peter Ruckman. I believe that position is heresy. That position in effect says that the King James Bible is not a translation but is direct, Holy-Spirit revelation, [coming] word for word, including the italics, from God in 1611. I believe that position is heresy. I believe that is adding revelation to the Word of God where He said the canon was closed. ... I believe to say that God supplanted and threw away the Hebrew and Greek that He gave us originally and now He is giving us special word for word revelation in the English language called the King James Bible, I believe that is heresy.

But I do believe in the superiority of the King James Bible. I believe it is God's Word kept intact in English. I hold it up proudly and say it is the Word of God in English. Our Dean Burgon Society does as well, and we strongly support it.

The Bible for Today: Our The Bible for Today ministry in Collingswood, New Jersey, which began in extensive fashion in 1971, has paralleled the development of this whole theme of the superiority of the King James Bible, and the Textus Receptus, and the version issue. In 1971 we saw the light on that issue, and in 1971 we also began our The Bible for Today ministry in a more extensive way. We have more than 2,100 titles that we carry. Of those 2,100, about 785 titles are concerning the defense of the King James Bible, both on video cassette recordings, on audio recordings, on books, on booklets, not only that I have written, but that others have written. So The Bible for Today has become a very important arm of this entire ministry.

The Dean Burgon Society: Since 1978 I have been the president of the Dean Burgon Society. That Society has a motto, 'In defense of traditional Bible text.' This refers to the traditional Massoretic Hebrew Old Testament Text that underlies our King James Bible, the traditional Greek New Testament Received Text, and the King James Bible itself, which is the traditional English Bible. We have over ten or eleven small booklets on various issues and subjects that deal with this Bible version issue. We publish them under the Dean Burgon Society title, and we continue to stand for this in the Dean Burgon Society.

Publishing out-of-print titles: The Bible for Today is a publishing organization, as well as carrying books from other publishers. One of the things we want to see published more than anything else are works that are defending our King James Bible, the Received Greek Text, and the Massoretic traditional Hebrew text, as well. We have reprinted old books that are now out of print. Some of these are *The Authorized Edition of 1611: The History and Changes In It* by Scrivener. We have reprinted all five of Dean John William Burgon's books [on Bible texts]—*Causes and Corruptions of the Traditional Text*, *The Traditional Text* itself, *Revision Revised*, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, and *Inspiration and Interpretation*. There are about 2,000 pages we have reprinted in full, with the original pagination and editions. At first we did it in a humble way, by photocopy machine method, in 8 ½ X 11 inch format, spiral bound. During the last few years, we have published all of Burgon's books in lovely hardcover

editions.

Then we have reprinted *Codex B and Its Allies: A Study and an Indictment*. This is 924 pages, two volumes, by Herman Hoskier. In this he compares B and Aleph, the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus, and says that in over 3,000 places they contradict one another in the gospels alone. That's an important one.

We've reprinted Dean John William Burgon's biography by Goulburn. This is 801 large pages, two volumes.

We reprinted *The English Revised Version Text Is Unauthorized* by G.W. Samson.

We've reprinted Edward Miller's *Guide to Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. That's the Edward Miller that was the understudy of Dean Burgon.

We've reprinted Frederick Nolan's *Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, or the Textus Receptus.*

We've reprinted even Hort's *Introduction to the Revised Greek Text*, even though we disagree with it. 'An Erroneous Theory,' we call it. It is 530 pages. It has been out of print for a long while and Dean Burgon's *Revision Revised* refuted this study, so we wanted it available for those who wanted to see exactly what Hort has written.

Then we have reprinted Alexander McClure's *King James Translators Revived: Biographical Notes*. This was written over 100 years ago.

We have reprinted Wilkerson's *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*. We've also reprinted Scrivener's *Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*. This is 920 pages, two volumes. We've also reprinted Scrivener's Greek New Testament, the Textus Receptus and the Westcott and Hort Greek Text in one edition, with the Westcott and Hort in bold face. We've reprinted *Spurgeon's Quotations Against the English Revised Version of 1881.*

Then we have reprinted *Textual Commentary on Matthew 1-14* by Edward Miller. It is 141 pages.

We have, therefore, reprinted many things on this issue of the version issue.

Computer studies on the new versions: I think one of the most important publications that we've made recently on the version issue has been the documented computer printout studies of the perversions of the New King James Version. We have over 2,000 examples of perversion and paraphrase in the New King James. There is also the study that we have made of the New American Standard Version, where we have shown over 4,000 examples of perversion and paraphrase. And there is the study of the New International Version, where we have shown 6,653 examples of perversion and paraphrase.

All three of these, to a lesser or greater extent, have used perversion, paraphrase, and dynamic equivalency. And we believe there are three ways this has been done. They have added to the words of God; they have subtracted from the words of God; and they have changed the words of God, and we believe they are theologically in error, as well.

Also in our reprinting facilities we have reprinted five excellent books by Pastor Jack Moorman. Brother Moorman is an excellent scholar and student on this whole issue. He's one of the members of the executive committee of the Dean Burgon Society. He's in England now as a missionary. He has written five books, as we have said, and excellent books at that. They are *Conies, Brass, and Easter*: *King James Bible Problems Answered*; *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version*: *A Closer Look; Forever Settled: Bible Documents and History Survey; The Hodges and Farstad So-called Majority Text Refuted by Evidence*; *Missing In Modern Bibles*. *Early Manuscripts* takes up over 356 doctrinal passages that are affected by the Greek text of Westcott and Hort and Nestle-Aland 26th edition. *Forever Settled* was recently published in a hardcover edition.

We believe that the Lord is honoring this defense of the King James Bible. It's just like hitting a nail with a hammer. You hit it, and you concentrate on it, and you keep hitting it, and pretty soon that nail begins to travel into the wood. And I believe with this 'Little Johnny One Note,' hitting and drumming and pounding—not only in our The Bible for Today ministry but also in our Dean Burgon Society ministry and our radio ministry—we believe this will give us results. And it has given us results. We believe many are waking up to this matter.

These things have encouraged us and give me to understand that there is a movement of change and of opposition to the new versions and perversions in this country.

I believe we can do it on a respectful basis. I believe we can do it on a logical and fundamental basis, without being wild and fanatical. We're forceful; we're emotional about it. I am positive that I am right about it. I have no doubts about it, but we can do it in a kind fashion without using lots of adjectives which are almost like swear words, as Dr. Ruckman himself gets into many times. We can do it in a forceful manner, and yet a respectful manner, using the king's English persuasively, to persuade others that the King James Bible is the Word of God in English and should be used in every area of our church life, of our school life, of our college life, of our printing life, our publishing life, our memorizing life, and our practicing life.

My background of Master of Theology at Dallas Seminary has been helpful. I majored in New Testament Greek literature and exegesis, and took many hours of electives in that language, as well. And I took two years of Hebrew at Dallas Seminary in my Master of Theology level, then I took another year and a half in the Doctor of Theology level.

This background that I have had as a trained person in these languages I believe has helped me greatly in being able to see the different texts in Hebrew and Greek. Though I do not try to flaunt the knowledge of these subjects, yet I do believe that the study of these languages, though I don't say that is the only way that you have to go, has made me more equipped than ever in the battle for this King James Bible that I love. I praise God for the training and the background, and for the ministry God has given to me in The Bible for Today, and in the Dean Burgon Society.

In 1992, Dr. Waite published *Defending the King James Bible: A Four-fold*

Superiority. This 307-page book is one of the best on the subject, in my estimation. Waite presents a four-fold superiority of the King James Bible over the modern versions: It is based upon superior texts; it had superior translators; it incorporated a superior translation technique; and it has a superior theology.

(For more on Waite see the Dean Burgon Society.)

Bibliography Bible Inspiration, Preservation, Texts, and Versions

I have been collecting the information for the following annotated bibliography for the past 30 years. Most of these books are in my personal library. I have spent many days in various research institutes, such as the British Library, just searching for the dates of birth and death for the authors. In many cases I have collected that information directly from the author himself through my travels and correspondence.

In Support of the Received Text and the Authorized Version

There is a wide variety of position among the authors listed in this first section of the bibliography. All are not necessarily strong defenders of the King James Bible. We do not list them together in an attempt to put them all into the same mold, but to simplify the categorization of this bibliography. In some cases it has been difficult to determine into which section we should place a certain title and author, and we realize that not everyone will agree with our categorizations. Some of the following authors are defenders of the KJV; some are defenders of the TR; some are defenders of the Traditional Text only in a very general sense as opposed to the modern critical text.

Aberhardt, William (1878-1943). *The Latest of Modern Movements: or What about the Revised Version of the Bible*? Calgary, Alberta: God Hath Spoken, c1925. 16 pp.

Alexander, Charles D. *The Wretched Woman of John Eight and Her Fight against the New Versions: A Defence of the Received Text and the Authorised Version*. Liverpool: The Bible Exposition Fellowship Tape Ministry, n.d.

Allis, Oswald Thompson (1880-1973). *God Spake by Moses: an Exposition of the Pentateuch*. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub., 1958. 159 pp.

———. *Is a Pronominal Revision of the Authorised Version Desirable?* Appendix B of *The Old Is Better* by Aldred Levell. Herts, England: Gospel Standard Publications, 1990.

———. *The New English Bible: the New Testament of 1961, a comparative study*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub., 1963. 71 pp.

———. *Revision or New Translation: the Revised Standard Version of 1946: a comparative study*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub., 1948.

Anderson, G.W., and D.E. Anderson. *The Authorised Version: What Today's Christian Needs to Know about the KJV*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d. 12 pp.

———. *The English Bible: Its Origin, Preservation and Blessing*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d. 9 pp.0

———. *A Textual Key to the New Testament: a List of Omissions and Changes*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1992. 14 pp.

———. *New International Version: What Today's Christian Needs to Know about the NIV*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d. 35 pp.

Anderson, Robert (1841-1918). *The Bible and Modern Criticism*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1905. 6th ed. 1907. 282 pp.

Aordkian, Solomon M. *Honoring the King James Bible: Exposing the Modern English Bible Versions as Counterfeits*. Naugatuck, CT: Solomon Aordkian, 2001. 80 pp.
Backus, Irena Doruta (1950-). *The Reformed Roots of the English New Testament: The Influence of Theodore Beza on the English New Testament*. Dikran Hadidian ed. Pittsburg, PA: The Pickwick Press, 1980.
Barnett, Robert J. (1933-). *An Answer to the Latest Attack on the KJB Position: a Critical Review and Analysis of the Original Autographs Only Message in the King James Only Controversy in American Fundamentalism since 1950*. Grayling, MI: Calvary Baptist Church, 1991.
———. *Beware of the "Revised" Gary Hudson*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1990.
———. *Dangerous Trends against Bible Defense*. A message presented to the 1993 Dean Burgon Society meeting, Indianapolis, Indiana. Grayling, MI: Calvary Baptist Church, 1993.
———. *Dr. Edward Freer Hill on the KJB*. A message presented to the 1991 Dean Burgon Society meeting. Collingswood, NJ: Dean Burgon Society, 1999.
———. *Our Baptist Bible Roots 1689-1989: a 300 Year Affirmation of Bible Authority*. Grayling, MI: Calvary Baptist Church, 1989.
———. *Possessing an Infallible Bible*. Grayling, MI: Calvary Baptist Church, n.d.
———. *The Word of God on Trial*. Grayling, MI: Calvary Baptist Church, 1981.
Bates, Michael J. (1949-). *A Syllabus on Inspiration, Preservation, and the KJV*. Newington, CT: Emmanuel Baptist Church, 2000. 346 pp.
———. *The Word of God – Kept or Lost?* Newington, CT: Emmanuel Baptist Church, n.d. 33 pp.
Beckett, Edmund. *a Reply to Dr. Farrar's Answer*. London: John Murray, 1882.
———. *Should the Revised New Testament Be Authorized*? London: John Murray, 1882. 194 pp.
Bennett, David. *Preserved in Egypt or Preserved in God's Churches*. Australia: 2004. 20 pp.
Bible League. *Truth Unchanged, Unchanging: a Selection of Articles from The Bible League Quarterly 1912-82*. Abingdon, England: The Bible League, 1984. 503 pp.
Birks, Thomas Rawson. *Essay on the Right Estimation of Manuscript Evidence in the Text of the New Testament*. London: Macmillan and Col, 1878. 128 pp.
Bishop, George Sayles (1836-1914). *The Doctrines of Grace and Kindred Themes*. New York: Gospel Publishing House, 1910. 509 pp.
Blanton, Raymond. *The Promise of Preservation*. Easley, SC: Highways & Hedges Tracts.
Blunt, David. *The Differences Between the Greek Texts of the New Testament*. Ayrshire, Scotland: Traditional Text Society, 1994.
Bouw, Gerardus D. (1945-). *The Book of Bible Problems*. Cleveland, OH: Association for Biblical Astronomy, 1997. 265 pp.
Bradley, Bill. *Purified Seven Times: The Miracle of the English Bible*. Claysburg, PA: Revival Fires, 1998. 144 pp.
Brainine, Clinton L. (1926-) *God's Word Preserved*. Greenwood, IN: Heritage Baptist University, 1994.
———. *The History of Bible Families and the English Bible*. Greenwood, IN: Heritage Baptist University, n.d.
Brandenburg, Kent, ed. *Thou Shalt Keep Them: A Biblical Theology of the Perfect Preservation of Scripture*. Contributors are Kent Brandenburg, Thomas Strouse, Gary Webb, Charles Nichols, Gary La More, David Sutton, and Thomas Corkish. El Sobrante, CA: Pillar & Ground Publishing, 2003. 315 pp.
Brantly, William T. (1816-1882) and Octavius Winslow (d. 1878)**.** *Objections to a Baptist Version of the New Testament,* with *Additional Reasons for Preferring the English Bible As It Is.* New York: J.P. Callender, 1837. 66 pp.
Breckinridge, Robert Jefferson (1800-1871). *The American Bible Society's Committee on Versions and Its New Bible*. Danville, KY, October 30, 1857. 8 pp.
Brookes, James G. (1830-1897). *God Spake All These Words: A Statement and Defence of the Supernatural Origin and Inerrant Inspiration of God's Holy Word*. NY: Gospel Publishing House, n.d.
———. *Is the Bible Inspired*? St. Louis: Gospel Book and Tract Depository, 1883. 128 pp.
———. ed. "The Revised Version." *The Truth or Testimony for Christ*. Vol. xxii, New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1896. pp. 89-91.

Brookes, James Hall (1830-97). *The Way Made Plain*. London, Ontario: Bethel Baptist Print Ministry, 2005 reprint of the 1871 edition by the American Sunday School Union of Philadelphia. 239 pp.
Brown, Andrew J. *A Review of D.A. Carson's "The King James Version Debate" 1979*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1979.
———. *The Word of God Among All Nations: A Brief History of the Trinitarian Bible Society 1831-1981*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1981. 162 pp.
Brown, David L. (1949-). *The Incomparable Book--The Holy Bible: Examining the History of the English Bible*. Oak Creek, WI: David Brown, 2000. 264 pp.
———. *The Great Uncials*. Oak Creek, WI: David Brown, 2000. 11 pp.
Brown Publishing. *Geneva Bible: a Facsimile of the 1559 Edition with Undated Sternhold & Hopkins Psalms*. Pleasant Hope, MO: L.L. Brown Publishing, 1990.
Brown, Terence Henry. *The Bible and Textual Criticism*: *Remarks on the Rev. Donald MacLeod's Article in the June 1972 Issue of the "Banner of Truth."* London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1972.
———. *God Was Manifest in the Flesh*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1965.
———. *What Is Wrong with the Modern Versions of the Holy Scriptures? An Address Given by the Secretary of the Trinitarian Bible Society, June, 1971*, Article No. 41.
Buch, Mark (1910-1995). *In Defence of the Authorized Version*. Vancouver: Mark Buch, 1977. 58 pp.
Burgon, John William (1813-1888). *Disestablishment of Religion in Oxford, the Betrayal of a Sacred Trust*. A sermon preached before the University of Oxford, at S. Mary-the-Virgin's, on the Sunday next before Advent, November 21, 1880. London: Parker and Co., 1880. 53 pp. (found in *Theological Tracts*, 4473 F.19 1-28 at the British Library)
———. *Disestablishment, The Nation's Formal Rejection of God, and Denial of the Faith*. A sermon preached at S. Mary the Virgin's, Oxford, on the 19th Sunday after Trinity, Oct. 18, 1868. James Parker and Co., Oxford and London, 1868. [32 pp.]
———, and Edward Miller. *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels, being the sequel to The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*. London: George Bell and Sons, 1896. 290 pp.
———. *England and Rome*: *Three Letters to a Pervert*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1869. 283 pp.
———. *Index of Texts of the New Testament Quoted by the Fathers*. 16 vol. London, 1872-1888. Resides in the British Library, manuscripts 33,33421-33,33436.
———. *Inspiration and Interpretation: Seven sermons preached before the University of Oxford; with preliminary remarks: being an answer to a volume entitled Essays and Reviews.* Oxford: J.H. & Jas. Parker, 1861. 545 pp.
———. *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to S. Mark Vindicated against Recent Critical Objectors and Established*. London: James Parker and Co., 1871. 334 pp.
———. *Letters from Rome to Friends in England*. London: John Murray, 1862. [420 pp.]
———. "The New Greek Text." *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 152, July & October 1881. London: John Murray.
———. *The Oxford Diocesan Conference*; and *Romanizing within the Church of England.* Two sermons preached at S. Mary the Virgin's, Oxford, Oct. 12th and 19th, 1873. James Parker and Co., Oxford and London, 1873. [40 pp.]
———. *Protests of the Bishops against the Consecration of Dr. Temple to the See of Exeter*: Preceded by a letter to the Right Hon. and Right Rev. John Jackson, D.D., Bishop of London. The appendix contained statements by eight bishops opposing the consecration of ---- Temple to the See of Exeter. The eight were Charles John Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol; George Augustus Selwyn, Bishop of Lichfield; James Atlay, Bishop of Llandaff; Christopher Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln; James Colquhoun Campbell, Bishop of Bangor; William Connor Magee, Bishop of Peterborough; and Thomas Legh Claughton, Bishop of Rochester. Oxford and London: James Parker and Co., 1870. [31 pp.]
———. *The Revision Revised*. Fort Worth: A.G. Hobbs Publications, 1983 reprint of the 1883 edition. 549 pp.
———. *The Roman Council*. A Sermon preached at S. Mary the Virgin's, Oxford, on the third Sunday in Advent, Dec. 12, 1869; being the Sunday after the death of John Parsons. James Parker and Co., Oxford and London, 1869. [12 pp.]

———. *Romanizing within the Church of England*: Two sermons preached at S. Mary-the-Virgin's, Oxford, Oct. 12th and 19th, 1873. Oxford and London: James Parker and Co., 1873. 40 pp. (found in *Theological Tracts*, 1872-73, 4109 B2, British Library)
———. *The Servants of Scripture*. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge: London, 1878. [132 pp.]
———, and Edward Miller. *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established*. London: George Bell and Sons, 1896. 317 pp.
———. *An Unitarian Reviser of Our Authorized Version, Intolerable*: An earnest remonstrance and petition addressed to Charles John Ellicott. Oxford and London: Parker and Co., 1872. 8 pp. (found in *Theological Tracts* 1867-78, 4372 G5 at the British Library)
Bynum, E.L. (1926-). *King James Fans?* Lubbock, TX: Tabernacle Baptist Church, 1979. 47 pp.
———. "King James or Saint James?" *Plains Baptist Challenger*. Lubbock, TX: Tabernacle Baptist Church, October 1985.
———. *Should We Trust the New International Version*? Lubbock, TX: Tabernacle Baptist Church, n.d.
———. Use the Bible God Uses: King James A.V. 1611. Lubbock, TX: Tabernacle Baptist Church, n.d.
———. *Why We Reject This Version*. Lubbock, TX: Tabernacle Baptist Church, 1969.
Cammenga, Ronald. *NIV or KJV: Comparison and Evaluation of These Two Bible Versions*. Grandville, MI: Southwest Protestant Reformed Church, n.d. 16 pp.
Carter, Cecil J. (1913-2005). *The New American Standard Version and the Deity of Christ*. Lubbock, TX: Tabernacle Baptist Church, n.d.
———. *The Oldest and Best Manuscripts: How Good Are They?* Prince George, B.C.: Cecil J. Carter, n.d.
———. *The Thinking, Theories, and Theology of Drs. Westcott & Hort*. Prince George, B.C.: Cecil J. Carter, 1978.
Carter, Mickey pp. (1935-) *Things that Are Different Are Not the Same: The truth about the battle for the preserved King James Bible*. Haines City, FL: Landmark Baptist Press, 1993. 214 pp.
———, ed. *The Elephant in the Living Room: Seeing the Shadow of the RSV in Spanish*. Haines City, FL: Landmark Baptist College, 2002. 178 pp.
Cassidy, Thomas (1947-). *Textual Criticism: Fact & Fiction*. Spring Valley, Calif.: First Baptist Church Publications, 1995. 48 pp.
Cereghin, John (1964-). *In Defense of Erasmus*. Elkton, MD: Maranatha Baptist College, 1994.
———. "Position Paper of Maryland Baptist Bible College on Various Teachings of Dr. Peter Ruckman." *Swordsman*. Maryland Baptist Bible College & Theological Seminary. Winter 1994, Vol. 4, No. 2. pp. 6-9.
Clark, Albert C. *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*. 1914. 112 pp.
Clark, Donald T. (1937-). *Bible Version Manual.* Sunbury, PA: Bible Truth Institute, 1975. 155 pp.
———. *The Quality of the Textus Receptus by Stewart Custer: a Critique*. Sunbury, PA: Bible Truth Institute, 1974.
———. *Facts on the Textus Receptus and the King James Version by Dr. Allan A. MacRae and Dr. Robert C. Newman: a Critique*. Sunbury, PA: Bible Truth Institute, 1974.
———. *Should You Choose the Bible of Your Choice*? Sunbury, PA: Bible Truth Institute, n.d.
Clark, Gordon Haddon. *Logical Criticisms of Textual Criticism*. Jefferson, MD: The Trinity Foundation, 1986. 70 pp.
Cloud, David W. (1949-). *Answering James White's "The King James Only Controversy."* London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 1999. 115 pp.
———. *The Apocryphal Books: Do They Belong in the Bible*? London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 1991. 8 pp.
———. *Dynamic Equivalency: Death Knell of Pure Scripture*. London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 1990. 51 pp.
———. *Faith vs. the Scholars: A Course on Bible Texts and Versions and a 10-Fold Defense of the King James Bible*. 2 vol. London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 2005. 800 pp.
———. *For Love of the Bible: The Battle for the Authorized Version and the Received Text from 1800 to Present*. London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 1995, 1999. 460 pp.

———. *The Modern Bible Version Hall of Shame*. London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 2005. 361 pp.
———. *The Modern Bible Version Question-Answer Database*. London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 2005. 375 pp.
———. *Modern Bible Versions: a Concise Overview of the Issue of Bible Texts and Versions*. London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 1994. 48 pp.
———. *Modern Versions Founded upon Apostasy: The Theology of the Men who Developed the Modern Textual Theories*. London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 1995. 78 pp.
———. *A Most Frightful Deception: The Good News Bible and Translator Robert Bratcher*. London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 1986. 27 pp.
———. *Myths about the King James Bible*. 5 Vol. London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 1986. 2nd ed. 1995. 163 pp.
———. *Myths about Modern Bible Versions*. London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 1999. 321 pp.
———. *New Age Bible Versions: a Critique*. London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 1994. 21 pp.
———. *Slipping Away from Preserved Scripture: Examining the Hodges-Farstad Majority Text*. London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 1989. 1991, 2005. 25 pp.
———. *Testimonies of King James Bible Defenders*. London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 2000. 64 pp.
———. *Unholy Hands on God's Holy Book: Report on the United Bible Societies*. London, Ontario: Way of Life Literature, 1985. 2nd ed. 1993. 86 pp.
———. *Way of Life Encyclopedia of the Bible and Christianity*. Oak Harbor, WA: Way of Life Literature, 1994. 486 pp.
Cobern, Camden. *The New Archeological Discoveries and Their Bearing upon the New Testament*, 1922.
Cook, Frederic Charles (1810-1889). *The Bible According to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611) with an explanatory and critical commentary and a revision of the translation*. London: John Murray, 1871.
———.*Deliver Us from Evil*. 1881-82. (A study of the change in "the Lord's Prayer" in the Revised Version.) 126 pp.
———. *The Revised Version of the First Three Gospels considered in its bearings upon the record of our Lord's words and of incidents in his life.* London: John Murray, 1882. 250 pp.
———. *Second Letter to the Bishop of London*. London: John Murray, 1882. 107 pp.
Coston Sr., Stephen Alexander. *King James the VI of Scotland and the I of England Unjustly Accused?* St. Petersburg, FL: Konigswort, 1996. 392 pp.
Coxe, Arthur Cleveland (1818-1896). *Apology for the Common English Bible; and a review of the extraordinary changes made in it by managers of the American Bible Society*. Baltimore: Joseph Robinson, 1857. 72 pp.
Coy, George H. *The Inside Story of the Anglo American Revised New Testament*. Dallas, Oregon: Itemizer-Observer, 1973. 232 pp.
Crampton, W. Gary. "The Original Manuscripts, Translations, and the Majority Text." *Chalcedon Report*, December 1994. pp. 23-26.
Cummons, Bruce D. (1924-2004). *The Foundation and Authority of the Word of God*. Massillon, OH: Massillon Baptist Temple, 1973, 2002, 52 pp.
Dabney, Robert Lewis (1820-1898). "The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek." *Discussions: Evangelical and Theological*. Vol. 1. 1891. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1967. pp. 350-90. This first appeared in the *Southern Presbyterian Review,* April 1871.
———. "The Influence of the German University System on Theological Literature." *Discussions: Evangelical and Theological*. Vol. 1. 1891. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1967. pp. 440 -65. This first appeared in the *Southern Presbyterian Review,* April 1881.
———. "The Revised Version of the New Testament." *Discussions: Evangelical and Theological*. Vol. 1. 1891. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust,.1967. pp. 390-98. This first appeared in the *Southern Presbyterian Review,* July 1881.

———. "Refutation of Prof. W. Robertson Smith." *Discussions: Evangelical and Theological*. Vol. 1. 1891. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust,. pp. 399-439. This first appeared in the *Southern Presbyterian Review,* January 1882.
David, Ben. *Three Letters Addressed to the Editor of The Quarterly Review, in which is Demonstrated the Genuineness of The Three Heavenly Witnesses--I John v. 7*. London: Printed for R. Hunter, St. Paul's Churchyard, 1825. (David was a Unitarian.)
Davis, Leo C. *A Comparison of the Jehovah Witness Bible and the New International Bible*. Bedford, IN: Leo C. Davis, n.d.
DeJonge, William A. *Desecrating God's Word*. Quarryville, PA: William DeJonge, n.d.
———. *Sixty-Six Reasons for Keeping Our Protestant Bible*. Quarryville, PA: William DeJonge, n.d. 15 pp.
———. *Tampering with the Truth*. Quarryville, PA: William A. De Jonge, n.d.
Dean Burgon Society. *Dean Burgon News*, The. Vol. 1 No. 1, January 1979. Collingswood, NJ: Dean Burgon Society.
———. *Selected Messages from the 13th Annual Meeting at Cedarville, Illinois, May 1991*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1991. 157 pp.
———. *Selected Messages from the 15th Annual Meeting at Greenwood, Indiana, July 1993*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1991. 204 pp.
DeHaan, Martin Ralph (1891-1965). *Bible Versions and Perversions*. Grand Rapids: Radio Bible Class, 1962. 32 pp.
Dennis, Russell (1932-1998). *Vital Importance of the KJV for Bible Colleges, Universities, and Seminaries*. Audio cassette. Dean Burgon Society Meeting, Hagerstown, Md., August 18, 1994. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today.
Ditty, William A. *A Critique on the Bible Translations: Presented at Pennsylvania Association of Regular Baptist Churches Pastors and Wives Conference, January 20, 1981*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1981. 16 pp.
Divietro, Kirk D. (1952-). *Scholars Lie*. Audio cassette. Dean Burgon Society Meeting, Hagerstown, Md., Aug. 18, 1994. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today.
———. *Why Not the King James Bible! An Answer to The King James Only Controversy by James R. White*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1995. 82 pp.
Dowling, John (1807-78). *The Burning of the Bibles: Defense of the Protestant Version of the Scriptures against the Attacks of Popish Apologists for the Champlain Bible Burners*, with introductory remarks by W.C. Brownlee. Philadelphia: Published by Nathan Moore, 1843. 141 pp.
———. *The Old-Fashioned Bible, or Ten Reasons Against the Proposed Baptist Version of the New Testament*. New York: Edward H. Fletcher, 1850. 36 pp.
Durham, R.D. *Proving the Deity of Christ*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1973. 49 pp.
Engelsma, David J. (1939-). *An Examination of Reach Out and The Greatest Is Love*. Grand Rapids: Standard Bearer, 1971.
———. *Modern Bible Versions*. South Holland, IL: Protestant Reformed Church, 1988.
Everts, William Wallace (1849-1926). "The Westcott and Hort Text Under Fire," *Bibliotheca Sacra*. Oberlin, Ohio: Bibliotheca Sacra Company, January-March, 1921.
Farrell, Hugh (c1912-). *Rome and the R.S.V*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1968.
Flanigan, Robert W. *A Critique of the New American Standard Bible New Testament Edition 1972*. Hayward, CA: First Baptist Church, 1972. 18 pp.
Fowler, Everett (1906-1990). *Evaluating Versions of the New Testament*. Cedarville, Illinois: Strait Street, Inc., 1986 printing of the 1981 Edition. This report was first published *as a Christian Approach to the English Versions of the N.T.*, Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1971. 72 pp.
———. *A Review of The King James Version Debate*. Weston, Ontario: Gordon Mellish, c. 1979.
Freeman, Paul L. *Bible Doctrines Affected by Modern Versions*. Oak Harbor, WA: Way of Life Literature, n.d. 25 pp.
Fry, Francis. *Bibliographical Description of the Editions of the New Testament Tyndale's Version in English*. London: Henry Sotheran & Co., 1878. 83 pp.
Fuller, David Otis, ed. (1903-1988). *The Battle for the Word of God! "Yea, Hath God Said*?" Grand Rapids: Which Bible? Society, n.d.

———.*Counterfeit or Genuine?* Grand Rapids: Kregal, 1975, 2nd ed. 1978 with indexes by Paul E. Gregg, Jr. 230 pp.
———. *Is the King James Version Nearest to the Original Autographs*? Halifax, N.S.: The People's Gospel Hour, n.d.
———. *My Answer to Those Who Have Misinterpreted My Stand on the KJV*. Grand Rapids: Which Bible? Society, n.d.
———. *A Position Paper on the Versions of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Which Bible? Society, n.d.
———. *True or False?* Grand Rapids: Kregal, 1973, 2nd ed. 1983 with indexes. 317 pp.
———. *Which Bible?* Grand Rapids: Kregal, 1970, 5th ed. 1974 with indexes by Thomas R. Steinbach. 350 pp.
Garrett, Les. *Which Bible Can We Trust?* Queensland, Australia: Christian Centre Press, 1982, revised 1998. 332 pp.
George, Calvin. *The Battle for the Spanish Bible*. Powell, TN: Calvin George, 2001. 124 pp.
Gibson, Denis (1931-). *The Critical Text - The Scholars' Text - Not God's*. Brampton, Ontario: Calvary Baptist Church, 1992. 12 pp.
———. *The Good Is Ever the Enemy of the Best*. Brampton, Ontario: Calvary Baptist Church, 1993. 7 pp.
———. *A Plea for the Whole Truth: Review of a Taped Message by Dr. Michael Cocoris, "Why We Should Switch to the New King James Bible*." Brampton, Ontario: Calvary Baptist Church, 1991. 17 pp.
———. *Some Quotes from Spurgeon's Sermon Volumes Regarding His Attitude Toward the Revised Version of 1881-1885*. Brampton, Ontario: Calvary Baptist Church, 1988.
———. *Textual Criticism in the Pastoral Context: How It Impinges on Faithful Preaching*. Brampton, Ontario: Calvary Baptist Church, 1990. 11 pp.
———. *Trifling with God's Word or Trembling at God's Word*. Brampton, Ontario: Calvary Baptist Church, 1994. 10 pp.
Gipp, Samuel C. (1950-). *The Answer Book*. Chick Publications. 165 pp.
———. *An Understandable History of the Bible*. Chick Publications. 557 pp.
Grady, William Patrick (1952-). *Final Authority: a Christian's Guide to the King James Bible*. Schererville, IN: Grady Publications, 1993. 392 pp.
Graham, Carl. *The Proper Perspective on the Bible: Sodomy and the NIV*. Wake Forest, NC: Twogistates Publishers, 1993. 13 pp.
Graham, Marc A. *Are the Oldest Manuscripts Automatically Best*? Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1990.
Gray, J.A. *An Argument Sustaining the Common English Version of the Bible*. New York: J.A. Gray, 1850.
Green, Jay pp. Sr. (1918-). *The Gnostics, the New Versions, and the Deity of Christ*. Lafayette, IN: Sovereign Grace Trust Fund, 1994. 113 pp.
———. *Interlinear Hebrew-Greek-English Bible*. Lafayette, Indiana: Assoc. Publishers & Authors, 1979.
———. ed. *Unholy Hands on the Bible: Volume 1: An Introduction to Textual Criticism*, including the complete works of John W. Burgon, Dean of Chichester. Lafayette, IN: Sovereign Grace Trust Fund, 1990.
———. *Unholy Hands on the Bible: Volume 2: An Examination of Six Major New Versions.* Lafayette, IN: Sovereign Grace Trust Fund, 1992. 654 pp.
Guile, G.R. *Why Not the NIV? Reasons Why the New International Version Is Unreliable*. Oxon, England: Penfold Book and Bible House, 2nd ed. 1996. 42 pp.
Hanko, Herman C. (1930-). *The Battle for the Bible*. Lansing, IL: Peace Protestant Reformed Church, 1993.
Harbach, Robert C. *Bible Archaisms and Modern Versions*. Grand Rapids, MI: Hope Protestant Reformed Church, 1984.
Heaton, Paul E. *What About Those Italicized Words?* Lupton, MI: The Kings Publishing Company, 1995. 33 pp.
Hemphill, Samuel (1859-1927). *A History of the Revised Version of the New Testament*. London: Elliot Stock, 1906. 144 pp.
Henderson, Ebenezer. "The Great Mystery of Godliness Incontrovertible: A Critical Examination of the Various Readings in 1 Tim. III. 16," *The Biblical Repository,* Vol. 2, No. 5, January 1832, pp. 1-56.

Henise, Lee (1952-). "Biblical Testimony to Preservation." *Swordsman*. Maryland Baptist Bible College & Theological Seminary. Winter 1994, Vol. 4, No. 2. pp. 13-16.
———. "Do We Need a New Bible Translation?" *Swordsman*. Maryland Baptist Bible College & Theological Seminary. Winter 1994, Vol. 4, No. 2. pp. 10-12.
———. "Why Do We Believe in the King James Version of the Bible?" *Swordsman*. Maryland Baptist Bible College & Theological Seminary. Winter 1994, Vol. 4, No. 2.
Hills, Edward Freer (1912-1981). *Believing Bible Study*. Des Moines, Iowa: The Christian Research Press, 1967, 2nd ed. 1977. 258 pp.
———. *The King James Bible Defended: a Space-age Defense of the Historic Christian Faith*. Des Moines, Iowa: The Christian Research Press, 1956, third edition 1979. 280 pp.
———. *Space Age Science*. Des Moines, IA: The Christian Research Press, 1964. 2nd ed. 1979.
Hodges, Zane Clark (1932-). "The Angel at Bethesda—John 5:4." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 136 (January-March 1979). pp. 25-39.
———. "The Critical Text and the Alexandrian Family of Revelation." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 119 (April -June 1962).
———. *A Defense of the Majority-Text: a Revised Edition of a Paper Originally Called "Introduction to the Textus Receptus."* n.d.
———. "The Ecclesiastical Text of Revelation—Does It Exist?" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 118 (April-June 1961).
———. "The Greek Text of the King James Version," *Bibliotheca Sacra 125* (October-December 1968).
———. "Modern Textual Criticism and the Majority Text: a Response. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 21 (June 1978), pp. 143-55.
———. "Modern Textual Criticism and the Majority Text: a Surrejoinder." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 21 (June 1978), pp. 161-64.
———. "Rationalism and Contemporary New Testament Textual Criticism*" Bibliotheca Sacra* 128 (January-March 1971).
Hodges, Zane Clark (1932-), and Arthur Leonard Farstad (1935-1999), editors. *The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1982. 810 pp.
Hoffman, David. *Which Bible*? Rensselaer, IN: Bible Baptist Church, n.d.
Holland, Thomas (1951-). *Crowned with Glory: The Bible from Ancient Text to Authorized Version*. New York: Writers Club Press, 2000. 291 pp.
Hoskier, Herman Charles (1864-1938). *Codex B and Its Allies: a Study and an Indictment.* 2 vol. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914. 909 pp.
———. *Concerning the Date of the Bohairic Version*. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1911. 203 pp.
———. *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the N.T.: remarks suggested by the study of P and the allied questions as regards the Gospels.* 2 Vol. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1910-11. 892 pp.
———. *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*. 2 vol. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929.
———. *A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Codex Evangelium 604, together with Ten Appendices.* London: David Nutt, 1890. 282 pp.
Hoste, William (1861-1938). *Remove not the Ancient Landmark*. Originally titled *Why I Abide by the Authorised Version*. Oxfordshire, Penfold Book & Bible House, 1931. 31 pp.
———, and William Rodgers. *Bible Problems and Answers*. Kilmarnock, UK: John Ritchie Ltd., 1957. 446 pp.
Houck, Steven. *The King James Version of the Bible*. Lansing, IL: Peace Protestant Reformed Church, 1990.
Howard, V.E. *Dangers of Modern Versions*. Texarkana, Texas: Central Printers, 1977. 33 pp.
Hymers Jr., Robert Leslie (1941-). *The Ruckman Conspiracy*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1989. 67 pp.
Ince, William (1825-1910), Edward Miller (1825-1901*). The Oxford Debate on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament: held at New College on May 6, 1897: with a preface explanatory of the rival systems*. London: George Bell, 1897. 43 pp.
James, Kevin R. (c. 1954-). *The Corruption of the Word: The Failure of Modern New Testament Scholarship*. Williamsburg, NM: Micro-load Press, 1990. 265 pp.

Jasmin, Don (1936-). "The Authority of the Bible." *The Fundamentalist Digest*. January/February 1995.
———. "The Bible." *The Fundamentalist Digest*. March/April 1994.
Johnson, Ben D. (c. 1885-1968). *Modern Infidelity and a Mutilated Bible*. Lubbock, TX: Ben D. Johnson, 1952. 40 pp.
Johnson, Chris. *The Superiority of the KJV Over the NIV*. Asheville, NC: Revival Literature, 1989. 8 pp.
Johnson, Dell Gaylord (1944-). *Additional Thoughts on –The Text is the Issue*. Pensacola, FL: Pensacola Christian College, 1997. Video recording.
———. *The Bible … the Text is the Issue*. Pensacola, FL: Pensacola Christian College. 1997. Video recording.
———. *The Bible … Preserved from Satan's Attack*. Pensacola, FL: Pensacola Christian College, 1996. Video recording.
———. *Doctrine and History of Preservation of the Text*. Pensacola, FL: Pensacola Christian College, 1998. Video recording.
Johnson, Ken (1936-). *The Real Truth about the Waldenses Bible and the Old Latin Version: a Refutation of Kutilek's "The Truth about the Waldenses Bible and the Old Latin Version."* Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1991. 41 pp.
———. *A Response to J.H. Melton's Forum Re. The King James Version and Inspiration*. Lubbock, TX: Tabernacle Baptist Church, n.d. 21 pp.
———. *A Review of a Book that Attacks the King James Version: Bibliology Part 1, Translation, Vol. IV of a Biblical Baptist Systematic Theology by J.H. Melton*. Lubbock, TX: Tabernacle Baptist Church, 1992. 11 pp.
Jones, Floyd Nolen (1936-). *Ripped out of the Bible*. Houston, TX: Floyd Jones Ministries, c. 1988. 39 pp.
———. *The Septuagint: a Critical Analysis*. Houston, TX: Floyd Jones Ministries, 3rd ed. 1994. 66 pp.
———. *Which Version is the Bible*? Houston: Floyd Jones Ministries, 1993. 160 pp.
Joyner, Robert A. *Is the King James Version of the Bible Infallible?* Newport, NC: Community Baptist Church, n.d. 19 pp.
———. *King James Only? A Guide to Bible Translations*. Newport, NC: Robert Joyner, 2000. 146 pp.
Kahr, H.E. *Earnestly Contending for the Faith, or Departing from the Faith: Which*? Grand Rapids: Which Bible? Society, n.d.
Keener, Forest L. *The Translations Trap*. Lawton, OK: Watchman Press, n.d.
Khoo, Jeffrey. *The Gospels in Unison: A Synthetic Harmony of the Four Gospels in the KJV*, including an Appendix "Wrongly Dividing the Synoptic Gospels: A Critique of the Historical-Critical Methodology." Singapore: Far Eastern Bible College Press, 1996. 224 pp.
———. *Kept Pure in All Ages: Recapturing the Authorised Version and the Doctrine of Providential Preservation.* Far Eastern Bible College, 2001. 150 pp.
———. *The KJV-NIV Debate: An Annotated Syllabus*. Singapore: Far Eastern Bible College, 2nd ed. 1999. 92 pp.
Kinney, Lebaron Wilmont (1876-). *Acres of Rubies: Hebrew Word Studies for the English Reader*. NY: Loizeaux, 1942. 195 pp.
———. *The Greatest Thing in the Universe; the Living Word of God*. NY: Loizeaux, 1939. 201 pp.
Kober, Manfred E. *A Timely Re-evaluation of the Textus Receptus*. Ankeny, IA: Faith Baptist Bible College, n.d. 10p.
Kulus, Chester W. *Those So-called Errors*. Newington, CT: Emmanuel Baptist Theological Press, 2003. 430 pp.
Lackey, Bruce (1930-1988). *Can You Trust Your Bible?* Chattanooga: BIMI Publications International, 1980. 54 pp.
———. *Why I Believe the Old King James Bible*. Chattanooga: Bruce Lackey, 1987. 105 pp.
Lacy, Al. *Can I Trust My Bible*? Littleton, CO: Al Lacy Publications, 1991. 287 pp.
La More, Gary E. (1943-). *Following in the Footsteps of a Liberal: The Life and Work of Dr. Philip Schaff*. Scarborough, Ontario: Grace Missionary Baptist Church, 1993. 59 pp.

———. *Softening Words in the Word of God*. Audio cassette of Dean Burgon Society Meeting, Hagertown, Md., Aug, 18, 1994. Also available in printed form. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1994.
———. D*r. Kenneth Taylor's Search for The Living Bible*. Audio cassette of Dean Burgon Society Meeting, 1992. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1992.
———. *¿Cuál Es La Santa Biblia En Español?* Audio cassette of Dean Burgon Society Meeting, 1995. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1995.
Laurence, Richard (1760-1838). *Critical Reflections upon Some Important Misrepresentations Contained in the Unitarian Version of the New Testament*. At the University Press for the Author: Oxford, 1811. [177 pp.]
———. *Remarks upon the Critical Principles Adopted by Writers Who Have Recommended a New Translation of the Bible.* Oxford, 1820.
Leary, T.H.L. *A Critical Examination of Bishop Lightfoot's Defence of the Last Petition in the Lord's Prayer*. 1882.
Letis, Theodore pp. (1951-2005) *John Owen Versus Brian Walton: a Reformed Response to the Birth of Text Criticism*. Philadelphia: Westminster Theological Seminary, n.d.
———. *The Majority Text: Essays and Reviews in the Continuing Debate*. Grand Rapids: Institute for Biblical Studies, 1987. 210 pp.
———. *The Revival of the Ecclesiastical Text and the Claims of the Anabaptists.* Ft. Wayne, IN: The Institute for Reformation Biblical Studies, 1992. 54 pp.
———. *Theodore Beza 1519-1605 as a Text Critic*, Westminster Theological Seminary, 1983.
Levell, Alfred J. *The Old Is Better: Some Bible Versions Considered*. Herts, England: Gospel Standard Trust Publications, 1990. 61 pp.
Lister, James. *The Excellence of the Authorized Version of the Sacred Scriptures Defended against the Socinians*: A sermon delivered at the monthly lecture, Gloucester Str4eet Chapel, Liverpool, Wednesday evening, October 18, 1820. Liverpool: Printed by J. Lang, 1820. 32 pp.
Logsdon, S. Franklin (1906-1987). *From the NASV to the KJV*. Oak Harbor, WA: Way of Life Literature, n.d. 25 pp.
McAfee, Cleland Boyd (1866-1944). *The Greatest English Classic: a Study of the King James Version of the Bible and Its Influence on Life and Literature*. New York: Harper, 1912. 287 pp.
M'Caul, Alexander (1799-1863). *Reasons for Holding Fast the Authorized Version of the Bible*. London: Wertheim and Macintosh, 1857. 51 pp.
McCalip, Steven Melvin. *Just Say the Word: A Fascinating Collection of Popular Expressions from the Bible*. Alief, TX: God's Treasure Chest, 2001. 256 pp.
———. *Lest Ye Faint*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1949.
MacLean, W. *The Providential Preservation of the Greek Text of the New Testament.* Gisborne, New Zealand: Westminster Standard, 3rd ed. 1977.
McClure, Alexander Wilson (1808-1865). *Translators Revived: Biographical Notes of the KJV Bible Translators*. Worthington, PA: Maranatha Publications, reprint of the 1855 edition. 250 pp.
Maconaghie, Donald F. *King James I*. Havertown, PA: The Conversion Center, 1988.
McWhorter, James A. *Developing a Texas Seed Line*. Unpublished manuscript. Mabank, TX: Wildwood Baptist Church, n.d.
———. *History of Bearing Precious Seed*. Unpublished manuscript. Mabank, TX: Wildwood Baptist Church, n.d.
Madden, D.K. (1926-). *A Brief Review of the 21st Century King James Version*. Tasmania, Australia: D.K. Madden, 1994.
———. *A Critical Examination of the New American Standard Bible*. Tasmania, Australia: D.K. Madden, 1976.
———. *How Shall the Child of God Know Which Is the Word of God*? Tasmania, Australia: D.K. Madden, 1981.
———. *Modern Bible Versions? What about the New King James Version*? Tasmania, Australia: D.K. Madden, 1993.
———. *Remarks on the New King James Version and Revised Authorized Version.* Tasmania, Australia: D.K. Madden, 1989, Revised 1989.

Malan, Solomon Caesar (1812-1894). *A Plea for the Received Greek Text and for the Authorised Version of the New Testament, in Answer to Some of the Dean of Canterbury's Criticisms on Both*. London: Hatchards, 1869. 212 pp.
———. *Seven Chapters of the Revision of 1881 Revised*. London: Hatchards, Piccadilly, 1881.
———. *A Vindication of the Authorized Version of the English Bible from the Charges Brought Against It by Recent Writers.* 2 vol. London: Bell & Daldy, 1856. 348 pp.
Marsh, George Perkins (1801-1882). *Lectures on the English Language*. New York: Charles Scribner, 1860. 697 pp.
Martin, Alfred (1916-1996). "A Critical Examination of the Westcott-Hort Textual Theory." Th.D. Thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, May 1951. 210 pp.
———. "The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever." *Founder's Week Messages, 1966*. Chicago: Moody Bible Institute, 1966. 283:296.
Martin, Robert pp. *Accuracy of Translation: The Primary Criterion in Evaluating Bible Versions with Special Reference to the New International Version*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1989. 89 pp.
Massey, Homer. *A Look at the King James Version Controversy: Where Is the Word of God Today*? Virginia Beach, VA: Tabernacle Baptist Bible Institute, 1981. 23 pp.
Mauro, Philip (1859-1952). *Baptism*. Swengel, PA: Reiner Publications, 1977 reprint of the 1914 original. 105 pp.
———. *The Characteristics of The Age and Their Signficance*. Swengel, PA: Bible Truth Depot, revised 1918. 29 pp.
———. *The Last Call to the Godly Remnant*. Boston: Hamilton Bros. Scripture Truth Depot, n.d. 64 pp.
———. *Man's Day*. London: Morgan & Scott, 1908. 267 pp.
———. *The Seventy Weeks and the Great Tribulation*. Swengel, PA: Reiner Publications, n.d. 286 pp.
———. *The World and Its God*. New York: Gospel Publishing House, 1905. 128 pp.
———. *Which Version? Authorized or Revised*. Boston: Hamilton Bros. Scripture Truth Depot, 1924. 119 pp.
Maynard, Michael (1955-). *A History of the Debate over 1 John 5:7-8*: a *tracing of the longevity of the Comma Johanneum, with evaluations of arguments against its authenticity*. Tempe, AZ: Comma Publications, 1995. 383 pp.
———. "In Defence of the Jonannine Comma." *The Burning Bush*, Vol. 3, No. 1, January 1997. pp. 31-37.
Melton, James L. *Fighting Back! A Handy Reference Guide for King James Bible Believers*. Sharon, TN: Bible Baptist Church, 1997. 38 pp.
Miller, Edward (1825-1901). *A Guide to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Collingswood, NJ: Dean Burgon Society, 1979 reprint of the 1886 1st ed. 147 pp.
———, and William Sanday (1843-1920). *The Oxford Debate on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. 1897. 59 pp.
———. *A Textual Commentary upon the Holy Gospels: Part 1. St. Matthew i-xiv*. London: George Bell & Sons, 1899. 118 pp.
Moon, G. Washington. *Ecclesiastical English*. London: Hatchards, 1886. 247 pp.
Moorman, Jack A. (1941-). *A Closer Look: Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version*: *with manuscript digest and summaries*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1990. 154 pp.
———. *Conies, Brass, and Easter: Answers to "Problem" Passages in the Authorized Version.* Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, n.d. 34 pp.
———. *Early Church Fathers and the Authorized Version: a Demonstration*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, n.d.
———. *Early Manuscripts, Church Fathers, and the Authorized Version*, with Manuscript Digests and Summaries. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 2005. 454 pp.
———. *8,000 Differences Between the Textus Receptus and the Nestle-Aland NT Greek Texts*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 2002. 517 pp.
———. *Forever Settled: a Survey of the Documents and History of the Bible*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1985. 212 pp.
———. *Missing in Modern Bibles: Is the Full Story Being Told?* Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1989. 83 pp.

———. *Modern Bibles—the Dark Secret*. Los Osos, CA: Fundamental Evangelistic Association. 1992. 48 pp.
———. *Samuel Tregelles: The Man Who Made the Critical Text Acceptable to Bible Believers*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today Press, 2004. 12 pp.
———. *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text: A New Twist in the Continuing Attack on the Authorized Version*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1988. 154 pp.
Morris, Henry Madison (1918-2006). *A Creationist's Defense of the King James Bible*. El Cajon, CA: Institute for Creation Research, 1996. 17 pp.
———."Preserving the Words of God." Back to Genesis, April 2005.
———. "Should Creationists Abandon the King James Version?" *Back to Genesis*, No. 90, June 1996, Institute for Creation Research.
Morton, Timothy S. *Which Translation Should You Trust? a Defense of the Authorized King James Version of 1611*. Sutton, WV: Morton Publications, 1993.
Moser, M.L. *Good News for Modern Man: The Devil's Masterpiece*. Little Rock, AR: The Challenge Press, 1970. 88 pp.
———. *The New English Bible: Satan's Polluted Translation*. Little Rock, AR: The Challenge Press, 1971. 70 pp.
Muir, William (1819-1905). *Our Grand Old Bible: being the story of the Authorized Version of the English Bible, told for the tercentenary celebration*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1911. 242 pp.
Music, Goebel. *Easy-to-Read Version: Easy to Read or Easy to Mislead?* Colleyville, TX: Goebel Music Pub., 1994. 1207 pp.
Newton, Benjamin Wills (1807-1899). *The Altered Translation of Genesis ii. 5, as given in the Revised English Version, Considered*. London: Houlston and Sons, 1888. 76 pp.
———. *Remarks on the Revised English Version of the Greek New Testament*. London: Houlston and Sons, 1881. 355 pp.
Nolan, Frederick (1784-1864). *The Analogy of Revelation and Science Established in a Series of Lectures: delivered before the University of Oxford, in the year 1833*. Oxford: J.H. Parker, 1833. 521 pp.
———. *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate or Received Text of the New Testament, in which the Greek manuscripts are newly classed, the integrity of the Authorised Text vindicated, and the various readings traced to their origin*. London: F.C. and J. Rivington, 1815. 576 pp.
Nolan, Gene. *Analysis of the New International Version*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1976. 136 pp.
———. *The Paraphrased Perversion of the Bible: a Bible Commentary and a Critique on The Living Bible Paraphrased*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1974. 297 pp.
Norris, David W. *The Big Picture: The authority and integrity of the authentic Word of God*. Cannock, Staffordshire, England: 2004. 393 pp.
Olasky, Susan. "Femme fatale: The Feminist Seduction of the Evangelical Church: The New International Version of the Bible is quietly going 'gender-neutral.'" *World*. March 29, 1997, pp. 12-14.
Osborne, W.A. *The Revised Version of the New Testament*. London: Kegan Paul.
Oster, Edwin. *Biblical Introduction*. Seattle: Seattle Bible Training School, n.d.
Paisley, Ian Richard Kyle (1926-). "The Authority of Scripture Versus the Confusion of Modern English Translations." *The Fundamentalist Digest*. January/February 1995. pp. 11-19. This message was first delivered by Dr. Paisley at a Bible Spreading Union meeting in London.
———. *The Battle for the Bible: A Critique*. Belfast: Martyrs Memorial Publications, 1977. 46 pp.
———. *Dr. Paisley Thunders Out for the King James Bible*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1984. 14 pp.
———. *The Four Windows of Life: A Sketch of My Life Story*. Belfast: Martyrs Memorial Publications, 1978. 21 pp.
———. *The Good News Bible: The False Views Bible*. Belfast: Martyrs Memorial Publications, 1976.
———. "Joseph, a Type of the Bible." *Watching and Waiting*. Essex: Sovereign Grace Advent Testimony. January/March 1988.

———. *The Livid Libel of the Scriptures of Truth: An Exposure of the So-Called Bible in Everyday Language for Everyone*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1973 reprint. 22 pp.
———. *My Plea for the Old Sword: The English Authorised Version (KJV)*. Belfast: Ambassador Productions, 1997. 111 pp.
———. *The New English Bible, New Testament: Version or Perversion?* Belfast: Martyrs Memorial Productions, 1961. 32 pp.
———. *The New English Bible, Old Testament: Faithful Translation or Faithless Interpretation?* Martyrs Memorial Productions, n.d.
———. *The New International Version of the Bible: Why We Will Not Follow Cunningly Devised Fables*. Belfast: Martyrs Memorial Publications, n.d.
———. *The Revised English Bible: The Antichrist Bible*. Martyrs Memorial Publications, 1989. 111 pp.
———. *Why We Hold to the Authorised King James Bible and Reject Modern Versions*. Belfast: Martyrs Memorial Publications, n.d.
Paton, John I. "Translations by the Dozen," *The Good News Broadcaster*, September 1961.
Paulson, R. Vernon. *Eeny-Meeny-Miny-Mo: To Which Translation Shall I Go*? Grand Rapids, MI: Which Bible? Society, 1977. 117 pp.
Penfold, Michael. *The NIV and GNB: Shocking Exposé*. Oxon, England: Penfold Book and Bible House, 1997.
Philpot, Joseph Charles (1802-1869). *The Authorized Version—1611 vs. The New English Bible: a Critical Review*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1961.
Pickering, Wilbur Norman (1934-). *The Identity of the New Testament Text*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1977, rev. 1980. 251 pp.
Powell, Ronald E. *Basic Studies in Early New Testament Manuscripts and Their Relationship to the Theories of Drs. Westcott and Hort*. 1983. 99 pp.
Prindle, William D. *Bible Word Comparison*. Gary, SD: Deuel Enterprises, 1998. 70 pp.
Pyle, Hugh Fletcher (1918-). *The One Book that Covers All the Bases*. Panama City, FL: Hugh Pyle, 1997. 24 pp.
Ray, Jasper James (1894-1985). *God Wrote Only One Bible*. Eugene, Oregon: The Eye Opener Publishers, 1955. 122 pp.
———. *New Eye Opener: 200 Key References showing how all modern Bibles differ from the King James Version and the Greek Textus Receptus from which it was translated*. Eugene, Oregon: The Eye Opener Publishers, n.d. 8 pp.
Reagan, David F. *Myth of Early Revisions: King James Version 1611*. Oak Harbor, WA: Way of Life Literature, 1986. 17 pp.
Rennell, Thomas. *Animadversions on the Unitarian Translation, or Improved Version of the New Testament*. London: Printed for J. Hatchard and Son, 1819. [111 pp.]
Reno, Robynn. *The KJV: Tried and Found Triumphant*. Asheville, NC: Revival Literature, 1989. 8 pp.
Riplinger, Gail Anne (1947-). *Blind Guides: G.A. Riplinger Exposes Critics of the KJV*. Ararat, VA: A.V. Publications Corp., 64 pp.
———. *King James Version Ditches Blind Guides*. Ararat, VA: A.V. Publications, 1995, 1997.
———. *The Language of the King James*. Ararat, VA: A.V. Publications Corp., 1998. 179 pp.
———. *New Age Bible Versions*. Monroe Falls, OH: A.V. Publications, 1994.
Robinson, Maurice A. (1947-), and William Grover Pierpont (1915-2003), ed. *The Greek New Testament according to the Byzantine Text Form*. Original Word Publishers, 1991, 2000.
———. *The New Testament in the Original Greek Byzantine Textform*. Southborough, MA: Chilton Book Publishing, 2005. 587 pp.
Rockwood, Perry F. (1917-2008). *The Authority of the Authorized King James Version of the Bible*. Halifax, N.S.: People's Gospel Hour, c1969. 32 pp.
———. *God's Inspired Preserved Bible*. Halifax, N.S.: People's Gospel Hour, c1974. 59 pp.
Roloff, Lester (1914-1982). "Hills that Help." Southwide Baptist Fellowship, Highland Park Baptist Church, Chattanooga, TN., October 6, 1982. Audio cassette.
Ruckman, Peter Sturges (1921-). *Bible Babel*. Pensacola, FL: Bible Believers Press, 1964. 136 pp.
———. *Black Is Beautiful*. Pensacola, FL: Bible Believers Press, 1996. 350 pp.

———. *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*. Pensacola, FL: Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1999. 560 pp.
———. *The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*. Pensacola, FL: Pensacola Bible Class, 1970. 227 pp.
———. *The Errors in the King James Bible*. Formerly titled "Problem Texts." Pensacola, FL: Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1980, revised 1999. 511 pp.
———. *The Full Cup*. Pensacola, FL: Bible Believers Press, 1992. 314 pp.
———. *King James Onlyism Versus Scholarship Onlyism*. Pensacola, FL: Bible Believer's Press, 1992. 94 pp.
———. *The Last Grenade*. Pensacola, FL: Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1990. 342 pp.
———. *Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage*. Pensacola, FL: Bible Believers Press, 1980. 34 pp.
———. *Memoirs of a Twentieth Century Circuit Riding Preacher*. Pensacola, FL: Bible Believers Press, 1992. 142 pp.
———.*The Monarch of the Books*. Pensacola, FL: Bible Believer's Press, 1980. 30 pp.
———. *The Professional Liars in Action*. Pensacola, FL: Bible Believer's Press, 1996. 36 pp.
———. *Ruckman's Apocalypse: The Revelation of Jesus Christ*. Pensacola, FL: Bible Believers Press, 1993. 398 pp.
———. *A Survey of the Authorized Version*. Pensacola, FL: Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1978. 29 pp.
———. *The Unknown Bible*. Pensacola, FL: Bible Believers Press, 1984. 134 pp.
Salliby, Chick. *If the Foundations Be Destroyed*. Fiskdale, MA: Word and Prayer Ministries, 1994. 101 pp.
Samson, George Whitefield (1819-1895). *The Classic Test of Authorship, Authenticity and Authority: founded on jurists' rules of Interpreting records, applied to supposed inaccuracies in the text of the Old and New Testament Scriptures*. New York: F. Scott, c1893. 100 pp.
———. *The English Revisers' Greek Text Shown to be Unauthorized excerpt by Egyptian Copies Discarded by Greeks and to be Opposed to the Historic Text of All Ages and Churches*. Cambridge: Moses King Pub., 1882. 132 pp.
Samuel Bagster and Sons. *The English Hexapla*. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1841. 1332 pp.
Sargent, Robert J. (1948-). *Is the New King James Bible the Word of God*? Lubbock, TX: Tabernacle Baptist Church, n.d.
———. *Landmarks of English Bible: Manuscript Evidence*. Oak Harbor, WA: Bible Baptist Church Publications, n.d. 357 pp.
Sawyer, John Wesley (1936-). *Geneva's Gem: The Newe Testament Printed in Geneva in 1557 a.d*. Houston, TX: The Martyrs Bible Series, 1990.
———. *The Legacy of Our English Bible.* Houston: John Wesley Sawyer, 1990.
———. *The Newe Testament by William Tindale*. Milford, OH: John the Baptist Printing Ministry, 1989.
———. *Tindale's Triumph, John Roger's Monument: The Newe Testament of the Matthew's Bible 1537 a.d.* Milford, OH: John the Baptist Printing Ministry, 1989.
Schonhaar, Hugo W.K. *The King James Only Controversy—Answered*. Toronto: Hugo Schonhaar, n.d. 135 pp.
Scrivener, Frederick Henry Ambrose (1813-1891). *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611): Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*. Cambridge: University Press, 1884. 312 pp.
———, and Edward Miller. *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*. 2 Vol. New York: George Bell and Sons, 4th ed. 1894. 846 pp.
———. *Six Lectures on the Text of the New Testament and the Ancient Manuscripts*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co. 1875.
Scott-Pearson, Stephen J. *The Enduring Word of God*. Kilkeel, Northern Ireland: Mourne Missionary Trust, 1984.
Seeger, Paul. *A Layman's Response to a Most Solemn Resolution by the 45th Biennial Convention Wisc. Evangelical Lutheran Synod*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1981. 45 pp.
Sightler, James H. (1937-). *Silver Words and Pure: Questions and Answers about Bible Translations*. Greenville, SC: Sightler Publcations, 2001. 59 pp.

———. *Tabernacle Essays on Bible Translation*. Greenville, SC: Tabernacle Baptist Church, 1993. 53 pp.
———. *A Testimony Founded For Ever: The King James Bible Defended in Faith and History*. Greenville, SC: Sightler Publications, 1999. 297 pp.
———. *Westcott's New Bibles, Changing the Truth of God into a Lie: a Trojan Horse in Our Churches*. Greenville, SC: Sightler Publications, 2001. 81 pp.
Smith, Chuck, and Henry Morris, Dave Hunt. The Wisdom of the Ages: the Origin, History, and Relevance of the Bible. Costa Mesa, CA: Chapel Tapes of Calvary Chapel, 1980. audio tapes.
Smith, Ron (1924-). *By What Authority*? Kent, England: Thy Word Is Truth, n.d.
———. *The Question of Language*. Kent, England: Thy Word Is Truth, n.d.
———. *They Tell Us ... the Authorised Version Is Hard to Understand*. Kent, England: Thy Word Is Truth, n.d.
Son, James H., ed. *The Bible Translations Test*. Lubbock, TX: James H. Son, 1983. 47 pp.
———. *The New Athenians: Word Changers at Seats and Tables of Learning, Thieves and Robbers of Words of God*. Lubbock, TX: Praise Publishing, 1992. 226 pp.
Sorenson, David H. (1946-). *Why We Use the King James Version*. Duluth, MN: Northstar Baptist Ministries, 2000. 8 pp.
———. *Touch Not the Unclean Thing: The Bible Translation Controversy and the Principle of Separation*. Duluth, MN: Northstar Baptist Ministries, 2001. 295 pp.
Spanner, Frank, and Ron Smith. *Why Modern Versions Are Different*. Kent, England: Thy Word Is Truth, n.d.
Stang, Alan. "The National Council of Churches Moves to Place Women's Lib above the Bible." *American Opinion*. April 1981.
Spencer, Skip. *Modern Version Omissions of New Testament Scripture: How Accurate Is the Bible Version You Use?* Fairbanks, AK: Leonard Spencer, 1989. 143 pp.
Standish, Russell R., and Colin D. Standish. *Modern Bible Translations Unmasked*. Rapidan, VI: Hartland Publications, 1993. 226 pp.
Stauffer, Douglas D. *One Book Stands Alone: The Key to Believing the Bible*. Millbrook, AL: McCowen Mills Publishers, 2001. 434 pp.
Steward, Bob (1932-2004). *An Answer to John's Answer: the Issue of Bible Versions*. Harrison, MI: First Baptist Church, 1994. 15 pp.
———. *Do We Have a Concept Bible? (or the Very Words of God?): In Defence of the Received Text*. Harrison, MI: First Baptist Church, 1983, Rev. 1987.
———. *The Mighty Fire Surrounding Bible Versions*. Harrison, MI: First Baptist Church, 1993. 47 pp.
———. *Textus Receptus! Is Our King James Bible Outdated*? Harrison, MI: First Baptist Church, 1981. 22 pp.
———. *Why I Believe as I Do about Bible Versions*. Harrison, MI: First Baptist Church, 1992. 11 pp.
Strauss, Mark L. *Distorting Scripture? The Challenge of Bible Translation and Gender Accuracy*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998. 240 pp.
Streeter, Lloyd L. (1943-). *Misleading the Laymen: A Review of From the Mind of God to the Mind of Men*. LaSalle, IL: First Baptist Church, 2001. 37 pp.
———. *Seventy-five Problems with Central Baptist Seminary's Book The Bible Version Debate*. Kearney, NE: Morris Publishing, 2001. 292 pp.
———. *Seventy-five Problems with Central Baptist Seminary's Book The Bible Version Debate*. LaSalle, IL: First Baptist Church of LaSalle, 2nd printing with a review of One Bible Only? 322 pp.
Strouse, Thomas Morton (1945-). "The 19th Century Baptists, Bible Translations, and Bible Societies," *Tabernacle Baptist Theological Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Summer 1994). Virginia Beach: Tabernacle Baptist Theological Seminary, Unpublished Thesis, January 1981. 63 pp.
———. *But My Words Shall Not Pass Away: The Biblical Defense of the Doctrine of the Preservation of Scripture*. Newington, CT: Emmanuel Baptist Theological Press, 2001. 44 pp.
———. *A Critique of D.A. Carson's The King James Version Debate*. Watertown, WI: Maranatha Baptist Bible College, 1980. 21 pp.

———. *A Critique of the NRSV*. Virginia Beach: Tabernacle Baptist Theological Press, 1989.
———. *Fundamentalism and the Authorized Version*. Presented to the National Leadership Conference, Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary, Landsdale, Penn., on Feb. 29, 1996. Virginia Beach: Tabernacle Baptist Theological Seminary, 1996. 23 pp.
———. *Is the New King James Version the Fundamentalist's Bible*? Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, n.d.
———. *The Lord God Hath Spoken: a Guide to Bibliology*. Virginia Beach: Tabernacle Baptist Theological Press, 1992. 100 pp.
———. *Review of "From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man."* Newington, CT: Emmanuel Baptist Theological Seminary. November 2000.
———, and J. Khoo. *Reviews of the book From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man*. Preface by Dell Johnson. Pensacola: Pensacola Theological Seminary, 2001. 50 pp.
Stuart, M. "Remarks on the Internal Evidence Respecting the Various Readings in 1 Tim. III. 16," *The Biblical Repository,* Vol. 2, No. 5, January 1832, pp. 57-80.
Surrett, Charles L. *Which Greek Text? The Debate among Fundamentalists*. Kings Mountain, NC: Surrett Family Publications, 1999. 122 pp.
Sutherland, Samuel H. (1900-1994). "Downgrading the King James Bible." *King's Business*, September 1961.
Taylor, Douglas W. "Pure Words, Preserved Words: The Doctrine of Providential Preservation." *Bible League Quarterly*, April-June 1995. pp. 35-41.
———. *The Words of Inspiration: John William Burgon and the Traditional Text of the New Testament*. Ayrshire, Scotland: Traditional Text Society, 1992.
Taylor, Robert G. (1926-). *Distorted Scripture: Analysis of the New International Version of the Holy Bible Compared to the King James Version, with Special Attention to Doctrinal Changes*. Together with *Examination of Modern New Testament Text-Criticism Theory and Methods* by Jeffrey A. Young. Fort Wayne, Ind.: Christ Lutheran Church. 81 pp.
Taylor, William Carey. *The New Bible Pro and Con*. New York: Vantage Press, 1955. 351 pp.
Thackway, John pp. (1950-). ed. *Archaic or Accurate: Modern Translations of the Bible and "You" vs. "Thee" in the Language of Worship*. Salisbury, Wiltshire: The Bible League, n.d. 48 pp.
Third Millennium Publications. *Third Millennium Bible*. Gary, SD: Deuel Enterprises, 1998. 2101 pp.
Thompson, D.A. (d. 1984). *The Controversy Concerning the Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to Mark*. Surrey: The Bible Christian Unity Fellowship, n.d.
———. "The Singular Care and Providence of God, and the Textus Receptus." *Bible League Quarterly*, No. 286 (July-September 1971).
———. "The Truth Unchanged and Unchanging*." The Bible League Quarterly* (1971).
Thornwell, James Henley (1812-1862).
Todd, Henry John (1763-1845). *A Vindication of Our Authorized Translation and Translators of the Bible*; and of preceding English Versions authoritatively commended to the notice of those translators: occasioned by certain objections made by Mr. John Bellamy in his late translation of the book of Genesis, and by Sir James Bland Burges, in his *Reasons in Favour of a New Translation of the Holy Scriptures*. London: F.C. & J. Rivington, 1819. 143 pp.
Tozer, Aiden Wilson (1897-1963). "Confessions of a New Version Addict," *Alliance Witness*, October 1961.
Tow, Siang Hwa (1925-). *Beyond Versions: A Biblical Perspective of Modern English Bibles*. Singapore: King James Productions, 1998. 152 pp.
———. *NIV Claims Examined*. Singapore: Tabernacle Books, 1997. 21 pp.
———. *Twenty-first Century Readers' Bible: The King James Version (Authorised Version) Incorporating Guide Notes and Important Instructions for Last Days' Christians*. Singapore: Calvary Bible-Presbyterian Church. n.d. 20 pp.
Trinitarian Bible Society. *The Bible a Sure Foundation*. Article No. 59. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d.
———. *The Bible and Textual Criticism: Remarks on the Rev. Donald MacLeod's Article in the June 1972 Issue of the "Banner of Truth."* London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1972.
———. *A Bible Word List and Daily Reading Scheme*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d. 30 pp.

———. *The Divine Original*: *The Doctrinal Deficiencies of the Modern Versions Traced to Their Source*. Article No. 13. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d.
———. *Ecumenism and the United Bible Societies*. Article No. 72. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1985,1987.
———. *The Excellence of the Authorised Version*. Article No. 24. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d.
———. *Good Will Toward Men—Luke 2:14*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d.
———. *Holding Fast the Faithful Word: The Testimony of the Trinitarian Bible Society on the Subject of the Text and Translations of the Holy Scriptures*. Article No. 56. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d.
———. *If the Foundations Be Destroyed*. Article No. 14. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d.
———. *The Living Bible*. Article No. 18. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1974.
———. *The Lord Gave the Word: A Study in the History of the Biblical Text*. By Malcolm H. Watts. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1998. 28 pp.
———. *Living Letters*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d.
———. *A Manual for Translators*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d. 71 pp.
———. *Many Things: The True Text of Mark 6:20 and the Correct Translation Vindicated by the Evidence of the Manuscripts*. Article No. 33. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d.
———. *The New King James Bible New Testament*. Article No. 68. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1980.
———. *The New Jerusalem Bible*. Article No. 73. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1986.
———. *Notes on Vindication of 1 John 5:7*. Article No. 17. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d.
———. *Plain Reasons for Keeping to the Authorised Version*. Article No. 63. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d.
———. *The Power and the Glory—Matthew 6:13*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d.
———. *Rome and Reunion*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1968.
———. *What Is Wrong with the Modern Versions of the Holy Scriptures*? Article No. 41. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1971. 14 pp.
———. *The Word Was God: a brief refutation of the erroneous rendering in "The New World Translation*." Article No. 55. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d.
Trumper, Peter. "Do We Have the Word of God?" *Our Inheritance*, Winter 1994 (p. 17).
Turner, Charles V. (1934-). *Why the King James Version? The Preservation of the Word of God through Faithful Churches*. Bowie, TX: Baptist Bible Translators Institute, n.d.
Twells, Leonard. *A Critical Examination of the Late New Text and Version of the New Testament*; wherein the editor [D. Mace]'s corrupt text, false version, and fallacious notes are censured. London, 1731-32.
Van Bruggen, Jakob (1936-). *The Ancient Text of the New Testament*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Premier Printing Ltd., 1976. 40 pp.
———. *The Future of the Bible*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Inc., Publishers, 1978. 192 pp.
Van Kleeck, Peter (1956-). *A 16th and 17th Century Exegetical and Theological Assessment of Central Baptist Theological Seminary's Perspective of the Bible Version Debate*. Oak Creek, Wisconsin, 1998. 32 pp.
———. *Fundamentalism's Folly: A Bible Version Debate Case Study*. Grand Rapids: Institute for Biblical Textual Studies, 1998. 34 pp.
———. *The Future of the KJV Defense*. Audio cassette. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1988.
———. *Logical Defense of the KJV*. Audio cassette. Dean Burgon Society Meeting, Aug. 1988. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1987.
———. *The Translational and Exegetical Rendering of Psalms 12:7 Primarily Considered in the Churchly Tradition of the 16th and 17th Centuries and Its Expression in the Reformation English Bibles: The Genius of Ambiguity*. Unpublished thesis, Calvin Theological Seminary, March 1993.
Von Rohr, Oscar E. *They Are Changing Our Bible*! Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1984. 19 pp.
———. *Science Upholds the Inerrancy of Scripture*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 18 pp.

Wadsworth, B. [Benjamin?]. *Authorised New Testament and Revised Contrasted*, with Translators' Preface to the Reader. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1886. [171 pp.]
Wahnert, John. *America's Priceless Heritage: The King James Version of the Bible*. Hicksville, NY: Exposition Press, 1978. 37 pp.
Waite, Donald A. (1927-). *An Answer to 'Textus Receptus: Is It Fundamental to Our Faith?' by Dr. Thurman Wisdom*. Collingswood, NJ: Dean Burgon Society.
———. *The Authorized Version 1611 Compared to Today's King James Version*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1985. 23 pp.
———. *Bible Preservation of the Words, Not Only the Message*. Audio cassette. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1983.
———. *A Brief Analysis of the NIV Inclusive Language* Edition. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1997. 52 pp.
———. *A Brief Summary of The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1997. 32 pp.
———. *A Brief Summary of Inspiration and Interpretation*. 1999. 46 pp.
———. *A Brief Summary of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1997. 30 pp.
———. *Burgon's Warnings on Revision of the Textus Receptus and the King James Bible.* Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1998. 93 pp.
———. *Central Seminary Refuted on Bible Versions*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1999. 174 pp.
———. *The Contemporary English Version (CEV) An AntiChrist Version (ACV)?* Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1996. 32 pp.
———. *Dean John William Burgon's Confidence in the King James Bible*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1995. 36 pp.
———. *Dean John William Burgon's Vindication of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1994. 36 pp.
———. *Defending the King James Bible*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1992. 307 pp.
———. *Dr. Fuller's Fight for the Faith: His Defense of the KJV*. Audio cassette. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1983
———. *Dr. Stewart Custer Answered on the Textus Receptus and the King James Bible*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1984. 182 pp.
———. *Foes of the King James Bible Refuted*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1997. 156 pp.
———. *Fuller's 50 Years of Fruitbearing: Dr. David Otis Fuller Interviewed by Dr. D.A. Waite*. Audio cassette. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1983.
———. *Fundamentalist Distortions on Bible Versions*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1999. 72 pp.
———. *Fundamentalist Mis-Information*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 2000. 135 pp.
———. *The Future of the Bible: The Curse of Dynamic Equivalency*. Audio cassette. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, n.d.
———. *Heresies of Westcott & Hort.* Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1978. 42 pp.
———. *How I Got into the KJV Battle and How It's Going*. Audio Cassette., 1982.
———. *The New American Standard Version Compared to the King James Version and the Underlying Hebrew & Greek Texts*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1990. 163 pp.
———. *The New King James Version Compared to the King James Version and the Underlying Hebrew & Greek Texts*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1990 rev. 79 pp.
———. *The New International Version Weighed in the Balances and Found Wanting: 6,653 Reasons Why the N.I.V. Is Not the Word of God in English*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1990. 256 pp.
———. *Response to the Ruckus of Ruckmanism in a Local Church.* Audio cassette. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1981.
———. *Ten Reasons Why the Dean Burgon Society Deserves Its Name*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1991. 57 pp.
———. *Textus Receptus and K.J.V.—How and When Would Dean Burgon Revise?* Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1980. 45 pp.

———. *Westcott and Hort's Greek Text and Theory Refuted: Summarized from Dean Burgon's Revision Revised*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1996. 36 pp.
———. *Westcott's Denial of Bodily Resurrection*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1983. 38 pp.
Walter, Henry (1785-1859). *Letter to the Right Reverend Herbert, Lord Bishop of Peterborough, on the Independence of the Authorized Version of the Bible*. London, 1823.
Webster, Noah (1758-1843). *The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments, in the Common Version. With amendments of the language*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987 reprint of the 1833 edition of Durrie & Peck, New Haven, Conn.
Westminster Standard. *The New English Bible*. Gisborne, New Zealand: Westminster Standard, n.d.
Whiddon, Bill. *The Original Difference between the King James Version of the Bible and the Modern Versions*. Seattle: Bill Whiddon, n.d.
Whitney, Samuel Worcester (1822-1905). *The Revisers Greek Text: a critical examination of certain readings, textual and marginal, in the original Greek of the New Testament adopted by the late Anglo-American revisers*. 2 vol. Boston: Silver, Burdett, 1892.
Whittaker, J.W. *An Historical and Critical Enquiry into the Interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures, with Remarks on Mr. Bellamy's New Translation.* 1820.
Williams, H. Wayne. *Does God Have a Controversy with the King James Bible?* Rapid City, SD: The Ol' Lighthouse Publications, 1997. 95 pp.
Williams, Robert J. *The Credibility of the Majority Text*. Clarks Summit, PA: Baptist Bible School of Theology, n.d.
Wilkinson, Benjamin George (1872-1968). *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*. Washington, D.C.: Leaves-of-Autumn Books, 1930, 1993 printing. 258 pp.
———. *A Reply to the "Review" of My Book "Our Authorized Bible Vindicated."* Washington, D.C.: Leaves-of-Autumn Books, reprint, n.d. 204 pp.
Winter, Mickey. *The King James Version on Trial*. Webster, FL: Mickey Winter, n.d. 55 pp.
Wordsworth, Christopher (1807-1885). *The Holy Bible, in the Authorized Version*. 6 vol. London: Rivingtons, 1872-1876.
———. *The Inspiration of the Bible*. London: Rivingtons, 1861. 118 pp.
———. *Is the Papacy Predicted by St. Paul*? Cambridge: Harrison Trust, 3rd ed. 1985. 36 pp.
———. *On the Inspiration of the Holy Scripture: or on the Canon of the Old and New Testament*. Philadelphia: Herman Hooker, 1854. 286 pp.
———. *Sequel to Letters to M. Gondon on the Destructive Character of the Church of Rome, both in Religion and Polity*. London: F. & J. Rivington, 1848.
Yarnell, Ralph I. *A Fresh Look at the King James Bible*. Haines City, FL: Ralph Yarnell, 1991. 35 pp.
Zeolla, Gary F. (1961-). *Differences Between Bible Versions: Translation Principles, Greek Text-types, and Other Controversial Issues*. Columbus, GA: Brentwood Christian Press, 1994. 95 pp.
Zwemer, Samuel Marinus (1867-1952). *"The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel of Mark,"* Chapter Five, *Into all the World: The Great Commission: a Vindication and an Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1943. 222 pp.

In Support of the Critical Text and the Modern Versions

Abbot, Ezra (1819-1884). *A Defense of the Reading "Only Begotten Son" in John 1:18*. 1856, 1861, 1875. 68 pp.
———. *Memoir of the Controversy Respecting the Three Heavenly Witnesses, 1 John v. 7, including critical notices of the principal writers on both sides of the discussion*. New York: James Miller, 1866. 213 pp.
———, and James Rendel Harris (1852-1941), and Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield (1851-1921), and Caspar Rene Gregory (1846-1917), and Joseph Henry Thayer (1828-1901). *Notes on Scriveners' "Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1885. 56 pp.

Abbott, Thomas Kingsmill (1829-1913*). The English Bible and Our Duty with Regard to It: a Plea for Revision*. Dublin: Hodges, Foster, 1871. 69 pp.

———. *Essays Chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments*. London: Longmans, Green, 1891. 227 pp.

Aland, Barbara. *A Century of New Testament Textual Criticism 1898-1998*. Bible Resource Center. Translated from "100 Jahre neutestamentliche Textforschung (1898-1998)," in Bericht der Hermann Kunst-Stiftung zur Förderung der neutestamentlichen Textforschung für die Jahre 1995 bis 1998, Münster/Westfalen, 1998.

Aland, Kurt (1915-1994). *The Problem of the New Testament Canon*. London: A.R. Mowbray & Co., 1962. 33 pp.

———. *Synopsis of the Four Gospels*. United Bible Societies, 1982, revised 1985. 361 pp.

———, and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. Translated by Errol F. Rhodes of *Der Text des Neues Testament*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, English translation of 1981, 2nd ed. 1987.

Alford, Henry. *The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ after the Authorized Version*. London: Strahan and Company, 1869. 523 pp.

American Revision Committee. *Historical Account of the Work of the American Committee of Revision of the Authorized English Version of the Bible*. New York: Charles Scribner, 1885. 74 pp.

Ankerberg, John and John Weldon. *The Facts on the King James Only Debate*. Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 1996. 63 pp.

Angus, Joseph. *The Bible Handbook*, Revised by Samuel G. Green. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1952. 837 pp.

Ballard, Frank (1873-1931). *Which Bible to Read--Revised or "Authorised"? a statement of facts and an appeal to the modern Christian.* London: H.R. Allenson, 1898. 204 pp.

Barker, Kenneth L. *The Making of a Contemporary Translation: The Purpose and Method of the New International Version*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1987. 177 pp.

Bauer, Walter (1877-1960), William F. Arndt (1880-1957), F. Wilbur Gingrich (1901-93), and Frederick William Danker (1920-). *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Second Edition Revised and Augmented from Walter Bauer's Fifth Edition, 1958. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Beacham, Roy E., and Kevin T. Bauder, ed. *One Bible Only? Examining Exclusive Claims for the King James Bible*. (in addition to the editors, contributors are Douglas McLauchlan, Douglas Kutilek, W. Edward Glenny, Robert Milliman, and Larry Pettegrew.) Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2001. 238 pp.

Beard, John Relly (1800-1876). *A Revised English Bible, the Want of the Church, and the Demand of the Age*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1857.

Beegle, Dewey M. *God's Word into English*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960. 178 pp.

Bellamy, John (1857-1903). *A New Version of the First Three Chapters of Genesis: accompanied with dissertations illustrative of the era*. London: printed for Rowland Hunter, 1819. 168 pp.

———. *A Critical Examination of the Objections Made to the New Translation [his own] of the Bible*. London, 1820.

Bengel, Johann Albrecht (1687-1752). *Bengel's New Testament Commentary*. 2 vol. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1981.

Bewer, Julius August (1877-1953). *The Literature of the Old Testament*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. 464 pp.

Black, David Alan (1952-), ed. *Scribes and Scripture: New Testament Essays in Honor of J. Harold Greenlee*. Contributors: Gordon Fee, Moises Silva, F.F. Bruce, J.K. Elliott, David Dockery, David Allen, Sakae Kubo, Bruce Metzger, David Black. Winona Lake, IN: 1992. 135 pp.

———. *Using New Testament Greek in Ministry*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books House, 1993. 128 pp.

Brown, Jerry W. *The Rise of Biblical Criticism in America, 1800-1820: The New England Scholars*. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1969.

Bruce, Frederick Fyvie (1910-1990). *The Books and the Parchments*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 2nd ed. 1953.

Bryson, Ada. “New Testament Criticism: The Present State of the Problems.” *The Expository Times*, Vol. X (October 1898-September 1899): 487-492.
Burges, James Bland. *Reasons in Favour of a New Testament of the Holy Scriptures*. London: Budd and Calkin, 1819.
Burgess, Henry (1808-1886). “Revision of Translations of the Holy Scriptures: An Argument against Objectors.” *Journal of Sacred Literature*, January 1857.
———. *Comparative New Testament: Old and New Versions Arranged in Parallel Columns.* Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1881.
Caine, Kenneth Winston. *The Positive Bible*. New York: Avon Books, 1998. 300 pp.
Carter, A. *The Story of the New Testament Told in Connection with the Revised Version*. 1881.
Carson, Donald A. (1946-). *Exegetical Fallacies*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996. 148 pp.
———. *The Gagging of God: Christianity Confronts Pluralism*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996. 640 pp.
———. *The Inclusive Language Debate: A Plea for Realism*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998. 221 pp.
———. *The King James Version Debate: a Plea for Realism*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979. 128 pp.
———. *New Testament Commentary Survey*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001. 144 pp.
———, and Douglas J. Moo, and Leon Morris. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992. 537 pp.
Central Baptist Theological Seminary. *The Bible Version Debate*. Minneapolis: Central Baptist Theological Seminary, 1997. 148 pp.
Childs, Brevard S. (1923-). *The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994. 572 pp.
———. *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986. 255 pp.
Chinn, Douglas S. and Robert C. Newman. *Demystifying the Controversy over the Textus Receptus and the King James Version of the Bible*. Hatfield, Penn.: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1980. 26 pp.
Clark, Kenneth Willis (1898-1979). *Checklist of Manuscripts in the Libraries of the Greek and Armenian Patriarchates in Jerusalem*, prepared under the direction of Kenneth W. Clark, director and general editor of the Jerusalem Expedition 1949-50. Washington: Photoduplication Services, Library of Congress, 1953. 44 pp.
———. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America*, with introduction by Edgar Goodspeed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937. 418 pp.
Codex Sinaiticus. (reprint of the 1911 facsimile) 298 pp.
Codex Vaticanus. (reprint of the 1868 facsimile) 286 pp.
Coleman, Roger. *New Light and Truth: The Making of the Revised English Bible*. London: Oxford University Press, 1989. 90 pp.
Colwell, Ernest Cadman (1901-1974). *A Beginner’s Reader-Grammar for New Testament Greek*. New York: Harper & Row, 1965. 107 pp.
———, ed., and Edgar Goodspeed. *A Greek Papyrus Reader, with vocabulary*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 108 pp.
———, and Julius R. Mantey. *A Hellenistic Greek Reader; selections from the koine of the New Testament period, with vocabulary and notes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939. 229 pp.
———. *The Origin of Texttypes of New Testament Manuscripts*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961.
———. *Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text, the Bible in Modern Scholarship*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.
———. *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969. 183 pp.
———. *What Is the Best New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.
Comfort, Philip Wesley (1950-). *The Complete Guide to Bible Versions.* Wheaton: Living Books, 1996. 157 pp.
———. *Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1990. 235 pp.

Combs, William W. “Erasmus and the Textus Receptus.” *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal*. Vol. 1. No. 1 Spring 1996. pp. 35-53.
Conybeare, Frederick Cornwallis (1856-1924). *History of New Testament Criticism*. London: Watts & Co., 1910. 146 pp.
Corner, Dan. *A Critique of Gail Riplinger's Scholarship and KJV Onlyism*. Washington, PA: Evangelical Outreach, 1999. 54 pp.
Custer, Stewart (1931-). *The Truth about the King James Version Controversy*. 1981.
Darby, John Nelson (1800-1882) *The Holy Scriptures: a New Translation from the Original Languages*. Lancing, Sussex: Kingston Bible Trust, 1975 printing of the 1961 edition; first published 1890. 1495 pp.
Davidson, Samuel (1806-1898). *On a Fresh Revision of the English Old Testament*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1873. 167 pp.
Dewes, Alfred. *A Plea for a New Translation of the Scriptures*. London, 1866.
Driver, Samuel Rolles (1846-1914*). An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. Cleveland and NY: Meridian Books, The World Publishing Company, 1956. 577 pp.
———, and A.F. Kirkpatrick. *The Higher Criticism*. 1911.
Drummond, James (1835-1918). *The Transmission of the Text of the New Testament*. London: Sunday School Assn., 1909. 122 pp.
Dunzweiler, Robert J. *Are the Bibles in Our Possession Inspired? Two Studies on the Inspiredness of the Apographs*. Hatfield, Penn.: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1981. 30 pp.
Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture:* The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993. 314 pp.
———. and M. Holmes, *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research. Essays on the Status Quaestionis. A Volume in Honor of Bruce M. Metzger*. Grand Rapids, 1995.
Fee, Gordon D. “Modern Textual Criticism and the Revival of the Textus Receptus*,” Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, March 1978.
Ellicott, Charles John (1819-1905). *Addresses on The Revised Version of Holy Scripture*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1903. 138 pp.
———*. Considerations on the Revision of the English Version of the New Testament*. London: Longmans, Green and Sons, 1870.
———. *The Revisers and the Greek Text of the New Testament, by Two Members of the New Testament Company*. London: MacMillan, 1882. 79p.
Epp, Eldon J. (1930-), and Gordon D. Fee. *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmands, 1993. 414 pp.
Finegan, Jack. *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts: A Working Introduction to Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974. 203 pp.
Fowler, Henry Thatcher (1867-1948). *The History and Literature of the New Testament*. New York: MacMillan, 1934.
Fuller, Reginald Horace (1915-2007). *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament*. London: Duckworth, 1974. 221 pp.
———. *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives*. New York: Macmillan, 1971. 225 pp.
Geddes, Alexander (1737-1832). *Prospectus of a New Translation of the Holy Bible*, 1786.
Goodspeed, Edgar Johnson (1871-1962). *Christianity Goes to Press*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1940. 115 pp.
———. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937. 362 pp.
———. *The Formation of the New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926. 210 pp.
Grant, Frederick Clifton, ed. and trans. (1891-1974). *Form Criticism: a new method of New Testament research*; including The *Study of the Synoptic Gospels*, by Rudolf Bultmann, and *Primitive Christianity in the Light of Gospel Research*, by Karl Kundsin. New York: Harper & Row, 1962. 161 pp.
Grant, Robert McQueen (1917-). *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament*. New York: Harper & Row, 1963. 447 pp.
———. *The Formation of the New Testament*. New York: Harper & Row, 1965. 194 pp.

Green, Thomas Sheldon. *A Course of Developed Criticism on Passages of the New Testament Materially Affected by Various Readings*. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1857. 192 pp.
Greenlee, Jacob Harold (1918-). *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972. 160 pp.
———. *Scribes, Scrolls & Scriptures*. Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1996. 102 pp.
Gregory, Caspar René (1846-1917). *The Canon and Text of the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907.
Harris, James Rendel (1852-1941). *Codex Bezae: a Study of the So-Called Western Text of the New Testament.* Cambridge: The University Press, 1891.
———. *Side Lights on New Testament Research*. London: James Clarke & Co., 1908.
Harrison, R.K., and B.K. Waltke, D. Guthrie, Gordon D. Fee. *Biblical Criticism: Historical, Literary and Textual*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978. 183 pp.
Harwood, Edward (1729-94). *A Liberal Translation of the New Testament into polite English* (or, in other words, a burlesque of the sacred Scriptures). London, 1768.
———. *The New Testament*, collated with the most approved MSS., with select Notes. 2 vol. London, 1776.
Hatch, William Henry Paine (1875-). *Facsimiles and Descriptions of Minuscule Manuscripts of the New Testament*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951. 289 pp.
———. *The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939.
Henderson, Ebenezer, and Moses Stuart. *A Defense of the Reading "God Was Manifest in the Flesh" in 1 Timothy 3:16*. 1832. 80 pp.
Heywood, James (1810-1897). *The Bible and Its Revisers*. 1857.
———. *The State of the Authorized Bible Revision*. 1860.
Horne, Thomas Hartwell (1780-1862). *An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*. London: T. Cadell, 1818, 7th ed. 1834.
Hort, Fenton John Anthony (1828-1892). *Expository and Exegetical Studies*: Compendium of Works Formerly Published Separately. Minneapolis: Klock & Klock Christian Publishers, 1980. 760 pp.
———. *Judaistic Christianity*. New York: MacMillan, 1894. 222 pp.
———. *Six Lectures on the Ante-Nicene Fathers*. London: MacMillan, 1895. 138 pp.
———. *Two Dissertations*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1876. 150 pp.
———. *Village Sermons*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1905. 250 pp.
———. *The Way the Truth the Life: The Hulsean Lectures for 1871*. Cambridge and London: Macmillan and Co., 1893. 219 pp.
———. *The Way the Truth the Life*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1897. 219 pp.
Humphry, William Gilson (1815-1886). *A Word on the Revised Version of the New Testament*. 1881.
Hutton, Edward Ardron (1870-1963). *An Atlas of Textual Criticism: being an attempt to show the mutual relationship of the authorities for the text of the New Testament up to about 1000 A.D.* London: Cambridge University Press, 1911. 125 pp.
James, Fleming, and Charles B. Hedriuck, Burton Scott Easton, and Frederick C. Grant. *The Beginnings of Our Religion*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934. 170 pp.
Judd, O.B. *Revision or no Revision, and Address before the Philadelphia Bible Union*. New York: Pamphlet in the Partee Center Archives, William Jewell College, Liberty, MO, 1853.
Kennedy, Benjamin Hall (1804-1889). *Ely Lectures of the Revised Version of the New Testament: with an appendix containing the chief textual changes*. London: Richard Bentley, 1882. 165 pp.
Kenyon, Frederic George (1863-1952). *The Bible and Modern Scholarship*. London: John Murray, 1948. 53 pp.
———. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Description and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible.* 1933.
———. *The Evidence of the Papyri with Regard to Textual Criticism*. 1904
———. *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1912, 2nd ed. 1951. 381 pp.
———. *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1895, 1951 reprint of the 1939 4th ed. 255 pp.

———. *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible*. Oxford: Humphrey Milford and Oxford University Press, 1932. 119 pp.
———. *The Text of the Greek Bible*. Third ed. revised and augmented by A.W. Adams. London: Duckworth, 1936, 3rd ed. 1975. 275 pp.
Klign, Albertus F.J. *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts*: Part 1. Utrecht, 1948.
———. *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts; part two 1949-1969*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969.
Kummel, Werner G. *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of Its Problems*. Trans. By S. McLean Gilmore and Howard C. Kee. Nashville: Abingdon, 1972.
Kutilek, Douglas. *Erasmus, His Greek Text, and His Theology*. Hatfield, Penn.: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1995. 22 pp.
———. *Westcott & Hort vs. Textus Receptus: Which Is Superior?* Hatfield, Penn.: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1996. 12 pp.
Ladd, George Eldon. *The New Testament and Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967. 222 pp.
Lake, Kirsopp (1872-1946). *The Text of the New Testament*. London: Rivingtons, 1900, 6th ed. rev. by Silva New, 1949. 104 pp.
Lamsa, George Mamishisho (1893-1975). *The Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Manuscripts; containing the Old and New Testaments translated from the Peshitta, the authorized Bible of the church of the East*. Philadelphia: A.J. Holman, 1957. 1243 pp.
———. *Old Testament Light: a Scriptural Commentary Based on the Aramaic of the Ancient Peshitta Text*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985. 976 pp.
Larson, Mildred. *A Manual for Problem Solving in Bible Translation*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975. 245 pp.
Lerson, Henry. *Notes on the Amended English Bible with Special Reference to Certain Texts in the Revised Version of the Old and New Testaments Bearing upon the Principles of Unitarian Christianity*. (written by a Unitarian, showing that the textual changes in the ERV support his doctrine) 1887. 188 pp.
Lewis, Jack Pearl (1919-). *The English Bible from KJV to NIV: a History and Evaluation*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981, 2nd ed. 1991. 408 pp.
Lightfoot, Joseph Barber (1828-1889). *On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*. London: MacMillan, 1871, 3rd ed. 1891. 342 pp.
———, and Richard Chenevix Trench (1807-1886), and Charles John Ellicott (1819-1905). *The Revision of the English Version of the New Testament: with an introduction by Philip Schaff*. New York: Harper & Row, 1873. 615 pp. Includes On a fresh revision of the English New Testament by J.B. Lightfoot; On the Authorized Version of the New Testament in connection with some recent proposals for its revision by R.C. Trench; Considerations on the revision of the English version of the New Testament by C.J. Ellicott.
M'Clymont, James Alexander (1848-). *New Testament Criticism Its History and Results*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913. 363 pp.
Marsh, Herbert (1757-1839). *Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible*. 1810.
Metzger, Bruce Manning (1914-2007). *Breaking the Code: Understanding the Book of Revelation*. Nashville: Abington Press, 1993. 143 pp.
———. *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963. 164 pp.
———. *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977. 498 pp.
———. "The Evidence of the Versions for the Text of the New Testament," *New Testament Manuscript Studies* edited by Merrill Parvis and Allen Wikgren. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950. pp. 25-68.
———, and Robert Dentan (1907-), and Walter J. Harrelson. *The Making of the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1991. 92 pp.
———. *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Palaeography*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981. Corrected edition, 1991. 150 pp.
———, and Herbert May. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible, Revised Standard Version*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973. 1564 pp.

——— and Eldon Epp, and Gordon Fee. *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis: essays in honour of Bruce M. Metzger*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981. 410 pp.
———. *The New Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965.
———. *Reminiscences of an Octogenarian*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997. 242 pp.
———. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968. 284 pp.
———. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1971, 2nd ed. 1994. 696 pp.
Miller, Edward (1825-1901), and William Sanday (1843-1920). *The Oxford Debate on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. 1897. 59 pp.
———. *Oxford Debate on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament: held at New College on May 6, 1897: with a preface explanatory of the rival systems*. London: George Bell, 1897. 43 pp.
Miller, Herbert Sumner (1867-). *General Biblical Introduction: From God to Us*. Houghton, NY: The Word-Bearer Press, 1937. 414 pp.
Milligan, George (1860-1934). *The Expository Value of the Revised Version*. 1917.
Moffatt, James (1870-1944). *The Approach to the New Testament*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1921. 240 pp.
———. *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925. 659 pp.
Mount Calvary Baptist Church. *Trusted Voices on Translations*. Greenville, SC: Mount Calvary Baptist Church, 2001. 12 pp.
Murray, John Owen Farquhar (1858-1944). "Textual Criticism of the New Testament." *A Dictionary of the Bible*. Ed. James Hastings. Supplement. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905. pp. 208-236.
Nestle, Eberhard (1851-1913). *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1901. 351 pp.
———, and Kurt Aland. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Stuttgart: Bibelanstalt, n.d. 671 pp.
Newman, Barclay M. *Creating and Crafting the Contemporary English Version: A New Approach to Bible Translation*. New York: American Bible Society, 1996. 98 pp.
Newth, Samuel (1821-1898). *Lectures on Bible Revision: with an appendix containing the prefaces to the chief historical editions of the English Bible*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1881. 247 pp.
Nicholson, Edward Byron (1849-1912). *Our New New Testament: An Explanation of the Need and a Criticism of the Fulfilment*. London: Rivingtons, 1881. 80 pp.
Nida, Eugene Albert (1914-). *Bible Translating: An Analysis of Principles and Procedures, with Special Reference to Aboriginal Languages*. London: United Bible Societies, 1947, rev. ed. 1961. 351 pp.
———. *Customs and Cultures: Anthropology for Christian Missions*. New York: Harper & Row, 1954. 306 pp.
———. *God's Word in Man's Language*. New York: Harper & Row, 1952. 191 pp.
———. *Message and Mission: The Communication of the Christian Faith*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960. 253 pp.
———. *Religion Across Cultures: A Study in the Communication of the Christian Faith*. Pasedena, CA: William Carey Library, 1979. 111 pp.
———, and William Reyburn. *Meaning Across Cultures: a Study on Bible Translating*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, c. 1981. 90 pp.
———, and Charles Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Published for the United Bible Societies by E.J. Brill, 1974. 218 pp.
———, and Jan de Waard. *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1986. 224 pp.
Norris, Rick. *The Unbound Scriptures: A Review of KJV-Only Claims and Publications*. 2003. 544 pp.

Orchard, B., and T.R.W. Longstaff, ed. *J.J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*. Cambridge: University Press, 1978.
Orme, William (1787-1830). *Bibliotheca Biblica: a Select List of Books on Sacred Literature, with Notices Biographical, Critical, and Bibliographical*. London, 1824.
———, and Ezra Abbot (1819-1884). *Memoir of the Controversy Respecting the Three Heavenly Witnesses, I John v.7: including critical notices of the principal writers on both sides of the discussion*. New York: James Miller, 1866. 213 pp.
Osborne, William Alexander (1814-1891). *The Revised Version of the New Testament: a critical commentary with notes upon the text*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1882. 200 pp.
Parvis, Merrill M., and Allen Paul Wikgren (1906-1998). *New Testament Manuscript Studies: The Materials and the Making of a Critical Apparatus*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950. 152 pp.
Pells, Samuel Frederick. *Lectures on the Texts of the Bible and Our English Translations: with appendix, containing chapters on the Apocryphal books, and the defects of the common English Bible*. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent, 1911. 60 pp.
Perrin, Norman. *What Is Redaction Criticism?* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969. 86 pp.
Pirkel, Estus W. *The 1611 King James Bible*. Southaven, MS: The King's Press, 1994.
Price, James D. *King James Onlyism: A New Sect*. Singapore: Saik Wah Press, 2006. 658 pp.
Rice, John Richard (1895-1980). "Some Questions for King James Fans." *Sword of the Lord*, Murfreesboro, TN., March 30, 1979.
Riddle, Matthew Brown (1836-1916). *The Story of the Revised New Testament: American Standard Edition*. Philadelphia: The Sunday School Times Co., 1908. 89 pp.
Roberts, Alexander (1826-1901). *Companion to the Revised Version of the New Testament: explaining the reasons for the changes made on the Authorized Version, with supplement by a member of the American Committee of Revision*. New York: Cassell, Petter, Galpin and Co., 1881. 213 pp.
Robertson, Archibald Thomas (1863-1934). *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1925. 300 pp.
Robinson, Henry Wheeler (1872-1945). *The Bible in Its Ancient and English Versions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. 337p.
———. *The Old Testament: Its Making and Meaning*. New York, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1937. 247 pp.
Ryle, Herbert Edward (1856-1925). *The Canon of the Old Testament*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1892. 316 pp.
Salmon, George (1819-1904). *A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament*. New York: E. And J.B. Young and Co., 4th ed. 1889.
———. *Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. London: John Murray, 1897. 161 pp.
Schaff, Philip (1819-1893). *Anglo-American Bible Revision: by members of the American Revision Committee*. New York: American Sunday-School Union, 1879. 192 pp. Includes "The English Bible as a classic" by Talbot W. Chambers, and "True conservatism in respect to changes in the English and Greek text" by Timothy Dwight.
———. *A Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Version*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1883. 616 pp.
Selwyn, William (1806-1875). *Notes on the Proposed Amendment of the Authorized Version*. 1856.
Sharpe, Granville. *Critical Notes on the Authorized Version of the New Testament*. London, 1856.
Simon, Richard. *A Critical History of the Text of the New Testament*; wherein is firmly established the truth of those acts on which the foundation of Christian religion is laid. 1689. 369 pp.
Skeat, Theodore Cressy. *The Collected Biblical Writings of T.C. Skeat*. Edited by James Keith Elliott (1943-). Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2004. 299 pp.
Skeat, William W., and H. Milne. *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus*. 1938.
Smith, George Vance (1816-1902). *The Bible and Its Theology: a review, comparison, and re-statement: with special reference to certain Bampton lectures and recent works on atonement and inspiration*. London: Longmans, Green, 1871. 5th ed. 1901. 331 pp.

———. *The Bible in Convocation*: being York Letters on Revision, with introductory statement and other additions. London: 1870. [35 pp.]
———. "Christianity: What It Is Not, and What It Is," chapter 9 of *Christianity and Modern Thought*. American Unitarian Association: Boston, 1873. Other authors are Henry W. Bellows, James Freeman Clarke, Athanase Coquerel, Orville Dewey, Charles Carroll Everett, Frederic Henry Hedge, James Martineau, Andrew pp. Peabody, Oliver Stearns.
———.*English Orthodoxy, as It Is and As It Might Be*: The established church; congregationism; Wesleyan Methodism; Christian Faith, and its relation to the Mosaic history. Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts and Green: London, 1863. [83 pp.]
———. "Eternal Punishment," chapter 3 of *The Religion and Theology of Unitarians*. British and Foreign Unitarian Association: London, 1906. Other authors are J.E. Manning, William Gaskell, Charles Hargrove, John Dendy, W.G. Tarrant, J.T. Sunderland, J. Page Hopps, Brooke Herford, Stopford A. Brooke, W. Copeland Bowie, and J.G. Whittier.
———. *A Reviser on the New Revision*. London, 1881.
———. *Texts and Margins of the Revised New Testament Affecting Theological Doctrine Briefly Reviewed.* British & Foreign Unitarian Association: London, 1881. 51 pp.
———. *The Word Made Flesh in Jesus Christ*: A tract for Bible readers. British and Foreign Unitarian Association, London: 1877. [7 pp.]
Smyth, John Paterson (1852-1932). *The Bible in the Making*. New York: J. Pott. and Co., 1914. 219 pp.
———. *How We Got Our Bible*. New York: James Pott & Co., 1899, rev. Ed. 1912. 153 pp.
———. *The Old Documents and the New Bible*. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1890. 216 pp.
Soden, Hermann von (1852-1914). *Books of the New Testament: Contributions to Early Literature*. Trans. by J.R. Wilkinson. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1907. 476 pp.
Soulen, Richard N. *Handbook of Biblical Criticism*. John Knox Press, 1978. 191 pp.
Souter, Alexander (1873-1949). *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*. Revised by C.S.C. Williams. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1913, 2nd ed. 1960. 254 pp.
———. *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912. 254 pp.
Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study in Origins; Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship and Dates*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1951. 624 pp.
Sumner, Robert L. *Bible Translations*. Murfreesboro, TN: Sword of the Lord, 1979. 30 pp.
Swift, Jonathan (1667-1745). *A Proposal for Correcting, Improving, and Ascertaining the English Tongue*, in a Letter to the Most Honourable Robert Earl of Oxford and Mortimer, Lord High Treasurer of Great Britain. London: Printed from Benjamin Tooke, at the Middle Temple Gate, Fleetstreet, 1712.
Thiessen, Henry Clarence. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955.
———. *Introductory Lectures in Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949. 574 pp.
Thorton, S. *The Revised Version of the Bible: Our Duty in Regard to It*. 1902.
Tischendorf, Constantine von (1815-1874). *A Lecture on the Historic Evidence of the Authorship and Transmission of the Books of the New Testament*. London, 1852.
———. *Origin of the Four Gospels*. Translated by William L. Gage from the fourth German edition. Boston: American Tract Society, c1867. 287 pp.
———. *When Were Our Gospels Written*: *with a narrative of the discovery of the Sinaitic manuscript*. Translated by the Religious Tract Society, London. New York: American Tract Society, 1866. 132 pp.
Tregelles, Samuel Prideaux (1913-1875). *An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament*. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1864. 274 pp.
———. *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. London: Longman, Green, et al., 1856.
———. *A Lecture on the Historic Evidence of the Authorship and Transmission of the Books of the New Testament: a lecture delivered before the Plymouth Young Men's Christian Association, October 14th, 1851*. London: Samuel Bagster, 1881. 120 pp.

Trench, Richard Chenevix (1807-1886). *On the Authorized Version of the New Testament: in connection with some recent proposals for its revision*. London: John W. Parker and Son, 1819, 2nd ed. 1859. 224 pp.
Tucker, Gene M. *Form Criticism of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971. 84 pp.
Vaganay, Leon (1882-). *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Translated by B.V. Miller. London: Sands & Co., 1937. 208 pp.
Vincent, Marvin Richardson (1834-1922). *A History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1899. 185 pp.
Voobus, Arthur (1909-1988). *Early Versions of the New Testament*. Stockholm: Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 1954. 411 pp.
———. *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*. A Contribution to the History of Culture in the Near East, I. Louvain, Belgique: Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium.
Wallace, John Sherman (1877-1934). *The Old Testament, an introductory study: an elective course for use by Sunday Schools and leadership*. rev. and enl. by William A. Irwin. Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1940. 142 pp.
Wegner, Paul D. *The Journey from Texts to Translations: The Origin and Development of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1999. 462 pp.
Weiser, Artur (1893-). *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*. Trans. By Dorothea M. Barton. Published in England under the title *Introduction to the Old Testament*. New York: Association Press, 1961. 492 pp.
Walters, pp. *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendation*. edited by D.W. Gooding. Cambridge: University Press, 1973.
Warfield, Benjamin Breckinridge (1851-1921). *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. 7th edition, 1907. 231 pp.
Weigle, Luther Allen (1880-1968). ed. *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament*. New York: International Council of Religious Education, 1946. 72 pp.
———. ed. *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament*. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1952. 92 pp.
Westcott, Brooke Foss (1825-1901). *The Apocalypse of St. John I-III: The Greek Text with Introduction, Commentary, and Additional Notes*. Minneapolis: James & Klock Publishing Co., 1976 reprint of the 1908 Macmillan edition. 48 pp.
———. *The Bible in the Church: a popular account of the collection and reception of the Holy Scriptures in the Christian churches*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979 reprint of 1894 Macmillan edition. 316 pp.
———. *Christus Consummator: Some Aspects of the Work and Person of Christ in Relation to Modern Thought*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1886.
———. *Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974 edition of the 1892 MacMillan Company edition. 504 pp.
———. *The Epistles of St. John: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays*. New introduction by F.F. Bruce, "Johannine Studies since Westcott's Day." Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966. 245 pp.
———. *Essays in the History of Religious Thought in the West.* London: MacMillan and Co., 1891. 397 pp.
———. *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament.* Cambridge: MacMillan, 1875. 587 pp.
———. *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament.* Cambridge: MacMillan, 6th ed. 1889. 593 pp.
———. *A General View of the History of the English Bible*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1871. 359 pp.
———. *A General View of the History of the English Bible*. London: The MacMillan Co., 1st ed. 1868, 3rd ed. rev. by William Aldis Wright 1905. 356 pp.
———. *The Gospel according to St. John*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975 reprint of the 1881 original. 307 pp.
———. *The Gospel of Life: Thoughts Introductory to the Study of Christian Doctrine*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1895. 306 pp.

———. *The Gospel of Life: Thoughts Introductory to the Study of Christian Doctrine*. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1906. 112 pp.
———. *The Gospel of the Resurrection: Thoughts on Its Relation to Reason and History*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1902. 261 pp.
———. *An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*. London: MacMillan and Co., 5th ed. 1875. 486 pp.
———, and Fenton John Anthony Hort. *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1914. 617 pp.
———, and Fenton John Anthony Hort. *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. New York: American Book Company, n.d. 603 pp.
———. *On the Canon of the New Testament*. New York: The MacMillan Co., 7th ed. 1896.
———. *Religious Thought in the West*. London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1891. 397 pp.
———. *The Revelation of the Father: Short Lectures on the Titles of the Lord in the Gospel of St. John*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1887. 188 pp.
———. *The Revelation of the Risen Lord*. London, Cambridge: MacMillan and Co., 2nd ed. 1882. 199 pp.
———. *Some Lessons on the Revised Version of the New Testament*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1898. 239 pp.
———. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: The Greek Text with Notes and Addenda*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1906. 212 pp.
———. *Study of the Gospels*. London: Macmillan, 5th ed. 1875.
———. *Words of Faith and Hope*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1902. 212 pp.
———, and Fenton John Anthony Hort. *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1882, reprint by Hendrickson Publishers, 1988. 512 pp.
———, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1925.
White, James Robert (1962-). *The King James Only Controversy: Can You Trust the Modern Translations?* Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House Publishers, 1995. 286 pp.
Wikgren, Allen Paul (1906-1998), with Ernest Cadman Colwell and Ralph Marcus. *Hellenistic Greek Texts*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1947. 277 pp.
———. *Early Christian Origins*: *Studies in Honor of Harold R. Willoughby*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961.
Williams, James B., ed. *From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man: A layman's guide to how we got our Bible*. Greenville, SC: Ambassador-Emerald International, 1999. 231 pp.
Wisdom, Thurman. *Light on the Bible Text Debate*. Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1984. 9 pp.
Wisselink, W.F. *Assimilation as a Criterion for the Establishment of the Text*. 4 vol. Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij J.H. Kok, 1989.
Young, Robert (1822-1888). *Contributions to a New Revision or a Critical Companion to the New Testament*. Edinburgh: G.A. Young, 1881. 390 pp.
Zahn, Theodor (1838-1933). *Introduction to the New Testament*. Trans. by M.W. Jacobus. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.
Zuntz, Gunther (1902-). *The Text of the Epistles*. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

History and Miscellaneous Titles Touching on Bible Texts and Versions

Most of the following volumes are sympathetic to the critical text and the modern versions. Since they are not written expressly to support the same, they are not included in the previous section. Some of these titles contain material that supports the TR and the KJV in certain narrow applications, but as the authors are not generally supporters of the same, they are not included in the first section of the bibliography. Again, it has been difficult to determine into exactly which division to place some material.

Allen, Ward (1922-). *Translating for King James: Being a True Copy of the Only Notes Made by a Translator of King James's Bible, The Authorized Version, as the Final Committee of Review*

Revised the Translation of Romans through Revelation at Stationers' Hall in London in 1610-1611: Taken by The Reverend John Bois. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1969. 155 pp.
———. *Translating the New Testament Epistles 1604-1611: A Manuscript from King James's Westminster Company* [Lambeth MS 98]. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Books on Demand, 1977, 2005. 319 pp.
———, and Edward C. Jacobus. *The Coming of the King James Gospels: A Collation of the Translators' Work-in-Progress*. Fayetteville, 1995.
———, and Edward C. Jacobus. *The Coming of the King James Gospels: A Collation of the Translators' Work-in-Progress*. Fayetteville, AR: The University of Arkansas Press, 1995. 420 pp.
Anderson, Christopher (1782-1852). *The Annals of the English Bible*. London: William Pickering, 1845. 2 vol. 1330 pp.
———. *A Brief Sketch of Various Attempts Which Have Been Made to Diffuse the Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures through the Medium of the Irish Language*. Dublin: Graisberry and Campbell, 1818. 159 pp.
Avi-Yonah, Michael. *Ancient Scrolls: Introduction to Archaeology*. Herzlia, Israel: The Jerusalem Publishing House, 1994. 80 pp.
Ayers, Samuel Gardiner, and Charles Fremont Sitterly (1861-1945), and Henry Mitchell MacCracken (1840-1918). *The History of the English Bible: Studied by The Library Method*. New York: Wilbur B. Ketcham, c1898. 127 pp.
Backhouse, Janet. *The Lindisfarne Gospels*. London: Phaidon Press Limited, 1981. 96 pp.
Bacon, Benjamin Wisner (1860-1932). *The Making of the New Testament*. New York: Henry Holt., 1912. 256 pp.
Baikie, James (1866-1931). *The English Bible and Its Story: Its Growth, Its Translators and Their Adventures*. London: Seeley, Service & Co., 1928. 318 pp.
———. *The Romance of the Bible*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, n.d.
Bailey, Lloyd R. ed. (1936-). *The Word of God: a Guide to English Versions of the Bible*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982. 228 pp.
Balg, G.H. *The First Germanic Bible Translated from the Greek by the Gothic Bishop Wulfila in the Fourth Century and the other Remains of the Gothic Language*. 1891.
Barlow, William. *The Sum and Substance of the Conference, which, it pleased his Excellent Majestie to have with the Lords, bishops, and other of his Clergie, (at which the most of the Lordes of the Councell were present) in his Majesties Privy-Chamber, at Hampton Court. January 14, 1604.* (written by the Dean of Chester, who went on to become one of the KJV translators). 1604. 114 pp.
Barker, Henry (1837-1909). *English Bible Versions: a tercentenary memorial of the King James Version, with special reference to the Vulgate, the Douay and the Authorized and Revised Versions*. New York: Limited edition issued for the New York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society by Edwin S. Gorham, 1911. 375 pp.
Barnes, Lemuel Call. *Pioneers of Light: The First Century of the American Baptist Publication Society 1824-1924*. Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society, n.d. 454 pp.
Bateman, Charles T. *The Romance of the Bible*. London: S. W. Partridge, 1903. 319 pp.
Bayly, Mary. *The Story of Our English Bible and What It Cost*. London: James Nisbet, c1886. 228 pp.
Beale, David (1944-). *A Pictorial History of Our English Bible*. Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1982.
Beardslee, John Walter (1837-1921). *The Bible Among the Nations: a Study of the Great Translations*. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1899. 226 pp.
Beekman, John, and John Callow. *Translating the Word of God with Scripture and Topical Indexes*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974. [Brian purchased 03/2005]
Biller, Peter. *Heresy and Literacy 1000-1530* (Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature.
Bissell, Edwin Cone (1832-1894), and Roswell Dwight (1817-1887). *The Historic Origin of the Bible: a handbook of principal facts from the best recent authorities, German and English*. New York: Anson D.F. Randolph & Company, 1873. 432 pp.
Blunt, John Henry (1823-1884). *A Plain Account of the English Bible from the Earliest Times of Its Translation to the Present Day*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1870.

Bobrick, Benson. *The Making of the English Bible*. London: Phoenix, 2003. 376 pp.
———. *Wide as the Waters: The Story of the English Bible and the Revolution It Inspired*. New York: Penguin Books, 2002. 379 pp.
Bonner, Carey. *The Romance of the Bible. In Our Mother Tongue*. London: The National Sunday School Union, n.d. 122 pp.
Borrow, Goerge. *The Bible in Spain*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1961. 510 pp.
Bosworth, Joseph. *The Gospels Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, Wycliffe and Tyndale Versions*. London: Gibbings and Company in London, 1907.
British and Foreign Bible Society. *The Gospel in Many Tongues*. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1912. 110 pp.
———. *Our Heritage*. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1934. 120 pp.
Broughton, Hugh. *An Epistle to the Learned Nobilitie of England*, touching translating the Bible from the Original, with ancient warrant for everie worde, unto the full satisfaction of any that be of Hart. 1597. 60 pp.
Brown, John (1830-1922). *The History of the English Bible*. Cambridge: University Press, 1911. 136 pp.
Browne, George Forrest (1833-1930). *The History of the British and Foreign Bible Society, from its institution in 1804 to the close of its jubilee in 1854*. 2 vol. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1859. 1112 pp.
Bruce, Frederick Fyvie (1910-1990). *History of the Bible in English: from the earliest versions*. New York: Oxford University Press, 3rd ed. 1978. 274 pp.
———. *The King James Version: the First 350 Years, 1611-1961*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1960. 46 pp.
Burrows, Millar (1889-c1990). *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: The Viking Press, 1955. 435 pp.
Burkitt, Francis Crawford (1864-1935). *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906. 359 pp.
———. *The Old Latin and the Italia: Texts and Studies*. 1896, 1910. 150 pp.
Butterworth, Charles C. (1894-1957). *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible*. Philadephia, 1941.
Cambridge University Press. *Cambridge History of the Bible. Vol. 1 -- From the Beginnings to Jerome.* Edited by R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans. Cambridge: University Press, 1970. 649 pp.
———. Vol. 2 -- *The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*. Edited by G.W.H. Lampe. Cambridge: University Press, 1969. 566 pp.
———. Vol. 3 -- *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day*. Edited by S.L. Greenslade. Cambridge: University Press, 1963. 590 pp.
Canton, William (1845-1926). *The Bible and the Anglo-Saxon People*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1914. 284 pp.
Carpenter, Joseph Estlin (1844-1927). *The Bible in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Longmans, Green, 1903. 512 pp..
Champeneys, A.C.. *History of English: a sketch of the origin an development of the English language with examples, down to the present day*. London: Rivington, Percival & Co., 1893. 414 pp.
Charlesworth, James H. ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. New York: Doubleday, 1985. 1006 pp.
Coggan, Donald (1909-). *Word and World: The Story of the English Bible*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971. 160 pp.
Cook, Albert Stanburrough (1853-1927). *The Authorized Version of the Bible and Its Influence*. New York: G.P. Putnam, 1910. 80 pp.
Conant, Hannah Chaplin (1809-1865). *The English Bible*: *History of the Translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue, with specimens of the Old English Versions*. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co., 1856. 466 pp.
———. *Popular History of the Translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue: with Specimens of the Old English Versions*. New York: I.K. Funk and Co., 1881. 284 pp.
Condit, Blackford (1829-1903). *The History of the English Bible: extending from the earliest Saxon translations to the present Anglo-American revision*. New York: A.S. Barnes and Co., 1881, 2nd ed. 1896. 507 pp.

Conjurske, Glenn (1947-2001). “Archaic Language in the Bible,” *Olde Paths and Ancient Landmarks*. Rhinelander, WI, Vol. 1, No. 8, August 1992.
———. “The Golden Age of Christian Literature,” *Olde Paths and Ancient Landmarks*. Rhinelander, WI, Vol. 1, No. 8, August 1992.
———. “The Real Superiority of the King James Version,” *Olde Paths and Ancient Landmarks*. Vol. 1, No. 7, July 1992.
Cooper, Clayton Sedgwick (1869-1936). *The Bible and Modern Life*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1911. 208 pp.
Cotton, Henry (1789-1879). *Editions of the Bible and Parts thereof in English from the Year 1505 to 1850*. Oxford, 2nd ed. 1852. 420 pp.
Crane, Frank, ed. *The Lost Books of the Bible*. New York City: Alpha House, 1926. 293 pp.
Cruse, Amy (1870-). *The Englishman and His Books in the Early Nineteenth Century*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., London: G.G. Harrap, 1930. 300 pp.
Crystal, David. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995, 2004. 499 pp.
———. *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 2003. 212 pp.
Daiches, David (1912-). *The King James Version of the English Bible: An account of the development and sources of the English Bible of 1611 with special reference to the Hebrew Tradition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1941. 228 pp.
Daniell, David Scott (1929-). *The Bible in English: Its History and Influence*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003. 900 pp.
———. *Tyndale’s New Testament: a Modern-spelling Edition of the 1534 Translation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989. 429 pp.
———. *Tyndale’s Old Testament: a Modern-spelling Edition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991.
Darlow, Thomas Herbert (1858-1927). *The Greatest Book in the World*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1927. 243 pp.
———, and Handley Carr Glyn Moule (1841-1920). *Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society*. London, The Bible House, 1903. 500 pp.
Davies, A. Powell. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Mentor Books, 1956. 144 pp.
Deanesly, Margaret. *The Lollard Bible and Other Medieval Biblical Versions*. Cambridge: University Press, 1920. 483 pp.
DeHamel, Christopher. *The Book. A History of the Bible*. London: Praidon Press, 2001. 352 pp.
Dobschutz, Ernst von (1870-1934). *The Influence of the Bible on Civilization*. New York: Ungar, 1914, republished 1959. 190 pp.
Dore, John Read. *Old Bibles: an Account of the Early Versions of the English Bible*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 2nd ed. 1888. 395 pp.
Dowley, Tim (1946-), ed., and John Briggs, and Robert Linder, and David Wright. *The History of Christianity*. Herts, England: Lion Publishing, 1977. 656 pp.
Dwight, Henry Otis. *The Centennial History of the American Bible Society*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1916. 605 pp.
Eadie, John (1801-1876). *The English Bible: An External and Critical History of the Various English Translations of Scripture: with remarks on the need of revising the English New Testament*. 2 vol. London: MacMillan, 1876. 944 pp.
Edgar, Andrew (1831-1890). *The Bibles of England: a Plain Account for Plain People of the Principal Versions of the Bible in English*. London: Alexander Gardner, 1889. 403 pp.
Ehlert, Arnold Douglas (1909-). “The Darby Translations.” Chapter 11.1 of R.A. Huebner’s *Precious Truths Revived and Defended through J.N. Darby: Volume Three, Defense of Truth 1858-1867*. Morganville, NJ: Present Truth Publishers, 1995.
Evans, Gillian R. *The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Earlier Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. 199 pp.
Evans, William (1870-1950). *The Book of Books: What It Is; How to Study It*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1902. 222 pp.

Ewert, David (1922-). *From Ancient Tablets to Modern Translations: A General Introduction to the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 1983. 284 pp.
Fant, David. *The Bible in New York: The Romance of the Scripture Distribution in a World Metropolis from 1809 to 1948*. New York: Bible Society, 1948. 165 pp.
Farrar, Frederic William (1831-1903). *The Bible: Its Meaning and Supremacy*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1897. 359 pp.
Frank, Harry Thomas, and Charles William Swain, and Courtlandt Canby. *The Bible Through the Ages*. New York: World Publishing, 1967. 246 pp.
Friedrichsen, G.W.S. *The Gothic Version of the Gospels: A Study of Its Style and Textual History*.
Gardiner, John Hays (1863-1913). *The Bible as English Literature*. New York: Charles Scribner, 1906. 402 pp.
Geisler, Norman L., and William E. Nix. *From God to Us: How We Got Our Bible*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1974. 255 pp.
Gibson, Fred. *The Romance of the Bible in Ireland*. Irish Mission, c. 1950. 40 pp.
Gilly, William Stephen. *The Romaunt Version of the Gospel according to John*, from MS. preserved in Trinity College, Dublin, and in the Bibliotheque du Roi, Paris. London, 1848.
Gilmore, Albert Field (1868-1943). *The Bible: Beacon Light of History*. Boston, Chicago: Associated Authors, 1935. 270 pp.
Gladden, Washington. *Who Wrote the Bible? A Book for the People*. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1891. 381 pp.
Goodspeed, Edgar Johnson (1871-1962). *The Making of the English New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925. 129 pp.
Graham, Henry G. *Where We Got the Bible: Our Debt to the Catholic Church*. Rockford, IL: Tan books, 1911, 1987. 154 pp.
Grierson, Herbert John Clifford (1866-1960). *The English Bible*. London: Collins, 1947. 48 pp.
Guppy, Henry A. (1861-1948). *A Brief Sketch of the History of the Transmission of the Bible Down to the Revised English Version of 1881-85*. Manchester: The University Press, London, NY: Longmans, Green and Co., 1926. 75 pp. (Guppy was the librarian of the John Rylands Library at the University of Manchester.)
———. *Catalogue of an Exhibition of Manuscript and Printed Copies of the Scriptures, illustrating the History of the Transmission of the Bible down to the Revised English Version of 1881-85*. Manchester: University Press, 1911. 128 pp.
Hamel, Christopher de. See DeHamel, Christopher.
Hammond, Gerald (1926-). *The Making of the English Bible*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1983. 249 pp.
Harrison, John Clement (1913-1989). *Five Hundred Years of the Printed Bible: an address delivered on December 6, 1962, in the Hunt Botanical Library, Pittsburgh*. Pittsburgh: The Pitttsburgh Bibliophiles, 1964. 24 pp.
Heaton, William James (1845-). *The Bible of the Reformation: Its Translators and Their Work*. London: Francis Griffiths, 1914. 285 pp.
———. *Our English Bible: Its Translators and Their Work*. London: Francis Griffiths, 1905. 307 pp.
———. *The Puritan Bible and Other Contemporaneous Protestant Versions*. London: Francis Griffiths, 1913. 345 pp.
Hemphill, Samuel (1859-1927). A *History of the Revised Version of the New Testament*. London: Elliot Stock, 1906. 144 pp.
Henslow, G. *The Vulgate: The Source of False Doctrines*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1909. 152 pp.
Herbert, A.S. *Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of the English Bible 1525-1961*. Revised and expanded from the edition of T.H. Darlow and H.F. Moule, 1903. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1968. 549 pp.
Hill, Christopher. *The English Bible in the Seventeenth-Century Revolution*. London: Penguin Books, 1994. 466 pp.
Hills, Margaret Thorndike (1898-). ed. *The English Bible in America: a Bibliography of Editions of the Bible and the New Testament Published in America 1777-1957*. New York: American Bible Society and the New York Public Library, 1961, reprinted w/corrections and revisions 1962. 475 pp.

Hinds, Samuel. *Scripture and the Authorized Version of Scripture*. London: B. Fellowes, 1845, 2d ed. 1853.
Hoare, Henry William (1844-). *Our English Bible: The Story of Its Origin and Growth*. (11th ed. of *The Evolution of the English Bible*: *an Historical Sketch of the Successive Versions from 1382 to 1885,* 1901.) New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., 1901. 2nd ed. 1902. 336 pp.
Hollis, Gertrude. *Romance of the Bible*. Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., n.d. 243 pp.
Houghton, Sidney Maurice. *Sketches from Church History: An Illustrated Account of 20 Centuries of Christ's Power*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1980. 256 pp.
Hudson, Anne. *Lollards and Their Books*. 1985.
———. *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988. 556 pp.
———, ed. *Selections from English Wycliffite Writings*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997. 235 pp.
———, ed. *The Works of a Lollard Preacher*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. 397 pp.
———, and Pamela Gradon, editors. *English Wycliffite Sermons*. 5 volumes.
Hunting, Harold Bruce (1879-1958). *The Story of Our Bible*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915. 385 pp.
Inge, William Ralph (1860-1954). *Our English Bible, being the White Lectures for 1938, by various contributors: with a foreword by the Archdeacon of London*. London, NY: Longmans, Green and Co., 1938. 88 pp.
Jacobus, Melancthon Williams (1816-1876). *Roman Catholic and Protestant Bibles Compared*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905. 2nd ed. 1908, 361 pp.
Joseph, Oscar Loos (1873-1938) ed. *The Influence of the English Bible upon the English Language and upon English and American Literature*. New York: National Commemoration Committee, 1935.
Kennett, Robert Hatch (1864-1932*). In Our Tongues: Some Thoughts for Readers of the English Bible*. London: Edward Arnold, 1907. 166 pp.
Kenyon, Frederic George (1863-1952). *The Story of the Bible*: a *Popular Account of How It Came to Us*. London: John Murray, 1936. 159 pp.
King, Marchant A. "Should Conservatives Abandon Textual Criticism?" *Bibliotheca Sacra*. vol. 130 (January-March, 1973), pp. 35-40.
Kingston, C. J. E. *Romance of the Bible: How the Scriptures Were Given*. London: Pickering & Inglis, 1938. 125 pp.
Kling, David William (1950-). *The Bible in History: How the Texts Have Shaped the Times*. Oxford: University Press, 2004. 389 pp.
Knox, James W. *The History of the Holy Bible in the United States of America*. Vol. 1. "The Roman Catholic Church in Florida, New Mexico and Arizona 1492-1600." Deland, FL: James Knox, 1998. 55 pp.
———. *The History of the Holy Bible in the United States of America*. Vol. 2. "The Roman Catholic Church in the Great Lakes Region and the Mississippi Valley 1523-1724." Deland, FL: James Knox, 2000. 100 pp.
Kohlenberger, John R. III (1951-). *The NIV Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament*, 1979.
Lea, John William (1870-). *The Book of Books and Its Wonderful Story*. Philadelphia: John W. Lea, 1922. 351 pp.
Leach. Charles (1847-). *Is My Bible True? Where Did We Get It*? Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1897. 119 pp.
Levett, Richard (1897-1917). *The Printed English Bible*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 5th ed. 1894.
Levi, Peter (1931-). *The English Bible 1534 to 1859*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974. 222 pp.
Lewis, Frank Grant (1865-1945). *How the Bible Grew*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1919.
Lewis, John (1675-1747). *A Complete History of the Several Translations of the Holy Bible and New Testament into English,* both in ms. and in print, and of the most remarkable editions of them since the invention of printing, to which is added a list of various editions of the Bible, and parts thereof, in English, from the year 1526 to the present time, extracted from Bishop

Newcome's Historical View of English Biblical Translations. London: 1741, 3rd edition printed by W. Baynes, 1818. 420 pp.
Lewis, Lupton. *History of the Geneva Bible. Vol. XIX - Tyndale the Martyr*. London: The Olive Tree, 1987. 160 pp.
Lightfoot, Joseph Barber (1829-1889) and John Reginald Harmer (1857-). *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations of Their Writings*. London: MacMillan and Company, 1891. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956, 2nd ed. 1992. 609 pp.
Lightfoot, Neil Roland (1929-). *How We Got the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1963, 2nd ed., 1988. 167 pp.
Llewelyn, Thomas. *History of the Welsh Versions*.
Loftie, William John (1839-1911). *A Century of Bibles of the Authorised Version from 1611 to 1711*. London, 1872. 249 pp.
Lovett, Richard (1851-1904). *The Printed English Bible, 1525-1885*. London: Religious Tract Society, 1894. 160 pp.
Lupton, Joseph Hirst (1836-1905). "Versions - English." *a Dictionary of the Bible*. Ed. James Hastings. Extra volume. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905. pp. 236-271.
McCaig, A. *The Grand Old Book, being Lectures on Inspiration and the Higher Criticism*. London and Chicago: Russian Missionary Society, 1923.
MacGregor, Geddes. *The Bible in the Making*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1959. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982. 310 pp.
——— *A Literary History of the Bible: from the Middle Ages to the Present Day*. Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1968. 400 pp.
Malless, Stanley, and Jeffrey McQuain. *Coined By God: Words and Phrases That First Appear in English Translations of the Bible*. New York and London: W.W. Norton and Company, 2003. 221 pp.
Margolis, Max Leopold (1866-1932). *The Story of the Bible Translations*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1917.
Marsh, George Perkins (1801-1882). *The English Language and Its Early Literature*. 1862.
———. *Lectures on the English Language*. New York: C. Scribner and Sons, 1860. 796 pp.
———. *The Origin and History of the English Language and of the Literature It Embodies*. London, NY: C. Scribner's Sons, 1862, rev. ed. 1898. 574 pp.
Marsh, Herbert (1757-1839). *A History of Translations*. London, 1812.
Marshall, Edward A. *The Romance of the Bible: Reading During the Inquisition*. Kalamazoo, MI: The Tract Evangel Society, 1935. 48p.
May, Herbert Gordon (1904- *). Our English Bible in the Making: The Word of Life in Living Language*. Philadelphia: Published for the Cooperative Publication Assn. By the Westminster Press, 1952. 154 pp.
McClure, James G.K. *The Supreme Book of Mankind: The Origin and Influence of the English Bible*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930. 227 pp.
McComb, Samuel (1864-1938). *The Making of the English Bible*. New York: Moffatt, Yard and Co., 1909. 187 pp.
McCrum, Robert, and William Cran, and Robert MacNeil. *The Story of English*. New York: Elisabeth Sifton Books, Viking, 1986. 384 pp.
McGrath, Alister (1953-). *In the Beginning: The Story of the King James Bible and How It Changed a Nation, a Language, and a Culture*. New York: Anchor Books, 2001. 338 pp.
McNally, Robert E. *The Bible in the Early Middle Ages*. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1959. 121 pp.
McNeile, A.H. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Oxford, 2nd ed. 1953.
Middleton, Thomas Fanshaw (1762-1822). *The Doctrine of the Greek article Applied to the criticism and illustration of the New Testament*. London & Cambridge: J. G. F. & J. Rivington and J. & J.J. Deighton, 1841
Miller, Herbert Sumner (1867-). *General Biblical Introduction: From God to Us*. Houghton, NY: The Word-Bearer Press, 1937. 414 pp.
Milligan, George (1860-1934). *Catalogue of an Exhibition of Bibles: in commemoration of the tercentenary of the Authorized Version 1611-1911*. Glasgow, Scotland: J. Maclehose, 1911.
———. *The English Bible: a Sketch of Its History*. New York: A.D. F. Randolph and Co., 1895. 137 pp.

———. *The New Testament and Its Transmission*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1932. 204 pp.
———. *The Words of the New Testament, as Altered by Transmission and Ascertained by Modern Criticism.* Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1873. 262 pp.
Mombert, Jacob Isidor (1858-1944). *English Versions of the Bible*: *a Handbook*. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, new and enl. ed., 1906.
Moon, George Washington (1823-1909). *The King's English*. London: Hatchards, 1881. 175 pp.
———. *The Bishops English: a series of criticisms on the Right Reverend Bishop Thornton's laudation of the Revised Version of the Scriptures, and also on the English of the Revisers, showing that the version put forth by them, and likewise the Authorized Version, contain errors against religion and morals so unpardonable as totally to unfit them for circulation, and that it is slandering God to call either of them His Word.* London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1904.
Moule, Charles Francis Digby (1908-). "The Shaping of the New Testament." *The Bible Today*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955. pp. 121-126.
Moynahan, Brian (1941-). *God's Bestseller: William Tyndale, Thomas More, and the Writing of the English Bible---A Story of Martyrdom and Betrayal*. New York: St. Martin's Press. 2002. 422 pp.
Moulton, William Fiddian (1835-1898). *The History of the English Bible*. London: Cassell Petter & Galpin, 2nd ed. 1878. 252 pp.
———. *William F. Moulton: a Memoir, with a chapter on biblical work and opinions by James Hope Moulton*. London: Isbister, 1899. 295 pp.
Nelson, Lawrence Emerson (1893-1978). *Our Roving Bible: Tracking Its Influence through English and American Life*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1945. 318 pp.
Newcome, William (1729-1800). *An Historical View of the English Biblical Translations: the expedience of revising by authority our present translation*. Dublin, 1792.
Newton, A. Edward. *The Greatest Book in the World and Other Papers*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1925. 451 pp.
Nicholson, Adam. *God's Secretaries: The Making of the King James Bible*. New York: HarperCollins, 2003. 281 pp.
Nida, Eugene Albert (1914-). ed. *The Book of a Thousand Tongues*. London: United Bible Societies, 1972. 536 pp. First ed. by Eric North in 1938.
Norlie, Olaf Morgan (1876-1962). *The Translated Bible 1534-1934: Commemorating the Four Hundredth Anniversary of the Translation of the Bible by Martin Luther*. Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1934. 222 pp.
Norton, David. *The History of the Bible as Literature*. Volume One: From Antiquity to 1700. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. 375 pp.
Opfell, Olba S. *The King James Bible Translators*. Jefferson, NC, and London: McFarland & Co., 1982. 173 pp.
Orlinsky, Harry M., and Robert G. Bratcher (1920-). *A History of Bible Translation and the North American Contribution*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991. 359 pp.
Osgood, Howard L. (1855-1909). *The References to the Versions in the British Revisers Compared with the Versions*. Rochester, NY: R.W. Lace, 1899. 74 pp.
Ottley, Richard Rusden. *A Handbook to the Septuagint*. Methuen & Co.: London, 1920. [296 pp.]
Parker, T.H.L. *Calvin's New Testament Commentaries*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1971. 208 pp.
Pattison, Thomas Howard (1838-1904). *The History of the English Bible*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1894. 281 pp.
Payson, Edward (1783-1827). *The Bible Above All Price*: a discourse delivered at Portland, May 5, 1814, before the Bible Society of Maine, at their annual meeting. Boston: Manning & Loring, & Cummings & Hilliard, 1814. 2nd ed. 24 pp.
Pelikan, Jeroslav. *Whose Bible Is It? A History of the Scriptures Through the Ages*. New York: Viking, 2005. 274 pp.
Pells, Samuel Frederick. *Lectures on the Texts of the Bible and Our English Translators*. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent, 1911. 60 pp.
Penniman, Josiah Harmar (1868-1941). *A Book about the English Bible*. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1919. 444 pp.
Peters, Edward. *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe: Documents in Translation* (Middle Ages).

Pfeifer, Charles F. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible*. New York: Weathervane Books, 1969. 148 pp.
Pick, Bernhard. *History of the Printer Editions of the Old Testament, together with a Description of the Rabbinic and Polyglot Bibles*. 1892-1893. 70 pp.
———.*The Vowel-Points Controversy in the XVI and XVII Centuries*. 1892. 24 pp.
Pollard, Alfred William (1859-1941). *Records of the English Bible: The Documents Relating to the Translation and Production of the Bible in English, 1525-1611*. London: Henry Frowde by Oxford University Press, 1911. 387 pp.
Pope, Hugh (1869-1946) and Sebastian Bullough. *English Versions of the Bible*. St. Louis, MO: B. Herder Book Co., 1952. 787 pp.
Price, Ira Maurice (1856-1939). *The Ancestry of Our English Bible: An Account of Manuscripts, Texts, and Versions of the Bible*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 9th ed., 1934. 350 pp.
———. *The Monuments of the Old Testament.* Judson Press, 18th ed., 1925.
Price, Warwick James (1870-). *The One Book: the Results of an Examination of the Sources of the Holy Bible, and a Survey of Its Growth*. Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Co., 1928. 259 pp.
Reumann, John. *The Romance of Bible Scripts and Scholars*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965. 248 pp.
Rice, Edwin Wilbur (1831-1929). *Our Sixty-six Sacred Books: Or How Our Bible Was Made*. Philadelphia: American Sunday-School Union. 1891. 222 pp.
Robertson, Edwin Hanton (1912-). *Makers of the English Bible*. Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 1990. 222 pp.
Robinson, George Livingston (1864-1958). *Where Did We Get Our Bible*? New York: Harper, 1928. 206 pp.
Robinson, Henry Wheeler (1872-1945). *The Bible in Its Ancient and English Versions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. 337p.
———. *Redemption and Revelation*. London: Nisbet and Co., 1942. 320 pp.
Rogerson, John W. *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Bible*. Oxford: University Press, 2001. 395 pp.
Rosenau, William. *Hebraisms in the Authorized Version of the Bible*. 1903. 283 pp.
Ryken, Leland. *The Word of God in English: Criteria for Excellence in Bible Translation*. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2002. 336 pp.
Samuel Bagster and Sons. *The Book and Its Story*; a narrative for the young, on occasion of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society: with an introductory preface, by the Rev. T. Phillips, Jubilee Secretary. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1855. 508 pp.
———. *An Historical Account of the English Translations*. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1841. 160 pp.
Scanlin, Harold. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Modern Translations of the Old Testament*. Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, 1993. 204 pp.
Scott, Walter (1838-1933). *The Story of Our English Bible: its various English translations, its separate books, writers, etc., with other Biblical information*. London: Alfred Holness, 1892. 206 pp.
Sedgwick, Sydney M. *The Romance of Precious Bibles*. London: Samuel Bagster, 1906. 292 pp.
Selden, John (1584-1654). *Table-Talk of John Selden*, edited by Frederick Pollock, together with an account of Selden and his work by the late Sir Edward Fry. London: 1927. 200 pp. (first published in 1689)
Shanks, Hershel, James Vanderkam, Kyle McCarter, and James Sanders. *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Forty Years*. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991. 85 pp.
Smalley, Beryl. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964. 406 pp.
Simms, Paris Marion (1874-). *The Bible from the Beginning*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1929. 318 pp.
———. *The Bible in America: Versions that Have Played Their Part in the Making of the Republic*. New York: Wilson-Erickson Inc., 1936. 394 pp.
Smith, George Barnett (1841-1909). *William Tyndale and the Translation of the English Bible*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, n.d.
Smith, Walter E. *The Great "She" Bible*. 1890. 31 pp.

Snowden, James H. *The Making and Meaning of the New Testament: Its Background, Books and Biographies*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930. 311 pp.
Stuart, Moses (1780-1852). *The Bible and the Versions of the Bible*. 1856.
———. *Critical History and Defence of the Old Testament Canon*. Andover: Allen, Morrill and Wardwell, 1845. 452 pp.
Stoughton, John (1807-1897). *Our English Bible: Its Translations and Translators*. London: Religious Tract Society, c1878. 310 pp.
Stevens, Daniel Gurden. *The First Hundred Years of the American Baptist Publication Society*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, c. 1924. 120 pp.
Sturz, Harry A. (1916-1989). *The Byzantine Text-type and New Testament Textual Criticism*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984. 305 pp.
Swete, Henry Barclay. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Revised by Richard Rusden Ottley, M.A.; with an appendix, containing the Letter of Aristeas, edited by H. St. J. Thackeray, M.A. Cambridge, 1914.
Talbot, Reginald Thomas. *Our Bible and How It Has Come to Us*. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1894. 128 pp.
Thomas, W.H. Griffith (1861-1924). *And God Spake These Words: How We Got Our Bible and Why We Believe It Is God's Word.* 1926. 127 pp.
Thompson, Craig R. *The Bible in English, 1525-1611*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1958.
Thuesen, Peter Johannes (1971-). *In Discordance with the Scriptures: American Protestant Battles over Translating the Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. 238 pp.
Tiplady, Thomas (1882-). *The Influence of the Bible: on History, Literature, and Oratory*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1924. 128 pp.
Tobie, Willard Nathan (1871-). *Our English Bible: How We Got It*. Urbana, IL: Epworth League of Trinity Church, 1905. 72 pp.
Todd, Henry John (1763-1845). *An Authentic Account of Our Authorised Translation of the Holy Bible*. 1834, 1842.
Turton, Thomas (1780-1864). *The Text of the English Bible as Now Printed by the Universities: considered with reference to a report by a sub-committee of dissenting ministers*. Cambridge: Pitt Press, 2nd ed. 1833. 131 pp.
Twilley, L.D. *The Origin and Transmission of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1957. 69 pp.
Vance, Laurence M. (1962-). *A Brief History of English Bible Translations*. Pensacola, FL: Vance Publications, 1993. 114 pp.
———. *King James: His Bible and Its Translators*. Pensacola, FL: Vance Publications, 2006. 164 pp.
Vedder, Henry Clay (1853-1935). *Our New Testament: How Did We Get It*? Philadelphia: The Griffith & Rowland Press, 1908. 388 pp.
Vernon, Samuel M. *The Making of the Bible*. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1916. 191 pp.
Voobus, Arthur (1909-1988). *Early Versions of the New Testament*. Stockholm: Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 1954.
———. *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac*. Louvain; L. Durbecq Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1951.
Walden, Treadwell (1830-1918). *Our English Bible and Its Ancestors.* Philadelphia: Porter & Croates, 1871. 231 pp.
Wegner, Paul D. *The Journey from Texts to Translations: The Origin and Development of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1999. 462 pp.
Weigle, Luther Allen (1880-1968*). The English New Testament from Tyndale to the Revised Standard Version*. New York, Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949. 158 pp.
Whitley, William Thomas (1861-1947). *The English Bible under the Tudor Sovereigns*. London, 1938.
———, and Gerald Hamilton Beard (1862-1921), and C.B. Dalton, and Melancthon Williams Jacobus (1855-1937). *Roman Catholic and Protestant Bibles Compared.* New York: Charles Scribner, 1908. 361 pp.
Wild, Laura Hulda (1870-). *The Romance of the English Bible: a history of the translation of the Bible into English from Wyclif to the present day*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Doran, 1929. 295 pp.

Witard, Doris. *Bibles in Barrels: A History of Essex Baptists*. Essex: The Essex Baptist Association, 1962. 213 pp.
Woolcombe. *The English Bible and Its Versions*. 1882.
Wright, John (1836-1919). *Early Bibles of America*. New York: T. Whittaker, 1894.
Wyckoff, W. H. *The American Bible Society and the Baptists*; Or, The Question Discussed, Shall the Whole Word of God be Given to the Heathern. New York: John R. Bigelow, 1842. 214 pp.
Wynne, Frederick Richards (1910-), and John Henry Bernard (1860-1927), and Samuel Hemphill. *The Literature of the Second Century: Short Studies in Christian Evidences*. New York: James Pott, 1892. 270 pp.
Zwemer, Samuel Marinus (1867-1952). *Into All the World*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1943. 222 pp.

The Modernism of Bible Scholars

Most of the following materials document the unbelief of textual critics and translators. Others describe the apostasy surrounding the modern version issue in general.

Abbott, Lyman. *Henry Ward Beecher*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1903. 457 pp.
Aland, Kurt (1915-1994). *A History of Christianity*. trans. by James L. Schaaf. 2 vol. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
Albright, William Foxwell (1891-1971). *From the Stone Age to Christianity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1957. 432 pp.
Ariarajah, Wesley. The Bible and People of Other Faiths. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1985. 71 pp.
Arnold, Matthew (1822-1888). *Literature and Dogma: Essay Towards a Better Apprehension of the Bible*. Boston: James R. Osgood and Co., 1873. 316 pp.
Barclay, William (1907-1978). *By What Authority?* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1978. 221 pp.
———. *Crucified and Crowned*. London: SCM Press, 1961. 192 pp.
———. *Introducing the Bible*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1972. 155 pp.
———. *Jesus as They Saw Him*. London: SCM Press, 1962. 492 pp.
———. *The King and the Kingdom*. Edinburgh: The Saint Andrew Press, 1969. 211 pp.
———, and F.F. Bruce, ed. *The Making of the Bible*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1961. 96 pp.
———. *The Mind of Jesus*. New York: Harper & Row, 1960. 340 pp.
Barth, Karl. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Trans. From the 6th ed. by Edwyn C. Hoskyns. London: Oxford University Press, 1933. 547 pp.
———. *The Word of God and the Word of Man*. Trans. By Douglas Horton. New York: Harper & Row, 1957. 327 pp.
Berneking, Nancy J. (1943-), and Pamela Carter Joern (1948-). *Re-Membering and Re-Imagining*. Cleveland, Oh: The Pilgrim Press, 1995.
Black, Matthew (1908-1995). *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Hendrickson Publishers, 1998.
———. and H.H. Rowley. Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Van Nostrand Reinhold International, 1982.
———. *Scrolls & Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1969.
Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *The Cost of Discipleship*. Revised and unabridged. New York: Collier Books, 1963. 352 pp.
Bowie, Walter Russell (1882-1969). *The Bible*. New York: Association Press, 1940. 68 pp.
———. *Great Men of the Bible*.
———. *I Believe in Jesus Christ*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1959. 80 pp.
———. *The Living Story of the New Testament*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1959. 183 pp.
———. *The Living Story of the Old Testament*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1964. 214 pp.
———. *See Yourself in the Bible*. New York: Harper & Row, 1967. 176 pp.
———. *Where You Find God*. New York: Harper & Row, 1968. 116 pp.

Bretscher, Paul G. “Translating the Bible: Review Essay, an Evaluation of the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) ... 1990.” *Logia: a Journal of Lutheran Theology*. Vol. 3, No. 1 (Jan. 1994), pp. 55-58.
Brown, Harold O.J. (1933-). *Heresies: The Image of Christ in the Mirror of Heresy and Orthodoxy from the Apostles to the Present*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1984.
Brunner, Emil. *The Word of God and Modern Man*. Trans. By David Cairns. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1964. 87 pp.
Burrows, Millar (1889-1980). *An Outline of Biblical Theology*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946. 380 pp.
Busch, Eberhard. *Karl Barth: His life from letters and autobiographical texts*. Trans. By John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976. 569 pp.
Cadbury, Henry Joel (1883-1974). *Jesus: What Manner of Man*? London: S.P.C.K., 1962. 123 pp.
Carpenter, Humphrey. *Robert Runcie: The Reluctant Archbishop*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1996. 401 pp.
Carter, Mary Ellen. *My Years with Edgar Cayce: The Personal Story of Gladys Davis Turner*. New York: Harper & Row, 1972. 140 pp.
Castro, Emilio. *When We Pray Together*. Geneva: WCC Publications, 1989. 86 pp.
Cayce, Hugh Lynn. *Adventure Inward: The Incredible Story of Edgar Cayce*. New York: Paperback Library, 1964. 207 pp.
Christian, C.W. *Friedrich Schleiermacher*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1979. 157 pp.
Coffin, Henry Sloane. *What Men Are Asking: Some Current Questions in Religion*. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1933. 196 pp.
Cox, Harvey. *The Seduction of the Spirit: The Use and Misuse of People’s Religion*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973. 350 pp.
Craig, Clarence Tucker (1895-1953). *The Beginning of Christianity*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943. 366 pp.
———. *The Study of the New Testament*. NY: Abingdon Press, 1939. 131 pp.
Cumming, John (1807-1881). *Is Christianity from God? a Manual of Biblical Evidence for the People*. NY: M.W. Dodd, 1854. 276 pp.
———. *Lectures on Romanism: being illustrations and refutation of the errors of Romanism and Tractarianism*. Boston: J.P. Jewett and Co., 1854. 728 pp.
———. *Moses Right, and Bishop Colenso Wrong: being popular lectures on the Pentateuch*. NY: J. Bradburn, 1863. 271 pp.
Dentan, Robert Claude (1907-). *The Apocrypha, Bridge of the Testaments*; a reader’s guide to the apocryphal books of the Old Testament. Greenwich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1969. 122 pp.
———. *The Design of the Scriptures: A First Reader in Biblical Theology*. New York: Seabury Press, 1961. 276 pp.
———. *The Holy Scriptures: A Survey*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1981. 197 pp.
———, ed. *The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955. 376 pp.
———. *Preface to Old Testament Theology*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950. 74 pp.
Dodd, Charles Harold (1884-1973). *The Authority of the Bible*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1929. 310 pp.
———. *Benefits of His Passion: Meditations on the Cross of Christ and Its Meaning in Our Lives Today*. New York: Abingdon Press, n.d.
———. *The Bible and Its Background*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1931. 90 pp.
———. *The Bible Today*. Cambridge: University Press, 1960. 168 pp.
———. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: University Press, 1960. 478 pp.
———. *The Johannine Epistles*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1946. 170 pp.
———. *The Meaning of Paul for Today*. New York: Meridian Books, 1957. 190 pp.
———. *A New Testament Triptych on Christ’s Coming, His Gospel, His Passion*. Cincinnati, OH: Forward Movement Pub., 1965. 127 pp.
Driver, Samuel Rolles (1846-1914). *The Book of Exodus*. Cambridge: University Press, 1953. 443 pp.
———. *The Book of Genesis*. London: Methuen & Co., 1904, 14th ed. 1948. 459 pp.

———. *The Book of Job in the Revised Version*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908. 133 pp.
———. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. Cleveland and NY: Meridian Books, The World Publishing Company, 1956. 577 pp.
———. *Men of the Bible: Isaiah His Life and Times*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, n.d. 212 pp.
Drummond, Henry. *Addresses*. Philadelphia: Henry Altemus, 1891. 322 pp.
———. *The Greatest Thing in the World*. Westwood, NJ: Fleming H. Revell, n.d. 63 pp.
Ferre, Nels F.S. *Christ and the Christian*. London: Collins, 1958. 256 pp.
———. *The Sun and the Umbrella*. New York: Harper & Bro., 1953. 156 pp.
Flesch, Rudolf Franz (1911-). *The Art of Plain Talk*. New York: Harper & Row, 1946. 210 pp.
Fosdick, Harry Emerson. *Adventurous Religion*. New York: Harper & Row, 1926. 326 pp.
———. *As I See Religion*. New York: Harper & Bro., 1932. 201 pp.
———. *The Assurance of Immortality*. New York: Association Press, 1924. 116 pp.
———. *The Man from Nazareth*. New York: Harper & Bro., 1949. 282 pp.
———. *The Manhood of the Master*. New York: Association Press, 1918. 175 pp.
———. *The Modern Use of the Bible*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1924. 291 pp.
———. *What Is Vital in Religion*. New York: Harper & Bro., 1955. 238 pp.
Froude, James Andrew (1818-1894). *Short Studies on Great Subjects*. 4 vol. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909. 2390 pp.
Fuller, Reginald Horace (1915-2007). *Christ and Christianity: studies in the formation of Christology*. Valley Forge, Penn: Trinity Press International, 1994. 181 pp.
———. *The Cost of Discipleship* by Dietrich Bonhoeffer; trans. from the German by R.H. Fuller, with some revision by Irmgard Booth. London: SCM Press, 1964. 285 pp.
———. *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament*. London: Duchworth, 1974. 221 pp.
———. *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives*. New York: Macmillan, 1971. 225 pp.
———. *He that Cometh: the Birth of Jesus in the New Testament*. Harrison, Penn.: Morehouse Pub., 1990.
———. *Interpreting the Miracles*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963. 127 pp.
———. *Kerygma and Mythos: a theological debate*, with contributions by Rudolf Bultmann, translated by R.H. Fuller. New York: Harper & Row, 1961. 228 pp.
———. *Primitive Christianity in Its Contemporary Setting* by Rudolf Bultmann, translated by R.H. Fuller. New York: World Publishing, 1972. 240 pp.
———. *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus: an examination of the presuppositions of New Testament theology*. Chicago: A.R. Allenson, 1954. 128 pp.
———. *The New Testament in Current Study*. New York: Scribner, 1962. 147 pp.
———. *Who Is This Christ? Gospel Christology and Contemporary Faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983. 169 pp.
George, Carol V.R. *God's Salesman: Norman Vincent Peale and the Power of Positive Thinking*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993. 269 pp.
Godsey, R. Kirby (1936-). *When We Talk about God…Let's Be Honest*. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 1996. 214 pp.
Gomes, Peter J. *The Good Book*. New York: William Morrow and Co., 1996. 384 pp.
Good, James Isaac (1850-1924). *History of the Reformed Church of Germany, 1620-1890*. Reading, PA: Daniel Miller, 1894. 646 pp.
Goodspeed, Edgar Johnson (1871-1962). *How to Read the Bible*. Philadelphia: John C. Winston Company, 1946. 238 pp.
———. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937. 362 pp.
———. *Life of Jesus*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950. 248 pp.
———. *The Story of the Old Testament*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934. 187 pp.
Grant, Frederick Clifton (1891-1974). *Ancient Judaism and the New Testament*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 1978. 155 pp.
———. *Basic Christian Beliefs*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1960. 112 pp.
———. *The Beginnings of Our Religion*. New York: Macmillian Co., 1934.
———, ed. and trans. *Form Criticism: a new method of New Testament research*; including The *Study of the Synoptic Gospels*, by Rudolf Bultmann, and *Primitive Christianity in the Light of Gospel Research*, by Karl Kundsin. New York: Harper & Row, 1962. 161 pp.

———. *Frontiers of Christian Thinking*. Chicago, New York: Willett, Clark & Co., 1935. 179 pp.
———. *An Introduction to New Testament Thought.* New York, Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 339 pp.
———. *Jesus after the Gospels: The Christ of the Second Century*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1990. 134 pp.
Guinness, Mrs. Henry Grattan (1831-1898). *Romanism and the Reformation, from the standpoint of prophecy*. London: J. Nisbet and Co., 1891. 244 pp.
Harrelson, Walter J. *Interpretating the Old Testament*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964. 529 pp.
———. *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament*, edited by Douglas A. Knight; with contributions by Walter Harrelson. London: S.P.C.K., 1977. 336 pp.
Hester, H.I. *The Heart of Hebrew History: A Study of the Old Testament*. Liberty, MO: William Jewell Press, 1949. 326 pp.
Inge, W.R. *Origen*. Oxford: University Press, 1946. 23 pp.
Irwin, William Andrew (1884-1967). *The Old Testament: Keystone of Human Culture*. New York: H. Schumann, 1952. 293 pp.
———. *The Problem of Ezekiel: an Inductive Study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943. 344 pp.
James, Fleming (1877-1959) and Charles Baker Hedwick (1877-1943), and Frederick Clifton Grant (1891-1974), and Burton Scott Easton (1877-1950). *The Beginnings of Our Religion*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1934. 170 pp.
Jones, E. Stanley. *Christ and the Roundtable*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928. 320 pp.
———. *The Christ of the Indian Road*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1925. 213 pp.
———. *A Song of Ascents: A Spiritual Autobiography*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968. 400 pp.
Kung, Hans (1928-). *On Being a Christian*. Garden City, NY: Image Books, 1984. 720 pp.
Lake, Kirsopp (1872-1946). *The Religion of Yesterday and Tomorrow*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1926. 183 pp.
Langley, Noel. *Edgar Cayce on Reincarnation*. Under the editorship of Hugh Lynn Cayce. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1968. 286 pp.
Larson, Bruce. *Ask Me to Dance*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1972. 151 pp.
Latourette, Kenneth Scott (1884-1968). *The Nineteenth Century in Europe: Background and the Roman Catholic Phase*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. 498 pp.
McConnell, Francis John. *The Christlike God*. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1927. 275 pp.
MacGregor, Geddes. *Reincarnation in Christianity*. Wheaton: Theosophical Publishing House, 1978. 190 pp.
Mackay, Robert William (1803-1882). *The Tubingen School and Its Antecedents: a review of the history and present condition of modern theology*. Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1863. 300 pp.
Martini, Carlo Maria (1927-). *Jacob's Dream: Setting Out on a Spiritual Journey*. Trans. Ron Lane. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992.
———.*In the Thick of His Ministry*.
———. *Journeying with the Lord: Reflections for Every Day*. New York: Alba House, 1987. 511 pp.
———. *Once More from Emmaus*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1995. 109 pp.
———, and Umberto Eco. *Belief or Nonbelief? a Confrontation*. Trans. by Minna Proctor. Introduction by Harvey Cox. New York: Arcade Publishing, 1997. 102 pp.
———.*Through Moses to Jesus*.
Mellon, John C. *Mark as Recovery Story: Alcoholism and the Rhetoric of Gospel Mystery*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1995. 310 pp.
Moffatt, James (1870-1944). *The Approach to the New Testament*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1921. 240 pp.
———. *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925. 659 pp.
———. *Everyman's Life of Jesus*. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1925. 242 pp.
Newbigin, Lesslie. *The Finality of Christ*. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1969. 120 pp.
———. *The Household of God*. New York: Friendship Press, 1954. 177 pp.

Nichols, James Hastings (1915-), and John Williamson Nevin (1803-1886), and Philip Schaff (1819 -1893). *The Mercersburg Theology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
Phillips, John Bertram (1906-1982*). Four Prophets.* London: Geoffrey Bles, 1963. 161 pp.
———. *God Our Contemporary*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960. 137 pp.
———. *New Testament Christianity.* London*:* Hodder and Stoughton, 1956. 159 pp.
———. *Plain Christianity*. London: Wyvern Books, 1954. 126 pp.
———. *When God Was Man*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1955. 62 pp.
———. *Your God Is Too Small*. New York: MacMillan Company, 1961. 124 pp.
Priest, George Madison (1873-1947). *A Brief History of German Literature*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909. 366 pp.
Quebedeaux, Richard (1944-). *The Worldly Evangelicals*. New York: Harper & Row, 1978. 189 pp.
Read, Anne. *Edgar Cayce on Jesus and His Church*. Under editorship of Hugh Lynn Cayce. New York: Warner Books, 1970. 188 pp.
Reeves, Thomas C. (1936-). *The Empty Church: The Suicide of Liberal Christianity*. New York: The Free Press, 1996. 276 pp.
Robinson, Henry Wheeler (1872-1945). *The Christian Doctrine of Man.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911. 365 pp.
———. *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament.* Oxford: University Press, 1946. 298 pp.
———. *The Old Testament: Its Making and Meaning*. New York, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1937. 247 pp.
———. *Redemption and Revelation*. London: Nisbet and Co., 1942. 320 pp.
Robinson, John Arthur Thomas (1919-). *Can We Trust the New Testament?* London and Oxford: Mowbrays, 1977. 142 pp.
Schaeffer, Francis August (1912-1984). *The Great Evangelical Disaster*. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1984. 192 pp.
Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *On Religion.* Trans. By John Oman. Abridged with an Intro. by E. Graham Waring. New York: Frederick Ungar Pub., 1955. 164 pp.
Schuller, Robert Harold. *Believe in the God Who Believes in You: The Ten Commandments A Divine Design for Dignity*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1989. 297 pp.
———. *God's Minute: 365 Daily Affirmations for Positive Prayer*. Garden City, CA: Hour of Power, 1987. 368 pp.
———. *Move Ahead with Possibility Thinking*. Carmel, NY: Guideposts, 1967. 197 pp.
———. *The Peak to Peek Principle*. New York: Doubleday, 1980. 177 pp.
———. *Peace of Mind Through Possibility Thinking*. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell, 1977. 191 pp.
———. *Power Thoughts*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1993. 239 pp.
———. *Prayer: My Soul's Adventure with God: A Spiritual Autobiography*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1995. 235 pp.
———. *Reach Out for New Life*. New York: Bantam Books, 1979. 183 pp.
———. *Self Esteem the New Reformation*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982. 177 pp.
———. *Tough Times Never Last, but Tough People Do!* New York: Bantam Books, 1984. 237 pp.
———. *You Can Become the Person You Want to Be*. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell, 1973. 159 pp.
Schweitzer, Albert. *The Light Within Us*. New York: The Philosophical Library. 1959. 58 pp.
———. *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God*. London: A. & C. Black, 1925. 275 pp.
———. *Reverence for Life*. Foreword by D. Elton Trueblood. New York: Harper & Row, 1966. 153 pp.
Sheldon, Charles. *In His Steps*. Barbour and Co., 1989. 242 pp.
Simon, Charlie May. *All Men Are Brothers: A Portrait of Albert Schweitzer*. New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., 1956. 192 pp.
Simon, Richard. *A Critical History of the Old Testament*. Parts one, two and three in one volume. 1682. 635 pp.
Smith, William Robertson (1846-1894). *Answer to the Form of Libel: Now Before the Free Church Presbytery of Aberdeen*. Edinburgh: D. Douglas, 1878. 64 pp.
———. *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*. New York, 1894.

———. *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1881. 446 pp.
———. *The Prophets of Israel and Their Place in History at the Close of the Eighth Century*. London, 1902.
Sperry, Willard Learoy (1882-1954). *Rebuilding Our World*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943. 157 pp.
———. *Signs of These Times: the Ayer Lectures of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School for 1929*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Doran & Company, 1929. 179 pp.
Spong, John Shelby. *Born of a Woman*. New York: HarperCollins, 1992. 245 pp.
———. *Into the Whirlwind: The Future of the Church*. Minneapolis, MN: The Seabury Press, 1983. 212 pp.
———. *Living in Sin? A Bishop Rethinks Human Sexuality*. New York: HarperCollins, 1988. 256 pp.
———. *Rescuing the Bible from Fundamentalism: A Bishop Rethinks the Meaning of Scripture*. New York: HarperCollins, 1991. 267 pp.
Stearn, Jess. *Edgar Cayce--the Sleeping Prophet*. New York: Bantam Books, 1968. 287 pp.
Stendahl, Krister. *The Bible and the Role of Women*. Trans. By Emilie T. Sander. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982. 48 pp.
Stringfellow, William, and Anthony Towne. *The Death and Life of Bishop Pike*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976. 447 pp.
Sugrue, Thomas. *There Is a River: The Story of Edgar Cayce*. New York: Dell Publishing, 1970. 326 pp.
Trueblood, Elton. *Confronting Christ*. Newe York: Harper & Row, 1960. 180 pp.
Unger, Merrill. *The Haunting of Bishop Pike: A Christian View of the Other Side*. Wheaton: Tyndale House, 1968. 115 pp.
Voobus, A. *The Threat of Communism and the Task of Christians: A Stand Agaisnt Dangerous Trends within Protestantism.* New York: ETSE, n.d. 28 pp.
Walsh, Walter (1847-1912). *The History of the Romeward Movement in the Church of England 1833 -1864*. London: James Nisbet & Co., 1900. 428 pp.
———. *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement*. London: Church Association, Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1899. 424 pp.
Willoughby, Harold R. (1890-1962). *Pagan Regeneration: a Study of Mystery Initiations in the Graeco-Roman World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929.
———. *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, edited by Harold R. Willoughby. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.
Wells, David Franklin (1928-). *No Place for Truth: Or Whatever Happened to Evangelical Theology*? Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993. 318 pp.

Inspiration and Authority of the Scriptures

The following titles relate to the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures.

Allis, Oswald Thompson (1880-1973). *God Spake by Moses: an Exposition of the Pentateuch*. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub., 1958. 159 pp.
Anderson, Robert (1841-1918). *The Bible and Modern Criticism*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1905. 6th ed. 1907. 282 pp.
———. *The Bible or the Church?* London: Pickering & Inglis, 269 pp.
Anderson, Stanley Edwin. *Our Dependable Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960. 248 pp.
———. *Our Inerrant Bible*. Texarkana, Texas: Bogard Press, 1977. 180 pp.
Angus, Joseph. *The Bible Handbook*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1952. Revised by Samuel G. Green. 837 pp.
Armstrong, John H., ed. *The Coming Evangelical Crisis: Current Challenges to the Authority of Scripture and the Gospel*. Articles by R. Kent Hughes, John MacArthur, Jr., R.C. Sproul, Michael S. Horton, Albert Mohler, Jr. Chicago: Moody Press, 1996. 269 pp.
———. *The Compromised Church: The Present Evangelical Crisis*. Articles by Edmund Clowney, Gerald Bray, Monte Wilson, Mark E. Dever. Derke Bergsma, R. Scott Clark, Stephen J. Wellum,

R. Albert Mohler, Arturo Azurdia III, Paul Schaefer, Jr., Sinclair B. Ferguson, Philip Graham Ryken, David Wells, and Donald S. Whitney. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1998. 330 pp.
Arnold, Matthew (1822-1888). *God and the Bible*. London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1893. 239 pp.
Banks, John Shaw (1835-1917). Scripture and Its Witnesses: Outlines of Christian Evidence. London: Charles H. Kelly, 1896. 221 pp.
Bannerman, James. *Inspiration: The Infallible Truth and Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1865.
Barnhouse, Donald Gray (1895-1960). "Adam and Modern Science." *Eternity*, May 1960.
Barth, Karl (1886-1968). *The Word of God and the Word of Man*. Translated by Douglas Horton. The Pilgrim Press, 1928. 327 pp.
Beale, David O. *S.B.C. House on the Sand?* Greenville, SC: Unusual Publications, 1985. 232 pp.
Beegle, Dewey M. *The Inspiration of Scripture*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963. 223 pp.
Bible League. *Truth Unchanged, Unchanging: a Selection of Articles from The Bible League Quarterly 1912-82*. Abingdon, England: The Bible League, 1984. 503 pp.
Bishop, George Sayles (1836-1914). *The Doctrines of Grace and Kindred Themes*. New York: Gospel Publishing House, 1910. 509 pp.
Blanchard, Charles A. *Visions and Voices or Who Wrote the Bible*. New York: Christian Alliance Pub., 1917. 184 pp.
Bloesch, Donald G. (1928-) *Holy Scripture: Revelation, Inspiration and Interpretation*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1994. 384 pp.
Boice, James Montgomery (1938-). *Does Inerrancy Matter?* Foreword by J.I. Packer. Oakland, CA: International Council on Biblical Inerrancy, 1979. 29 pp.
———,and Benjamin E. Sasse, ed.. *Here We Stand: A Call from Confessing Evangelicals*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996. 207 pp.
Bratton, Fred Gladstone. *A History of the Bible*. London: Robert Hale Limited, 1961. 287 pp.
Broomall, Wick. *Biblical Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957. 329 pp.
Brown, Arthur Judson (1856-). *In Truth the Word of God*. London: Stirling Tract Enterprise, n.d. 112 pp.
Brown, Robert McAfee. *The Spirit of Protestantism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961. 264 pp.
Brunner, Emil (1889-1966). *The Word of God and Modern Man*. Trans. by David Cairns. Richmond, Vir.: John Knox Press, 1947. 87 pp.
Burgon, John William (1813-1888). *Inspiration and Interpretation: Seven sermons preached before the University of Oxford; with preliminary remarks: being an answer to a volume entitled Essays and Reviews.* Oxford: J.H. & Jas. Parker, 1861. 545 pp.
Bush, L. Russ (1944-), and Tom J. Nettles. *Baptists and the Bible: The Baptist doctrines of biblical inspiration and religious authority in historical perspective*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980. 456 pp.
Campbell, John L. *The Bible Under Fire*. Introduction by Robert Dick Wilson. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1928. 285 pp.
Carroll, Benajah Harvey (1843-1914). *The Inspiration of the Bible*. Introduction by George W. Truett (1867-1944) and L.R. Scarborough. Orlando: Christ for the World Publishers, 1930.
Cartledge, Samuel A. *A Conservative Introduction to the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1939. 238 pp.
Champion John Benjamin (1868-). *Inspiration Explains Itself*. Philadelphia: Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1938.
———. *The Virgin's Son*. Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Assn., 1924. 160 pp.
Cheyne, Thomas Kelly (1841-1915). *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*. London: Methuen & Co., 1893. 372 pp.
Christian Life. "Is Evangelical Theology Changing?" *Christian Life*, March 1956, pp. 17.
Clark, Gordon Haddon. *The Concept of Biblical Authority*. Philipsburg, N.J.: The Presbyterian & Reformed Pub., n.d.
———. *God's Hammer: The Bible and Its Critics*. Hobbs, New Mexico: The Trinity Foundation, 1982. 232 pp.
———. *Religion, Reason, and Revelation*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed Pub., 1961.
Collett, Sidney. *All about the Bible*. Westwood, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1966. 328 pp.

———. *The Scripture of Truth*. London: S.W. Partridge & Co., 1905. 324 pp.
Cottrell, Jack. *The Authority of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978. 94 pp.
Coxe, Arthur Cleveland (1818-1896). *Holy Writ and Modern Thought: a Review of Times and Teachers,* The Bedell Lectures, 1891. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1892. 271 pp.
Criswell, Wallie A. (1909-). *Why I Preach that the Bible Is Literally True*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1969. 220 pp.
Cumming, John (1807-1881). *Moses Right, and Bishop Colenso Wrong: being popular lectures on the Pentateuch*. NY: J. Bradburn, 1863. 271 pp.
Custer, Stewart. *Does Inspiration Demand Inerrancy?* Nutley, NJ: The Craig Press, 1968. 120 pp.
Dockery, David S. *Christian Scripture: An Evangelical Perspective on Inspiration, Authority, and Interpretation*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1995. 257 pp.
Dodd, Charles Harold (1884-1973). *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments*. Chicago, NY: Willett, Clark & Company, 1937. 167 pp.
———. *The Authority of the Bible*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1929. 310 pp.
———. *The Bible and Its Background*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1931. 90 pp.
———. *The Bible Today*. Cambridge: University Press, 1960. 168 pp.
Dods, Marcus (1834-1909). *The Bible: Its Origin and Nature*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1905. 245 pp.
Draper Jr., James T. *Authority: The Critical Issue for Southern Baptists*. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1984. 126 pp.
Driver, Samuel Rolles (1846-1914*). An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. Cleveland and NY: Meridian Books, The World Publishing Company, 1956. 577 pp.
———, and A.F. Kirkpatrick. *The Higher Criticism*. 1911.
Dunzweiler, Robert J. *Are the Bibles in Our Possession Inspired? Two Studies on the Inspiredness of the Apographs*. Hatfield, Penn.: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1981. 30 pp.
Earle, Ralph. "Further Thoughts on Biblical Inspiration." *Bulletin of The Evangelical Theological Society,* Winter 1963.
Elmendorf, John J. *The Word and the Book: Letters on the Higher Criticism*. Milwaukee: The Young Churchman Co., 1896. 92 pp.
Foulkes, Edmund S. *The New Criticism*. London: Skeffington & Son, 1890. 40 pp.
Fosdick, Harry Emerson. *The Modern Use of the Bible*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1924. 291 pp.
Garbett, Edward (1817-1887). *God's Word Written: The Doctrine of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture*. London: The Religious Tract Society, c1870. 312 pp.
Gaussen, Louis (1790-1863). *It Is Written*, or every word and expression contained in the Scriptures proved to be from God. London: Samuel Bagtster and Sons, 1847. 312 pp.
———. *The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1949. 381 pp.
Geisler, Norman L. *Inerrancy*. Grand Rapids: Academie Books, 1980. 515 pp.
George, Timothy and Denise, ed. *Baptists and Their Doctrines: B.H. Carroll*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1995. 277 pp.
———. *Baptist Confessions, Covenants, and Catechisms*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1995. 282 pp.
———. *The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration: Basil Manly, Jr*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1995. 282 pp.
Green, Andrew Rigden. *The Authority of Scripture*. Eastbourne, England: Kingsway Publications, 1990. 64 pp.
Haldeman, L.M. *A King's Penknife or Why I Am Opposed to Modernism*. New York: Francis Emory Fitch, 1929. 165 pp.
Harris, Robert Laird (1911-). *Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957. 304 pp.
Henry, Carl Ferdinand Howard, ed. (1913-). *Revelation and the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958. 413 pp.
———. "Yea, Hath God Said…" *Christianity Today*, April. 26, 1963.
Horn, H.J. *Is the Bible True?* London: The Book Society, 1928. 86 pp.
Horsch, John. *Modern Religious Liberalism: The Destructiveness and Irrationality of Modernist Theology*. Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Assn., 1920. 320 pp.

Horton, Robert F. *Inspiration and the Bible*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1888. 279 pp.
Hubbard, David Allan. *What We Evangelicals Believe*. Pasadena: Fuller Theological Seminary, 1979.168 pp.
Hymers, Robert L. *Inside the Southern Baptist Convention*. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1990. 143 pp.
Jewel, John. *Treatise of the Holy Scriptures, gathered out of sermons preached by Bishop Jewel at Salisbury*. 1570. Parker Society edition 1850.
Jewett, Paul King. "Biblical Authority a Crucial Issue in Protestantism." *United Evangelical Action*, May 1, 1953, pp. 9.
Jodock, Darrell (1941-). *The Church's Bible: Its Contemporary Authority*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989. 173 pp.
Jones, Bob. *Fundamentals of the Faith*. Greenville, S.C.: Bob Jones University Press, 1964. 56 pp.
Judock, Darrell (1941-). *The Church's Bible: Its Contemporary Authority*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989. 173 pp.
Khoo, Keffrey (1964-). *The Gospels in Unison: A Synthetic Harmony of the Four Gospels in the KJV*, including an Appendix "Wrongly Dividing the Synoptic Gospels: A Critique of the Historical-Critical Methodology." Singapore: Far Eastern Bible College Press, 1996. 224 pp.
Kistler, Don, Ed. *Sola Scriptura! The Protestant Position on the Bible*. Contributors: Bruce Bickel, Michael Horton, Robert Godfrey, James White, R.C. Sproul, John Armstrong, John MacArthur, Sinclair Ferguson, Joel Beeke, Ray Lanning. Morgan, Penn.: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 1995. 280 pp.
Leach. Charles (1847-). *Is My Bible True? Where Did We Get It*? Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1897. 119 pp.
Leith, John H. ed. *Creeds of the Churches*. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1963, 3rd ed. 1982. 736 pp.
Lewis, Gordon Russell (1926-). "What Does Biblical Infallibility Mean?" *Bulletin of The Evangelical Theological Society,* Winter 1963.
Lightfoot, John. *Works*.
Lightner, Robert Paul. *Neo-Liberalism*. Nutley, N.J.: Craig Press, 1970.
———. "Scripture." *Neo-Evangelicalism*. Des Plains, Ill.: Regular Baptist Press, 3rd ed. 1969. 71:88.
Lindsell, Harold (1913-1998). *The Battle for the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976. 218 pp.
———. *The Bible in the Balance*. Zondervan Publishing House, 1979. 384 pp.
———. "An Historian Looks at Inerrancy." *Bulletin of The Evangelical Theological Society,* Winter 1965.
Lloyd-Jones, David Martyn (1899-1981). *Authority*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1984. 94 pp.
Lott, Ernest E. Compiler. *The Miracle Book*. Lincoln, Neb.: Back to the Bible Broadcast, 1953. 122 pp.
Lumpkin, William Latane. *Baptist Confessions of Faith*. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1969. 444 pp.
McCaig, A. *The Grand Old Book, being lectures on inspiration and the higher criticism*. London, Chicago: The Russian Missionary Society, 1923. 322 pp.
McClain, Alva J. *The "Problems" of Verbal Inspiration*. Winona Lake, Ind.: The Brethren Missionary Herald Co., n.d.
———. "Is Theology Changing in the Conservative Camp?" *The Brethren Missionary Herald*, February 23, 1957.
McDonald, Hugh Dermot. *Theories of Revelation: An Historical Study 1860-1960*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1963. 384 pp.
McDowell, Josh (1939). *The New Evidence That Demands a Verdict*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999. 760 pp.
Machen, J. Gresham. *Christianity and Liberalism*. 1923.
Mackay, Robert William (1803-1882). *The Tubingen School and Its Antecedents: a review of the history and present condition of modern theology*. Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1863. 300 pp.

Macintosh, Charles Henry (1820-1896). "The Bible: Its Sufficiency and Supremacy," Miscellaneous Writings. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, n.d.
M'Intosh, Hugh. *Is Christ Infallible and the Bible Truth?* Minneapolis, MN: Klock & Klock Christian Publishers, reprint of the Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902. 723 pp.
McIntire, C.T. *God, History, and Historians: Modern Christian Views of History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977. 477 pp.
Miller, D.L. *The Eternal Verities*: A series of plain arguments showing the abundant evidences of the truth of the Holy Scriptures, drawn from various sources. Elgin, Ill.: Brethren Publishing House, 1902. 370 pp.
Montgomery, John Warwick, ed. *God's Inerrant Word: Conference on the Inspiration and Authority of Scripture.* Ligonier, Pa., 1973. Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1974. 288 pp.
———. "Inspiration and Inerrancy: A New Departure." *Bulletin of The Evangelical Theological Society,* Spring 1965.
Morey, Robert A. (1946-). *The Dooyeweerdian Concept of the Word of God*. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub., 1974. 53 pp.
Morris, Henry Madison (1918-). *Many Infallible Proofs*. San Diego: Creation-Life Publishers, 1974. 381 pp.
Mozley, Edward Newman (1875-1950). *The Theology of Albert Schweitzer for Christian Enquirers*. With an epilogue by Albert Schweitzer. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1950. 108 pp.
Munhall, Leander Whitcomb (1843-1934). *The Highest Critics vs. the Higher Critics*. Philadelphia: E. and R. Munhall, 1896. 249 pp.
Newman, Robert Chapman (1941-). *The Council of Jamnia and the Canon of the Old Testament*. Hatfield, Penn.: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1983. 23 pp.
Noll, Mark A. (1946-). *Between Faith & Criticism: Evangelicals, Scholarship, and the Bible in America*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987. 255 pp.
———. *The Princeton Theology, 1812-1921: scripture, science, and theological method from Archibald Alexander to Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983.
Orr, James (1844-1913). *The Bible Under Trial: Apologetic Papers in view of present-day assaults on Holy Scripture*. London: Marshall Brothers, 1907. 234 pp.
———. *Revelation and Inspiration*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books House, 1969, reprinted from 1910 original by Duckworth and Co., London. 224 pp.
Otten, Herman J. *Baal or God: Liberalism or Christianity*. New Haven, MO: Christian News, 1988. 114 pp.
Owen, John (1616-1683). "Of the Integrity and Purity of the Hebrew and Greek Text of Scripture." *Works*.
Pache, Rene. *The Inspiration and Authority of Scripture*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1969. 349 pp.
Packer, James Innell (1926-). *Fundamentalism and the Word of God*. Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1958.191 pp.
Padilla, C. Rene, ed. *The New Face of Evangelicalism: An International Symposium on the Lausanne Covenant*. Downers Grove, InterVarsity Press, 1976. 282 pp.
Paine, Thomas. *The Complete Religious and Theological Works*. New York: Peter Eckler, 1891. 432 pp.
Pauck, Wilhelm and Marion. *Paul Tillich: His Life and Thought*. Vol. 1: Life. New York: Harper & Row, 1976. 340 pp.
Payne, J. Barton. "Apeitheo: Current Resistance to Biblical Inerrancy." *Bulletin of The Evangelical Theological Society,* Winter 1967.
———. "Hermeneutics as a Cloak for the Denial of Scripture." *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society*. Fall 1960.
Peale, Norman Vincent. *The Positive Power of Jesus Christ*. Carmel, NY: Guideposts, 1980. 266 pp.
———. *The Power of Positive Thinking*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952. 237 pp.
Pearson, Thomas (1740-1781). *Infidelity Dissected: the Evangelical Alliance prize essay on infidelity*. Chicago: Geo. MacDonald & Co., 1874. 392 pp.
———. *Many Infallible Proofs: The Evidences of Christianity*. London: Morgan and Scott, 1911. 317 pp.

Pickering, Ernest Dinwoodie (1928-2000). “Keeping Everybody Happy.” *The Tragedy of Compromise: The Origin and Impact of the New Evangelicalism*. Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1994. 93:126.
———.*Questions and Answers about Bible Translations*. Minneapolis, MN: Central Press, n.d. 8 pp.
Pink, Authur W. *The Divine Inspiration of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1976. 108 pp.
Pinnock, Clark H. *Biblical Revelation: The Foundation of Christian Theology*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1971. 256 pp.
———. *A Defense of Biblical Infallibility*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1967. 32 pp.
Pond, Enoch (1791-1882). *Conversations on the Bible: Its Statements Harmonized and Mysteries Explained*. Chicago: Royal Publishing Co., 1889. 630 pp.
Quebedeaux, Richard. *The Worldly Evangelicals*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978. 189 pp.
Radmacher, Earl D. Ed. *Can We Trust the Bible? Leading Theologians Speak out on Biblical Inerrancy*. Wheaton: Tyndale House, 1979. 126 pp.
Ramm, Bernard L. (1916-). *After Fundamentalism: The Future of Evangelical Theology*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1982. 225 pp.
———. *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956. 368 pp.
———. *The Pattern of Religious Authority*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1957,1959. 117 pp.
Rice, John R. *Southern Baptist Convention Approves Liberal Commentary*. Murfreesboro, TN: Sword of the Lord, 1972. 24 pp.
———. *Verbal Inspiration of the Bible and Its Scientific Accuracy*. Murfreesboro, Tenn.: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1943. 28 pp.
Rimmer, Harry. *The Harmony of Science and Scripture*. New York: Books, Inc., 1960. 238 pp.
Robinson, Henry Wheeler (1872-1945). *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament.* Oxford: University Press, 1946. 298 pp.
———. *The Old Testament: Its Making and Meaning*. New York, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1937. 247 pp.
———, Ed. *Record and Revelation: Essays on the Old Testament by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. 539 pp.
Rogers, Henry. *The Superhuman Origin of the Bible Inferred from Itself*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1857. 359 pp.
Ryrie, Charles Caldwell (1925-). “The Importance of Inerrancy. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April-June 1963.
Samson, George Whitefield (1819-1895). *The Classic Test of Authorship, Authenticity and Authority: founded on jurists’ rules of Interpreting records, applied to supposed inaccuracies in the text of the Old and New Testament Scriptures*. New York: F. Scott, c1893. 100 pp.
Sanday, William (1843-1920). *Inspiration: Eight Lectures on the Early History and Origin of the Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 3rd ed. 1896. 477 pp.
Saucy, Robert L., and Bruce Leon Shelley (1927-). *The Bible: Breathed from God*. Wheaton: Victor Books, 1978. 132 pp.
Schaeffer, Francis August, and James Montgomery Boice (1938-). *The Foundation of Biblical Authority*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978.
———. *The Great Evangelical Disaster*. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1984. 192 pp.
Simpson, David. *A Plea for Religion and the Sacred Writings*. c1803. 406 pp.
Smyth, J. Paterson. *The Old Documents and the New Bib*le. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1890. 216 pp.
Stendahl, Krister. *Meanings: The Bible as Document and as Guide*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984. 244 pp.
Stewart, Herbert. *The Stronghold of Prophecy: Irrefutable Evidence from Fulfilled Prophecy that the Scriptures are the Infallible Word of God*. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1941. 127 pp.
Strouse, Thomas Morton (1945-). *The Lord God Hath Spoken: a Guide to Bibliology*. Virginia Beach: Tabernacle Baptist Theological Press, 1992. 100 pp.
Sword of the Lord. *A Coffer of Jewels about Our Infallible, Eternal Word of God*. Murfreesboro, Tenn.: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1963. 318 pp.

Tenney, Merrill Chapin (1904-), Ed. *The Word for This Century: Evangelical Certainties in an Era of Conflict*. Contributors: Carl F.H. Henry, Kenneth S. Kantzer, Stuart C. Hackett, T. Leonard Lewis, Billy Graham, Glenn W. Barker, V. Raymond Edman, John F. Walvoord. London: Lutterworth Press, 1960. 184 pp.
Thomas, Robert L., and F. David Farnell. *The Jesus Crisis: The inroads of historical criticism into evangelical scholarship*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1998. 416 pp.
Thomas, Thomas A. *The Doctrine of the Word of God*. Rochester, NY: Backus Book Publishers, 1972. 114 pp.
Thomas, W.H. Griffith (1861-1924). *And God Spake These Words: How We Got Our Bible and Why We Believe It Is God's Word*. 1926. 127 pp.
Torrey, Reuben Archer (1856-1928). *The Divine Origin of the Bible*. London: James Nisbet & Co., 1903. 93 pp.
Turretin, Francis (1623-1687). *Institutes of Eclectic Theology*. Turretin was one of the authors of the *Formula Consensus Helvetica* of 1675.
Urquhart, John. *The Inspiration and Accuracy of the Holy Scriptures*. London: Marshall Brothers, 1895. 581 pp.
Vaughan, John Gaines (1858-1921). *The Wonderful Book*. Boston: Cushman Press, 1906. 73 pp.
Vine, William Edwy (1873-1949). *The Divine Inspiration of the Bible*. London: Pickering & Inglis, 1923. 126 pp.
Waard, Jan De. *A Handbook on Isaiah. Textual Criticism and the Translator*, Vol. 1. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997. 228 pp.
Walvoord, John F. "Biblical Inerrancy Today." A report of a panel discussion moderated by Walvoord. *Bulletin of The Evangelical Theological Society*, Winter 1966.
Warfield, Benjamin Breckinridge (1851-1921). *Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*. Edited by Samuel G. Craig with an Introduction by Cornelius Van Til. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1948. 446 pp.
Wells, David Falconer (1939-). *No Place for Truth or Whatever Happened to Evangelical Theology?* Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1993. 318 pp.
Whitaker, William (1548-1595). *Disputation of the Holy Scripture against the Papists, especially Bellarmine an Stapleton*. 1588. Whitaker was Regius Professor of Divinity at the University of Cambridge. Parker Society edition 1849. 718 pp.
Whitcomb, John Clement (1924-). "Biblical Inerrancy and the Double Revelation Theory." *Grace Journal*, Winter 1963. 3:20.
Wilbur, Earl Morse. *A History of Unitarianism in Transylvania, England, and America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952. 518 pp.
———. *A History of Unitarianism Socinianism and Its Antecedents*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945. 617 pp.
Wilson, Robert Dick (1856-1930). *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?* Ft. Worth, TX: Calvary Publications, 10th ed. 1953. 62 pp.
———. *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament.* With revisions by Edward J. Young. Chicago: Moody Press, 1959. 194 pp.
Wordsworth, Christopher (1807-1885). *The Inspiration of the Bible*. London: Rivingtons, 1861. 118 pp.

Biographical

Abbot, Ezra (1819-1884). *Tischendorf and Tregelles*. 1875. 34 pp.
Allen, pp.S. *The Age of Erasmus: Lectures Delivered in the Universities of Oxford and London*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1963. 303 pp.
Allen, Ward (1922-). *Translating for King James,* being a true copy of the only notes made by a translator of King James's Bible, the Authorized Version, as the Final Committee of Review revised the translation of Romans through Revelation at Stationers' Hall in London in 1610-1611: taken by the Reverend John Bois. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, facsimile, 1969. 155 pp.
Anderson, Christopher (1782-1852). *The Annals of the English Bible.* Includes in depth biography of William Tyndale. London: William Pickering, 1845. 2 vol. 1330 pp.

Andrewes, Lancelot. *Preces Privatae [Private Prayers] of Lancelot Andrewes*. Trans. by W.E. Burns. London: Metheun, 1949. 181 pp.
Arnold, T. *Wyclif's Select English Works*. 1869.
Babbage, S.B. *Puritanism and Richard Bancroft*. London, 1962.
Bagster, Samuel (1772-1851). *Memorials of Myles Coverdale*. London, 1839.
Bainton, Roland Herbert (1894-1984). *Erasmus of Christendom*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969. 308 pp.
Barclay, William (1907-1978). *A Spiritual Autobiography*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977. First published 1975 by A.R. Mowbray & Co., under the title *Testament of Faith*. 125 pp.
Bible Institute Baptist Church. *A Tribute to William Aberhart: Student Teacher Statesman*. Calgary, Alberta: The Bible Institute Baptist Church, n.d.
———. "In Loving Memory of Our Beloved Brother Aberhart." *Gospel Chimes*, Calgary, Alberta: The Bible Institute Baptist Church, Vol. 4 No. 2, June 1943.
Birch, Thomas. *The Court and Times of James the First*. 2 vol. London: Longmans, Green: 1849. 986 pp.
Brown, Andrew J. *The Word of God Among All Nations: a Brief History of the Trinitarian Bible Society 1831-1981*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1981. 162 pp.
Bruce, Frederick Fyvie (1910-1990). *In Retrospect: Remembrance of Things Past*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1980. 319 pp.
Burrows, M. *Wiclif's Place in History*. 1882.
Chester, Joseph Lemuel (1821-1882). *John Rogers, the Compiler of the First Authorised English Bible*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1861. 452 pp.
Curry, Daniel, and C.E. Barrows. *John Wycliffe*. 1853, 1879. 69 pp.
Demaus, Robert (1829-1874). *William Tyndale: a Biography, being a contribution to the early history of the English Bible*. Edited by Robert Lovett (1851-1904). Religious Tract Society, 1874, 4th ed. 1927. 561 pp.
Daniell, David Scott (1929-). *Let There Be Light: William Tyndale and the Making of the English Bible*. London: The British Library, 1994. 31 pp.
———. *Tyndale's New Testament: a Modern-Spelling Edition of the 1534 Translation*. Introduction. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989, pp. vii-xxxi. 429 pp.
———. *William Tyndale: A Biography*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994. 429 pp.
Dillistone, Frederick William (1903-). *C.H. Dodd: Interpreter of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1977. 255 pp.
Dolan, John pp., ed. The Essential Erasmus. New York: Penguin, 1983. 397 pp.
Dorey, Thomas Alan. ed. *Erasmus*. Chapters by Margaret Mann Phillips, A.E. Douglas, J.W. Binns, B. Hall, D.F.S. Thomson, and T.A. Dorey. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1970. 163 pp.
Dorman, Marianne. *Lancelot Andrewes: A Perennial Preacher of the Post Reformation English Church*. Tucson: Fenestra Books, 2004. 138 pp.
Douglas, Macleane. *Lancelot Andrewes and the Reaction*. London: George Allen & Unwin Limited, 1910. 258 pp.
Edwards, Brian H. *God's Outlaw: The Story of William Tyndale and the English Bible*. Hertfordshire: Evangelical Press, 1976. 185 pp.
Elliott, David Raymond (1948-) and Iris Miller. *Bible Bill: A Biography of William Aberhart*. Edmonton, Alberta: Reidmore Books, 1987. 372 pp.
Eliot, T.S. *For Lancelot Andrewes: Essays on Style and Order*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1929. 159 pp.
Elwell, Walter A., and J.D. Weaver. *Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century: A Selection of Evangelical Voices*. "Bruce M. Metzger" by James A. Brooks, pp. 260-271. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999.
Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Enchiridion*. Trans. by Raymond Himelick. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1970. 222 pp.
———. *Essential Erasmus*.
———. *Erasmus and Cambridge*. Trans. by D.F.S. Thomson. Intro. by H.C. Porter. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963. 343 pp.

———. *Handbook of the Militant Christian*. Trans. by John pp. Dolan. Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1962. 159 pp.
———. *The Praise of Folly*. Trans. by Hyyt Hopewe.l Hudson. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1941. 166 pp.
Faludy, George. *Erasmus*. New York: Stein and Day, 1970. 298 pp.
Flood, Robert G. "Franklin Logsdon: The Transition Years," Chapter Six, *The Story of Moody Church*. Chicago: Moody Bible Institute, 1985.
Forshall and Madden, Richard Robert (1798-1886). *The Holy Bible by Wycliffe and His Followers*. 4 vol. 1850.
Fountain, David. *John Wycliffe: The Dawn of the Reformation*. Southampton: Mayflower Christian Books, 1984. 132 pp.
Friesen, Abraham. *Erasmus, the Anabaptists, and the Great Commission*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998. 196 pp.
Fromow, George H., ed. *Teachers of the Faith and the Future*. B.W. Newton and Dr. S.P. Tregelles. London: Sovereign Grace Advent Testimony, 1969. 198 pp.
Froude, James Anthony (1818-1894). *Life and Letters of Erasmus: Lectures delivered at Oxford 1893-4*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1894. 433 pp.
Fuller, David Otis (1903-1988). *Bible Versions*. Audio cassette. c. 1973.
Fuller, Thomas (1608-1661). *History of the Worthies of England*.
Gaebelein, Arno C. *The History of the Scofield Reference Bible*. Spokane, WA: Living Words Foundation, 1991. 71 pp.
Gardiner, Gordon pp. *Champion of the Kingdom: The Story of Philip Mauro*. Clacakamas, OR: Emissary Publications, 1961. 79 pp.
Giles, John Allen (1808-1884). *Bede's Complete Works*. 1845.
Goodspeed, Edgar F.. *As I Remember*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953. 315 pp.
Goulburn, Edward Meyrick (1818-1897). *John William Burgon Late Dean of Chichester: a biography with extracts from his letters and early journals*. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1892. 773 pp.
Greenslade, Stanley Lawrence (1905-), and Gavin David Bone (1907-42). *The Work of William Tindale, with an Essay on Tindale and the English Language by G.D. Bone*. London: Blackie & Son Limited, 1938. 222 pp.
Guppy, Henry (1861-1948). *Desiderius Erasmus 1536-12th July 1936*. Manchester: The University Press, 1936. 15 pp.
———. *Myles Coverdale and the English Bible*. Manchester: The University Press, 1935. 30 pp.
——— *William Tindale and the Earlier Translators of the Bible into English*. Manchester, 1925. 222 pp.
———. *William Tindale and the Earlier Translation of the Bible into English, with twelve facsimiles: in commemoration of the four-hundredth anniversary of the publication of Tindale's first printed New Testament, 1525*. Manchester, The University Press, 1925. 50 pp.
Higham, Florence May Grier (1896-). *Lancelot Andrewes*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1952.128 pp.
Hills, Edward Freer (1912-1981). "A Biographical Sketch of the Life of Burgon," *Unholy Hands on the Bible: Vol. 1*. Lafayette, IN: Sovereign Grace Trust Fund, 1990.
Hodder, Edwin (1837-1904). *The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury*. 3 vol. London: Cassell & Co., 1892.
Hollis, Christopher. *Erasmus*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1933. 307 pp.
Hollowood, James (1916-). *Dr. Fuller's Contribution to the KJV*. Audio cassette. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1988.
Hort, Arthur Fenton (1828-1892). *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*. 2 vol. London: MacMillan and Co., 1896. 980 pp.
Huizinga, Johan (1872-1945). *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957. 266 pp.
Ing, Janet. *Johann Gutenberg and His Bible: A Historical Study*. Preface by Paul Needham. New York: The Typophiles, 1988, 2nd printing rev. 1990. 154 pp.
Issacson, Henry. *The Life and Death of Lancelot Andrewes*. London: John Hearne, 1829. [145 pp.]
Inge, W.R. *Origen*. Oxford: University Press, 1946. 23 pp.

Johnson, L.P.V. and Ola MacNutt. *Aberhart of Alberta*. Edmonton, Alberta: Institute of Applied Art, 1970. 252 pp.
Johnson, Thomas Cary (1859-1936). *The Life and Letters of Robert Lewis Dabney*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1903, Banner of Truth edition 1977. 585 pp.
King, Marjorie. *A House Eternal: Historical Novel about a Bible Translator [John Bois]*. Marjorie King, 1997.
Knox, Ronald Arbuthnott (1888-1957). *The Trials of a Translator*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1949. 113 pp.
Lechler, Gotthard Victor (1811-1888). *John Wycliffe and His English Precursors*, translated from the German and edited by Peter Lorimer. London: Religious Tract Society, 1878. 512 pp.
Lewis, John (1675-1747). *Brief History of the Rise and Progress of Anabaptism in England*. To which is prefixed, Some Account of the Learned Dr. Wiclif, and A Defence of Him from the false Charge of his, and his Followers, denying Infant Baptism. Pedobaptist. 1738.
———. *The History of the Life and Sufferings of the Reverend and Learned John Wiclif, D.D*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1719, new edition 1820. 401 pp.
Lossky, Nicholas. *Lancelot Andrews the Preacher (1555-1626): The Origins of the Mystical Theology of the Church of England*. Oxford, 1991.
Lyell, James pp.R. *Cardinal Ximenes: Statesman, Ecclesiastic, Soldier, and Man of Letters, with an Account of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible*. 1917. 142 pp.
McClure, Alexander Wilson (1808-1865). *Translators Revived: Biographical Notes of the KJV Bible Translators*. Worthington, PA: Maranatha Publications, reprint of the 1855 edition. 250 pp.
McFarlane, Kenneth Bruce. *John Wycliffe and the Beginnings of English Non-conformity*. London: English Universities Press, 1952. 197 pp.
Mansfield, Bruce. *Phoenix of His Age: Interpretations of Erasmus c. 1550-1750*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979. 348 pp.
Matthew, F.D. *The English Works of Wyclif*. 1880.
Maynard, Theodore. *The Life of Thomas Cranmer*. London: Staples Press, 1956. 214 pp.
Metzger, Bruce Manning (1914-). *Reminiscences of an Octogenarian*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997. 242 pp.
Moulton, William Fiddian (1835-1898). *William F. Moulton: a Memoir, with a chapter on biblical work and opinions by James Hope Moulton*. London: Isbister, 1899. 295 pp.
Mozley, James Frederic (1887-). *Coverdale and His Bibles*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953. 359 pp.
———. *William Tyndale*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1937. 364 pp.
Offor, George. *Memoir of William Tyndale*. London, 1836. 98 pp.
Olin, John C. *Christian Humanism and the Reformation:* Selected Writings of Erasmus, with His Life by Beatus Rhenanus and a Biographical Sketch by the Editor. New York: Fordman University Press, 1987. 221 pp.
Opfell, Olga S. *The King James Bible Translators*. Jefferson, NC, and London: McFarland & Company, 1982. 173 pp.
Ottley, Robert L. *Lancelot Andrewes*. London: Methuen & Co, 1894. 216 pp.
Owen, Trevor. *Lancelot Andrewes*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1981. 179 pp.
Paine, Gustavus Swift. *The Men Behind the King James Version*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1959. 212 pp.
Paisley, Ian Richard Kyle (1926-). "None Dare Call Him Antichrist," sermon preached in Martyrs' Memorial Free Presbyterian Church, October 16, 1988. *The Revivalist*, November 1988.
Parker Society. *Remains of Myles Coverdale*. Edited by George Person. Cambridge: The University Press, 1846. 618 pp.
———. *Writings and Translations of Myles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter*. Edited by George Person. Cambridge: The University Press, 1844. 544 pp.
———. *Doctrinal and Introductions to Different Portions of the Holy Scriptures by William Tyndale*. Edited by Walter, Henry. Cambridge: The University Press, 1848. 532 pp.
Pearson, George. *Remains of Miles Coverdale*. Cambridge: University Press, 1846. 618 pp.
———. *Writings and Translations of Miles Coverdale.* Cambridge: for the Parker Society, 1841. 544 pp.

Phillips, John Bertram (1906-1982*). The Price of Success: An Autobiography. Wheaton: Harold Shaw Publishers*, 1984. 222p.
———. *Ring of Truth: a Translator's Testimony*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1967. 124 pp.
Poole, Reginald Lane (1857-1939). *Wycliffe and Movements for Reform*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 2nd ed. 1896. 204 pp.
Qurollo, James (1942-). *Change of Mind from Westcott-Hort and New Evangelicalism to the Textus Receptus and Fundamentalism*. Audio cassette. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1986.
Rawlins, Clive L. (1940-). *William Barclay: The Authorized Biography*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1984. 791 pp.
Reidy, Maurice. *Bishop Lancelot Andrewes: Jacobean Court Preacher*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1955. [237 pp.]
Rockwood, Perry F. (1917-2008). *Triumph in God: The Life Story of a Radio Pastor*. Halifax, N.S.: The People's Gospel Hour, n.d.
Sargeant, Lewis E. *John Wyclif: Last of the Schoolmen and First of the English Reformers*. New York, London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1893. 377 pp.
Sawyer, John Wesley (1936-). *At the End of the Rope: Tales from Tulsa to Tirgu Mures: 30 Years on Three Continents*. Houston: John Wesley Sawyer, 1990.
Schaff, David Schley (1852-1941). *The Life of Philip Schaff: in Part Autobiographical*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897. 526 pp.
Smith, Preserved (1880-1941). *Erasmus: a Study of His Life, Ideals, and Place in History*. New York: Harper, 1923. 479 pp.
Steven, Hugh, ed. *A Thousand Trails: Personal Journal of William Cameron Townsend 1917-1919, Founder of Wycliffe Bible Translators*. Langley, B.C.: Credo Publishing, 1984. 224 pp.
Stewart, James Alexander (1910-). *A Man in a Hurry: The Story of the Life and Work of Pastor Basil A. Malof.* Asheville, NC: Revival Literature, 1968. 149 pp.
Storrs, Richard Salter (1787-1873). *John Wyclif and the First English Bible*. New York: Anson D.F. Randolph, 1880.
Trevelyan, George Macaulay (1876-1962). *England in the Age of Wycliffe*. London: Longmans, Green, 3rd ed. 1900.
Vaughan, Robert (1795-1868). *English Nonconformity*. London: Jackson, Walford and Hodder, 1862.
———. *The Life and Opinions of John de Wycliffe, D.D*. 2 Vol. London: B.J. Holdsworth and Hatchard & Son, 1828. 896 pp.
———. *The life and opinions of J. de Wycliffe*, illustrated principally from his unpublished manuscripts. With a preliminary view of the Papal system, and of the State of the Protestant doctrine in Europe, to the commencement of the fourteenth century. 2 vol. London, 1828.
Waite, Donald A. (1927-). *Dr. Fuller's Fight for the Faith: His Defense of the KJV*. Audio cassette. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1983
———. *Fuller's 50 Years of Fruitbearing: Dr. David Otis Fuller Interviewed by Dr. D.A. Waite*. Audio cassette. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1983.
———. *How I Got into the KJV Battle and How Its Going*. Audio Cassette. Collingswood, NJ: The Bible for Today, 1982.
Walter, Henry (1785-1859), ed. *Works of William Tyndale*. 3 vol. Cambridge: for the Parker Society, 1848-50.
Welsby, Paul A. *Lancelot Andrewes 1555-1626*. London: SPCK, 1964. 298 pp.
Westcott, Arthur. *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, Sometime Bishop of Durham*. 2 Vol. London: MacMillan and Co., 1903. 900 pp.
Whyte, Alexander. *Lancelot Andrewes and His Private Devotions*. Oliphant Anderson, 1896.
Wood, Anthony. *The History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford*. Published in English From the Original Mss in the Bodleian, By John Gutch.
Wood, Douglas C. *The Evangelical Doctor: John Wycliffe and the Lollards*. Herts, England: Evangelical Press, 1984. 144 pp.
Wood, Mary. *The Story of a Saintly Bishop's Life: Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Westminster 1555-1626*. Longmans, Green & Co, London, 1898.
Wordsworth. *Ecclesiastical Biographies*. 1839.

Zweig, Stefan. *Erasmus of Rotterdam* and *The Right to Heresy*. Trans. By Eden and Cedar Paul. London: Cassell and Co. Erasmus was originally published in Austria in 1934; The Right to Heresy in 1936. First published together in the Hallam Ed. 1951. 387 pp.

INDEX

A.V. Holiday & Business Directory, 418
Abbot, Ezra, 40, 44
Aberhart, William, 157, 197, 214, 215, 227
Alabama, 265, 293
Aland, Barbara, 26, 34, 46
Aland, Kurt, 31, 34, 46, 360
Albright, William, 205
Alexandria, 13
Alexandrinus, 429
Alford, Henry, 55, 57, 78, 81, 92, 104, 113, 123, 164
Alliance Witness, 212
Allis, Oswald, 221
Allison, Mike, 293
Almah, 212
Ambassador Baptist College, 263
American Baptist Church, 356
American Board of Mission to Jews, 221
American Council of Christian Churches, 222
American Standard Version, 5, 12, 45, 112, 147, 204, 214, 219, 220, 237, 255, 257, 278, 279, 285, 304, 306, 325, 326, 375, 438, 441
Amplified Version, 394
Anderson, Christopher, 49
Anderson, George, 302, 311
Anderson, Robert, 188
Anglican, 78, 86, 110, 111, 112, 113, 123, 130, 132, 144, 150, 167, 189, 331, 376
Antioch, 19
Apocrypha, 204, 323
Apostolic Lutheran Church, 378
Arabic, 317, 318, 319
Archaic (words in the KJV), 51, 53, 58, 78, 81, 91, 98, 114, 250, 251, 295, 403, 404, 417
Arizona, 316
Arkansas, 266
Astruc, Jean, 106
Atonement, 197, 207, 225, 226, 228, 372
Australia, 260, 269, 296, 336, 376
Authorised Version Preservation Venture, 301
Baker, Gregory, 268
Baker, Robert, 432
Baker, Roger, 265
Baptism, 428
Baptist, 73, 102, 112, 142, 143, 159, 194, 197, 212, 213, 214, 220, 221, 222, 224, 225, 231, 252, 253, 260, 261, 263, 268, 269, 270, 275, 276, 279, 282, 284, 287, 288, 291, 296, 300, 301, 302, 303, 306, 310, 312, 317, 324, 332, 335, 348, 349, 356, 360, 363, 367, 369, 374, 378, 408, 413, 416, 418, 421, 432, 435
Baptist Bible Translators Institute, 302
Baptist College of America, 265
Baptist Reporter, 287
Baptist Union, 392
Barber, Raymond, 288
Barnett, Robert, 303, 347, 406, 421
Barrow, John, 78, 113
Barth, Karl, 107, 393
Bashkir, 408
Bates, Michael, 267
Baur, F.C., 107
Beacon Lights, 403
Bearing Precious Seed, 310
Beckett, Edmund, 164, 191
Bede, 97
Believer's Magazine, 191
Bell, Rodney, 296, 366
Bellamy, John, 62, 64, 66, 69
Bengel, Johann, 35, 55
Bengel, John, 56
Berry's Interlinear, 334, 371
Bethany Divinity College, 265
Beza, 60, 61, 163, 239, 360, 429
Bible Baptist Seminary, 194, 220, 287, 324
Bible League, 320
Bible League Quarterly, 179, 320
Bible Presbyterian Church, 321
Bible Society, American, 96, 97, 99
Bible Truth Publishers, 222
Bibliotheca Sacra, 6, 39, 181, 245, 263
BIOLA, 222
Birch, Andrew, 55

Birks, Thomas, 91
Bishop, George, 171, 326, 343
Bishops Bible, 12, 64, 65
Blass, Frederick, 182
Blunt, David, 430
Bob Jones University, 268, 271, 296, 322, 337, 353, 364, 366
Bookstores, 355
Boruff, Bill, 293
Bowie, Walter, 205
Brainine, Clinton, 270, 274
Brantley, William, 73
Breckbill, W.W., 222
Breckinridge, Robert, 95
Brethren, 57, 194, 218
Broadus, John, 142, 183
Broadway Baptist Church, 102
Brookes, James, 178
Brooklyn, 103
Brooks, Otis, 282
Broughton, Hugh, 145
Brown, Andrew, 434
Brown, Terence, 9, 95, 185, 343, 388, 409
Broyhill, Kevin, 265
Bruce, F.F., 147, 152
Bruno, R.J., 269
Buch, Mark, 158, 198, 213, 214, 227, 232
Buchannan, Houston, 316
Bulgarian, 408
Burges, J.B., 58, 62, 69
Burgon, John, 6, 32, 37, 41, 56, 69, 118, 126, 127, 128, 137, 143, 144, 145, 155, 159, 168, 171, 174, 181, 182, 183, 184, 188, 191, 226, 235, 240, 241, 244, 253, 263, 270, 271, 292, 330, 333, 341, 343, 348, 377, 386, 387, 400, 401, 409, 431, 439, 440
Burrows, Millar, 206
Burton, E.D., 182
Bushnell, Horace, 99
Buttrick, George, 224
Byers, William, 316
Bynum, E.L., 220, 324, 330, 367
Cadbury, Henry, 206, 219
Calgary Prophetic Bible Institute, 198
California, 222, 269, 301
Calvary Baptist Bible College, 265
Calvary Baptist Seminary, 298
Calvin Theological Seminary, 360, 401
Cambodian, 318
Cambridge, 42, 58, 64, 65, 91, 110, 119, 120, 191, 243, 347
Cammenga, Ronald, 402
Canada, 8, 127, 197, 213, 214, 215, 218, 223, 268, 275, 283, 302, 313, 336, 348, 375, 400, 432
Capaci, Eric, 266
Carpenter, Tim, 320
Carr, David, 288
Carson, D.A., 297, 298
Carter, Cecil, 218, 375
Carter, Mickey, 276, 300
Caughill, Edward, 296
Cedarholm, B. Myron, 282, 284, 296, 297
Central Baptist Church, 289
Central Baptist Seminary, 264
Central Baptist Theological Seminary, 419, 426
Cereghin, John, 286
Champion Baptist College, 266
Champlain, 102
Chappel, Paul, 301
Chartier, Mark, 319
Chase, F.H., 182, 317
China, 417
Chinese, 316, 317
Choctaw, 409
Chomsky, Noam, 396
Christ's deity, 42, 60, 109, 171, 173, 184, 185, 193, 219, 222, 226, 281, 379, 426
Christianity Today, 221, 228, 231
Clark, A.C., 182, 211
Clark, Gordon, 211
Clarke, Adam, 84
Clearwaters, Richard, 419
Clement of Alexandria, 15
Cloud, David, 274, 395
Cobb, Rex, 303
Colorado, 317, 367
Comfort, Ron, 263
Comte, Auguste, 107
Concept Bible, 422, 423, 425
Concordia Lutheran Conference, 378
Congregationalists, 95
Connecticut, 289
Conner, Gordon, 214

Conrad, D.H., 85
Constantine, 18
Cook, Albert, 51, 148, 181, 189
Cook, F.C., 176, 184, 189, 190
Cooper, Anthony, 86
Costella, Dennis, 222
Cowles, H. Robert, 212
Coxe, Arthur Cleveland, 97, 164
Coy, George, 111
Craig, Clarence, 206
Crawford, Joseph, 423
Creole, 317
Crown College, 267
Crowned With Glory, 356
Cummons, Bruce, 287
Custer, Stewart, 353
Czech, 317
Dabney, R.L., 25, 39, 57, 60, 91
Dallas Theological Seminary, 42, 174, 230, 240, 245, 263, 275, 342, 343, 437, 442
Daniel, 52, 81, 153, 188
Darby, J.N., 57, 200, 255
Darwin, Charles, 110
Darwinism, 43, 110, 112, 129, 138, 184, 264, 354, 396
Davison, Sam, 270
Dayspring Magazine, 391
De Jonge, Henk, 379
Dead Sea Scrolls, 428
Dean Burgon Society, 7, 112, 154, 263, 270, 271, 283, 296, 304, 330, 332, 348, 367, 419, 430, 440, 442
Dearmore, Benjamin F., 194
Dearmore, James, 194
DeHaan, M.R., 247, 304
Deneau, Dennis, 317, 319
Dennis, Russell, 7, 271
Dentan, Robert, 207
Dewitt, John, 96
Dickerson, Allen, 212, 284, 363
Dickerson, David, 269
DiVietro, Kirk, 274, 332
Doom, Bob, 408
Dorotheus, 20
Dowling, John, 102
Downey, Paul, 323
Duttry, Bill, 312
Dynamic Equivalency, 218, 397, 441
Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 283, 436
Edgar, Andrew, 57, 111, 127
Edinburgh Bible Society, 74
Edinburgh Review, 98, 168
Egypt, 13
Ellicott, Charles, 53, 54, 56, 58, 78, 113, 119, 120, 122, 123, 129, 145, 147, 153, 164, 182, 190, 193, 243
Ellis, David C., 301
Emanuel Lutheran Church, 415
Emmanuel Baptist Church, 264
Emmanuel Baptist Theological Seminary, 267
Engelsma, David, 400
England, 12, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 58, 65, 75, 80, 83, 86, 91, 98, 107, 109, 110, 111, 124, 129, 144, 167, 174, 179, 181, 184, 188, 191, 195, 214, 215, 225, 280, 301, 320, 335, 336, 341, 343, 351, 357, 375, 376, 380, 391, 404, 408, 409, 413, 416, 418, 435
English Revised Version, 37, 41, 48, 54, 59, 69, 78, 82, 86, 88, 90, 104, 106, 112, 113, 115, 117, 118, 119, 121, 124, 125, 126, 127, 140, 144, 147, 164, 167, 168, 171, 173, 176, 178, 179, 181, 184, 188, 191, 198, 203, 204, 227, 255, 306, 343, 345, 346, 350, 353, 377, 440, 441
Episcopalian, 97, 127, 164
Erasmus, 54, 60, 61, 147, 170, 198, 238, 241, 287, 361, 379, 411, 429
Estonian, 408
Eusebius, 18
Evangelical Christian Churches Synod, 435
Evensen, Helge, 390
Everts, William, 181
Eye Opener Publisher, 405
Fairhaven Baptist College, 268
Faithway Baptist College, 268
Far Eastern Bible College, 321
Farrell, Hugh, 195
Fasting, 287
FEA News & Views, 222
Fellowship of Evangelical Baptist Churches in Canada, 8, 221, 349
Fidaistic, 275
Field, Frederick, 126, 148, 181

Finnish, 378
First Baptist Church Brooklyn, 103
First Baptist Church Milford, Ohio, 311, 318
First Baptist Church New York City, 252
First John 5.7, 60, 76, 89, 94, 96, 185, 240, 246, 281, 305, 321, 357, 378, 389
First Timothy 3.16, 45, 60, 77, 89, 94, 171, 173, 185, 193, 281, 379, 426
Florida, 8, 276, 292, 300, 317, 319
Form Criticism, 368
Fortna, Joseph, 288
Foundation Magazine, 222
Fourth Baptist Church, 419
Fowler, Everett, 252, 284, 330, 377
Fraser, Don, 282, 310, 317, 318
Free Church of Scotland, 430, 432
Free Presbyterian Church, 334
Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, 340, 432
French, 317
Frew, James, 430
From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man, 268, 322, 324, 420, 427
Froude, J.A., 111
Froude, Richard, 110, 111
Fuller Theological Seminary, 231
Fuller, D.O., 5, 9, 10, 37, 47, 140, 148, 157, 188, 214, 219, 220, 227, 228, 240, 253, 258, 270, 283, 303, 305, 325, 333, 342, 359, 360, 364, 375, 409, 421, 439
Fundamental Baptist Bible College, 269
Fundamental Baptist Fellowship, 367
Fundamental Bible Conference of North America, 223
Fundamental Evangelistic Association, 222
Fundamental Ministries, 363
Fundamentalist Digest, 363
Furse, Tom, 316
Gaudet, Tom, 314, 317
Gebhardt, Otto van, 182
Geddes, Alexander, 40
General Association of Regular Baptists, 342, 366, 421, 423, 424
Geneva Bible, 429
Georgia, 269
Georgia Baptist College, 269
Georgian, 408
German, 318, 377, 391
Germany, 38, 56, 59, 60, 85, 86, 89, 91, 98, 106, 107, 108, 158, 169, 174, 300, 330, 358, 414, 415
Gethsemane Bible College, 384
Gibson, Denis, 8, 348
Gietzel, R.F., 416
Global Bible Society, 408
Golden State Baptist College, 269
Goodspeed, Edgar, 208
Gospel Standard Baptist Churches, 88, 89, 351, 432
Goulburn, Edward, 128, 129, 227
Grace and Truth Fellowship Baptist College, 269
Graceway Bible Society, 432
Grady, William, 352
Graham, Billy, 228, 337, 375, 393
Grant, Frederick, 209
Gray, Bob, 300
Great Plains Baptist College, 270
Greek, 5, 48, 61, 64, 74, 81, 83, 84, 85, 88, 94, 119, 142, 143, 144, 160, 163, 168, 169, 170, 172, 174, 176, 177, 181, 182, 183, 187, 190, 192, 200, 211, 212, 215, 218, 238, 252, 255, 256, 262, 263, 264, 271, 279, 300, 341, 359, 371, 373, 379, 386, 400, 401, 412, 437, 439, 441, 442
Green, Don, 319
Green, John, 319
Green, Oliver B., 303
Greenville, 300
Gregory, Caspar, 40
Griesbach, J.J., 35, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 75, 81, 99, 104, 108, 141, 243
Griesbach, Johann, 40
Griffin, Gene, 300
Grudem, Wayne, 393
Gullion, Brian, 355
Gullion's Christian Supply Centers, 355
Haddow, H.D., 352
Haldeman, Isaac, 252
Hamilton, Don, 293
Hanko, Herman, 233
Harbach, Robert, 403
Harness, Dave, 319
Harrelson, Walter, 209
Harvard Divinity School, 206, 210

Harwood, Edward, 40
Hastings Bible Dictionary, 182
Hawkins, Ernest, 78, 113, 117
Heartland Baptist College, 270
Hebrew, 53, 63, 64, 67, 69, 70, 71, 79, 84, 85, 88, 168, 169, 186, 194, 200, 211, 221, 262, 341, 362, 376, 377, 379, 412, 429, 442
Hegel, Georg, 107
Helzerman, Ron, 310, 319
Hemphill, Samuel, 70, 82, 115, 121, 164, 179, 191, 312
Henise, Lee, 285
Heracleon, 17
Heritage Baptist College, 270
Herklots, H.G.G., 209
Heywood, James, 78, 113, 124
Highland Park Baptist Church, 225, 407
Hills, Edward F., 39, 108, 128, 155, 157, 227, 234, 258, 291, 292, 302, 310, 341, 358, 363, 377, 381, 388, 395, 401, 407, 409, 439
Historic Baptist Bible College, 275
Hitchens, Robert, 285
Hobbs, A.G., 157
Hodge, J.L., 103
Hodges, Zane, 39, 155, 244, 245, 256, 263, 386, 434, 442
Hoffman, James, 320
Holland, Thomas, 356
Holloway, Mike, 265
Hollowood, James, 283, 297, 330
Hort. *See* Westcott-Hort
Horton, Arlin, 292
Hoskier, Herman, 6, 54, 56, 147, 174, 191, 241, 244, 343, 387, 441
Hoste, William, 191, 192
Houck, Steven, 402
Houghton, S.M., 107, 179, 320
Hudson, Gary, 347, 381
Hug, J.L., 107
Humphry, W.H.G., 78, 113
Hungarian, 316, 318
Huxley, Thomas, 110
Hyles, Jack, 275
Hyles-Anderson College, 275, 352
Ignatius, 20
Illinois, 222, 400, 402, 426
Illinois Lutheran Conference, 358, 378
Independent Methodist Church, 432
Indiana, 265, 268, 269, 270, 275, 292, 293, 304, 315, 332, 352
Inspiration, 42, 46, 50, 52, 94, 107, 129, 140, 150, 152, 172, 179, 188, 198, 204, 207, 209, 221, 222, 231, 241, 251, 259, 268, 285, 286, 289, 307, 308, 329, 331, 339, 345, 358, 359, 365, 368, 386, 388, 393, 405, 416, 426
Inspiration and Interpretation, 440
Institute for Biblical Textual Studies, 359
Institute for New Testament Textual Research, 46
Institute of Creation Research, 389
Ireland, 334, 335, 348, 413, 417, 432
Irwin, William, 209
Isaiah, 153, 211, 221, 289, 342, 376
Isaiah 7.14, 211, 221, 342, 376
Iser, Wolfgang, 394
Italian, 318
Italics, 68, 295
James I, 52, 412
James, Fleming, 210
Jasmin, Don, 363
Jaus, Robert, 394
Jebb, John, 70
Jebb, R.C., 182
Jerome, 141
Job, 429
John 9.38, 45
Johnson, Ben, 224, 324
Johnson, Chris, 409
Johnson, Dell, 292, 323
Johnson, Ken, 367
Joyful Woman, 279
Karachay, 408
Kazahk, 408
Keen, Charles, 311, 312, 316
Kenyon, Frederic, 6, 31, 50, 55, 56, 138, 145, 146, 153, 181, 182, 183, 379
Kept Pure in All Ages, 322
Khmer, 317
Khoo, Jeffrey, 322
Kierkegaard, Soren, 107
King James Fans, 279, 326
King James Only, 8, 9, 160, 195, 226, 298, 304, 326, 347, 381

King James Version Debate, 297, 298
King, Randall, 320
King's Business, 250
Kinney, LeBaron, 194
Kituba, 318
KJV Copyright, 12, 125
KJV Translators, 71, 76, 79, 82, 97, 103, 146, 323, 372, 374, 428
Koeninger, Leonard, 416
Korean, 316
Krauss, F.M., 415
Krinke, John, 274
Kutilek, Doug, 347, 381
La More, Gary, 275, 283
Lachmann, Karl, 25, 55, 57, 74, 93, 104, 108, 118, 120, 148, 178, 183, 243, 297
Lackey, Bruce, 369
Lakin, B.R., 355
Landmark Baptist College, 276
LaSalle, 426
Last Twelve Verses of Mark, 126, 129, 140, 143, 185, 440
Latin, 61, 362
Latin Vulgate, 61, 64, 65, 76, 141, 181, 186, 334
Latvian, 408
Laurence, Richard, 56, 70
Lawrence, Richard, 59
Lee, Edward, 379
Lemmon, Bob, 315
Letis, Theodore, 292
Levell, Alfred, 352
Liberty University, 355
Lighthouse Baptist Press, 316
Lime Street Chapel, 75
Lindsell, Harold, 231
Lister, James, 75
Literary Theory, 394, 397
Liverpool, 75
Living Bible, 214, 228, 237, 255, 256, 277, 283, 305, 337, 367, 407
Lloyd-Jones, David Martyn, 251
Logsdon, Franklin, 12, 219, 263, 374
Loizeaux Brothers, 194, 450
London, 385
Louisiana, 221, 282
Louisiana Baptist Seminary, 282
Luther Bible, 9, 109, 361, 414, 415
Lutheran, 231, 358, 377, 414, 415
Lutheran Churches of the Reformation, 377
Mace, Daniel, 40
MacLean, William, 341
Madden, D.K., 376
Madison Baptist Church, 293
Majority Text, 38, 217, 244, 246, 256, 297, 339, 386, 434, 442
Malagasy, 317
Malan, Solomon, 6, 78, 82, 125
Malof, Basil, 408
Malone, Tom, 288
Manning, James, 269
Maranatha Baptist Bible College, 282
Mark 16, 128, 140, 141, 182
Marsh, George, 90, 125
Marsh, Herbert, 58
Martin, Abbe, 182
Martin, Alfred, 42, 56, 119, 174, 240, 245, 343, 386
Martini, Carlo, 46, 75
Mary, Queen, 97
Maryland, 284, 286, 332, 363
Maryland Baptist Bible College, 284
Massachusetts, 223, 249, 332
Matson, Jerry, 433
Matthaei, Christian, 55, 56
Matthew 1.16, 211
Mattingly, Lonnie, 292
Mauro, Philip, 9, 188, 343
Maynard, Michael, 378
McAfee, Cleland, 49
McCarty, Eric, 316
McCaul, Alexander, 73
McClintock, John, 96
McClure, Alexander, 70, 82, 441
McComb, Samuel, 58, 106
McConnell, Francis, 225
McGinley, James, 225
McIntire, Carl, 220
McKeever, Bob, 289
McLane, James, 96
McNeilly, Chris, 268
McPherson, A., 340
McWhorter, James, 310, 313
Melton, J.H., 367
Metropolitan Baptist Church, 296
Metzger, Bruce, 6, 25, 26, 31, 46, 55, 56,

138, 149, 264, 333, 360, 401
Michigan, 220, 233, 288, 302, 303, 319, 342, 360, 374, 402, 415, 421
Midwestern Baptist College, 288, 303
Miller, Edward, 56, 128, 143, 144, 158, 159, 263, 441
Miller, H.S., 53, 54
Miller, Kenneth K., 377
Miller, L.E., 194
Minnesota, 5, 317, 419
Minnick, Mark, 324
Mitchell, Judson, 266
Moberly, G., 78, 113, 121, 148
Modern Textual Criticism, 24, 31, 237, 245, 380
Modernism, 8, 39, 41, 42, 48, 57, 62, 86, 90, 98, 106, 107, 108, 111, 127, 128, 129, 137, 138, 145, 150, 151, 177, 179, 187, 188, 201, 209, 211, 212, 213, 220, 221, 222, 224, 225, 235, 237, 241, 243, 247, 263, 320, 324, 330, 335, 350, 353, 388, 402, 408, 415, 421
Moffatt, James, 140, 200, 210, 255
Moody Monthly, 221
Moorman, Jack, 38, 244, 258, 384, 442
Morris, Henry, 324, 389
Moses, 133, 135, 153, 212
Mt. Pisgah Baptist Church, 318
Muir, William, 49, 51
Munhall, L.W., 107
National Council of Churches USA, 219, 220, 221, 222, 224, 226
Nestle, Eberhard, 45, 181, 185, 215, 252, 268, 283, 364, 386, 442
Netherlands, 102
New American Standard Version, 5, 12, 112, 214, 219, 237, 257, 285, 357, 371, 375, 430, 437, 441
New Devotional Pictorial Bible, 196
New England School of the Bible, 289
New Evangelicalism, 228, 263, 275, 426
New Haven Theology, 95
New International Version, 112, 185, 214, 219, 234, 237, 256, 258, 260, 279, 281, 291, 302, 320, 322, 343, 350, 358, 359, 361, 365, 395, 396, 402, 409, 414, 423, 426, 431, 432, 437, 441
New Jersey, 171
New King James Version, 223, 246, 256, 320, 349, 377, 407, 432, 434, 437, 441
New Revised Standard Version, 207
New York, 97, 102, 164
New York City, 102
New Zealand, 341, 417
Newcome, William, 75
Newton, William, 176
Nida, Eugene, 395, 396, 399
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 107
Nolan, Frederick, 6, 17, 60, 70, 441
Nordic Bible Society, 390
Norris Bible Baptist Institute, 288
Norris, David, 391
Norris, J. Frank, 194, 214, 220, 287, 324, 335
North Carolina, 263, 264, 265, 355, 408
Norway, 390, 417
Nova Scotia, 223
Ockenga, Harold, 228
Ohio, 181, 287
Oklahoma, 194, 270, 291, 324
Oklahoma Baptist College, 291
Olongo, 318
Ontario, 275, 348
Oregon, 405
Origen, 16, 62, 95, 143, 160, 175, 181, 353, 405
Ossete, 408
Owen, John, 377, 379
Oxford University, 137
Oxnam, G. Bromley, 225
Pacific Coast Baptist College, 270
Paisley, Ian, 214, 335, 340
Panmure, Lord, 74
Pantaenus, 15
Parker Memorial Baptist Church, 319
Pattison, T. Harwood, 126
Paulus, H.E.G., 106
Peabody, A.P., 183
Pensacola Christian College, 292, 323, 419
Peoples Fellowship Tabernacle, 214
Peshito, 141
Phillips Version, 394
Phillips, Joshua, 316
Philpot, Joseph, 9, 70, 88, 343, 351
Pickering, Wilbur, 37, 129, 264, 343, 363, 377, 386, 409, 431

Pillsbury Baptist Bible College, 264, 419
Plains Baptist Challenger, 220, 324, 367
Plato, 16
Polish, 318
Poole, Matthew, 77
Portuguese, 316, 317
Presbyterian, 8, 60, 92, 109, 181, 197, 213, 234, 334, 335, 341, 348, 400, 418, 432
Presbyterians, New School, 96
Presbyterians, Old School, 95
Preservation, Bible, 10, 31, 38, 83, 94, 155, 157, 158, 161, 169, 178, 179, 180, 184, 188, 198, 215, 237, 242, 245, 268, 281, 286, 289, 291, 297, 301, 302, 320, 332, 334, 338, 341, 344, 359, 360, 363, 372, 377, 386, 401, 409, 413, 416, 422, 428, 431, 432, 436
Price, Ira, 54
Price, James, 304, 347, 381
Price, Jim, 319
Prisk, Gary, 260
Protestant Reformed Churches, 233, 400, 403
Protestant Reformed Seminary, 233, 400
Protestants Today, 404, 435
Providence, 102
Psalm 12.6-7, 267, 293, 301, 318, 357, 360, 371
Psalm 74.8, 71
Quarterly Review, 6, 66, 144, 145, 168
Quebedeaux, Richard, 233
Quotation Marks, 295
Qurollo, James, 246, 263
R.L. Hester, 296
Radio Bible Class, 247
Rasmussen, Mark, 301
Ray, J.J., 10, 47, 306, 342, 405, 409, 439
Reader's Digest Condensed Bible, 223
Received Text, 1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 38, 49, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 60, 68, 78, 81, 92, 104, 113, 114, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 124, 128, 144, 147, 155, 159, 162, 169, 170, 174, 175, 176, 177, 179, 181, 184, 187, 188, 197, 214, 215, 218, 238, 239, 241, 245, 252, 258, 260, 262, 263, 264, 269, 271, 279, 280, 282, 285, 291, 300, 305, 316, 318, 331, 334, 343, 350, 354, 358, 359, 360, 371, 377, 387, 390, 400, 401, 404, 405, 409, 414, 417, 430, 431, 432, 434, 437, 440, 441, 447
Recension, Syrian, 32, 34, 56, 181, 402
Reformed Church of Dort, 102
Rennell, T., 63
Reno, Robynn, 409
Revised Standard Version, 48, 151, 185, 195, 196, 204, 214, 216, 218, 219, 220, 222, 227, 228, 237, 247, 249, 256, 257, 263, 277, 279, 281, 282, 300, 303, 306, 324, 342, 350, 361, 376, 407, 409, 423
Revision Revised, 37, 41, 144, 153, 157, 184, 227, 241, 343, 440, 441
Revival Literature, 409
Reynolds Jr., M.H., 222
Reynolds Sr., M.H., 222
Rhode Island, 102
Rice, John R., 277, 326
Riddle, Matthew, 12, 122
Riley, William B., 198
Rimmer, Harry, 198
Roberson, Lee, 225, 300
Robinson, H. Wheeler, 49, 151
Rockwood, Perry, 213, 228, 406
Roloff, Lester, 406
Roman Catholic, 13, 46, 48, 75, 84, 110, 111, 129, 138, 141, 163, 170, 173, 185, 186, 195, 201, 204, 214, 230, 232, 233, 287, 304, 336, 340, 353, 380, 393, 399, 411
Romanian, 315, 316
Rome, 27
Ross, Bob, 347
Ruckman, Peter, 8, 10, 47, 286, 291, 300, 303, 363, 367, 420, 440, 442
Rumanian, 408
Rummel, Erika, 380
Russian, 316, 317, 318, 319, 408
Russian Bible Society, 408
Sales - Bible, 154, 257
Salmon, George, 56, 182, 183
Samson, George, 39, 108, 168
Sargent, Robert, 260, 261, 269
Sauer, Erich, 393
Saussure, Ferdinand, 396
Sawyer, John Wesley, 57, 409
Sawyer, Leicester A., 57
Scandinavia, 391

Schaeffer, Francis, 231
Schaff, Philip, 96, 112, 122, 181, 193, 283
Schiavone, Mario, 296
Schmidt, Walter, 5
Scholz, J.M.A., 55, 56, 57, 108
Scholz, Martin, 59
Schulte, Anton, 393
Schulz, V.J., 416
Scotland, 108, 340, 417, 430, 432
Scott-Pearson, Stephen, 413
Scrivener, F.H.A., 6, 29, 56, 119, 120, 124, 128, 142, 143, 149, 173, 174, 181, 182, 184, 189, 191, 244, 332, 334, 387, 391, 440, 441
Secretive, 119, 122
Seeger, Paul, 414
Selden, John, 103
Selwyn, William, 58, 78, 113
Semler, J.S., 55, 99
Sepulveda, Juan Ginez, 379
Seventh-day Adventist, 8, 347
Seventy-five Problems, 426
Sexton, Clarence, 267
Shaftesbury, Earl of, 88
Shawnee Baptist College, 293
Shuemake, H.D., 265
Shumacher, Reinhard, 319
Sightler, Harold, 221, 279, 300, 416
Sightler, James, 112
Simon, Richard, 55
Sinaiticus, 15, 18, 27, 28, 61, 62, 81, 142, 160, 168, 170, 174, 182, 280, 345, 359, 429, 441
Singapore, 321
Smith, G. Vance, 121, 122, 172
Smith, George Vance, 40, 41, 44
Smith, John Pye, 58
Smith, Phil, 319
Smith, Ron, 320, 416
Smith, Shelton, 279
Smith, W. Robertson, 172
Socialism, 112
Sorenson, David, 419
South Africa, 191, 384, 417
South Carolina, 221, 279, 300, 337
South Dakota, 270, 316
South Fort Worth Baptist Temple, 194
Southeastern Fundamental Baptist College, 293
Southern Baptist Convention, 142, 231, 277, 292, 300, 314, 325, 368, 406
Southern Indiana Baptist College, 293
Southwide Baptist Fellowship, 276, 407
Spanish, 311, 316, 317, 318, 319, 410
Spees, Russ, 359
Sperry, Willard, 210
Spring, Gardiner, 96
Spurgeon's College, 408
St. Catherine's Monastery, 13, 93, 128, 158, 168
St. Catherine's Monastery, 28
Stephenus, 117, 163, 170, 334
Steward, Bob, 421
Stormer, John, 219
Storrs, Richard, 96
Stoughton, John, 72
Strauss, David, 107
Streeter, Lloyd, 426
Strict Baptist Churches, 432
Strouse, Thomas, 240, 296, 330
Sturz, Harry, 386, 388
Surrett, Charles, 264
Susu, 315
Sutherland, S.H., 250
Swahili, 318
Swati, 316
Sword and Trowel, 57
Sword of the Lord, 276, 279
Sydney Bible Baptist College, 296
Synagogues, 71
Syrian Recension S. *See* Recension
Tabernacle Baptist Bible College Virginia Beach, 296
Tabernacle Baptist College, 300, 416
Tartar, 408
Tassell, Paul, 346, 422
Temple Baptist Church, 267
Temple, Frederic, 110
Tennessee, 225, 267, 315, 318, 369, 385, 407
Tennessee Temple, 369, 381, 385, 407
Teremi, Rick, 319
Texas, 92, 157, 194, 220, 224, 287, 288, 302, 310, 315, 317, 324, 367, 406
Textual Criticism, 186
Thacker, Clyde, 316

Thacker, Tim, 316
Thackway, John, 179, 320
Tharpe, J.G., 221, 282
Thayer, Joseph, 40, 45, 85
The Bible League, 179
The Lord God Hath Spoken, 268
The Standard Bearer, 403
Theophilus, 20
Thiele, Walter, 378
Thirlwall, Connap, 41
Thompson, D.A., 126, 179, 320
Thornwell, James, 95
Thy Word Is Truth, 416
Tischendorf, 55, 57, 74, 81, 92, 104, 118, 120, 148, 164, 182, 183, 185, 215
Tischendorf, Constantine, 31
Today's English Version, 214, 228, 256, 311, 325, 367, 407, 421, 431
Today's English Bible, 396
Todd, Henry, 62
Tottingham, Ron, 270
Touch Not the Unclean Thing, 419
Tow, S.H., 322
Tow, Timothy, 321
Townsley, Jim, 289
Tractarianism, 89, 110, 112
Traditional Text Society, 430
Translators KJV. *See* KJV Translators
Tregelles, Samuel, 39, 55, 57, 118, 120, 148, 163, 241
Trieber, Jack, 269
Trinitarian Bible Society, 12, 39, 95, 109, 157, 184, 195, 214, 222, 258, 263, 264, 291, 340, 352, 359, 371, 377, 391, 413, 431, 432, 434
Trinity Baptist College, 300
Trinity College, Dublin, 347
Trinity Valley Seminary, 194
True or False, 188, 375
Trumper, Peter, 405, 435
Turner, Charles, 302
Tyndale, William, 97, 341
UBS Greek New Testament, 5, 45, 253, 333
Udmart, 408
Ukrainian, 408
Union Theological Seminary, 209, 210
Unitarian, 35, 40, 41, 44, 45, 57, 75, 77, 87, 89, 102, 122, 172, 202
Unitarian Book Society, 75
United Bible Societies, 5, 48, 75, 104, 187, 204, 253, 256, 285, 332, 371, 386, 432
Uzbek, 408
Valentinus, 17
Van Bruggen, Jakob, 377, 386, 401
Van Dusen, Henry, 225
Van Gilder, H.O., 422, 425
Van Kleeck, Pete, 269, 359, 421
Van Kleeck, William, 363, 421
Vatican, 27
Vatican Library, 27
Vaticanus, 15, 18, 27, 61, 62, 75, 81, 128, 142, 160, 168, 170, 174, 182, 280, 333, 345, 359, 379, 429, 441
Vietnamese, 317
Vineyard, Jim, 291
Virgin Birth, 211, 212, 221, 226, 376
Virginia, 85, 296, 433
Vocal Protestants' International Fellowship, 435
Voegtlin, Roger, 268
Von Soden, 182
Wahnert, John, 435, 436
Waite, D.A., 6, 42, 154, 159, 258, 284, 297, 308, 330, 349, 354, 356, 358, 430, 437
Waldenses, 347, 367
Wales, 335, 417
Wallace, Donald, 275
Walls, Garvan, 318
Walter, Henry, 70, 378
Warfield, B.B., 398
Washington, 168, 261, 269, 413
Watkins, Keith, 230, 340, 341
Way of Life Literature, 261
Wealthy Park Baptist Church, 220, 306, 342, 360, 421
Webster, Noah, 72, 85
Weeks, Richard, 283
Weisse, C.H., 107
Wellhausen, Julius, 107
Weniger, A.Q., 297
West Coast Baptist College, 301
Westcott-Hort, 6, 9, 13, 25, 27, 28, 32, 35, 37, 40, 41, 42, 48, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 74, 92, 104, 106, 109, 110, 111, 114, 118, 119, 121, 137, 140, 144, 145, 149,

151, 161, 168, 172, 174, 176, 177, 181, 182, 184, 188, 189, 193, 203, 215, 217, 218, 219, 220, 235, 240, 244, 245, 255, 263, 291, 297, 325, 333, 343, 350, 353, 364, 376, 377, 387, 401, 437, 441
Wettstein, Johann, 35, 40
Wheaton College, 263, 342, 375
Which Bible, 347
Which Bible Society, 359
Whitaker, J.W., 103
White, Ellen G., 347
White, James, 383
White, Joseph, 77
Whitney, S.W., 177
Whittaker, J.W., 64, 70, 80
Wilberforce, 123
Wilkinson, Benjamin, 8, 10, 47, 253, 343, 347, 405
William, Charles, 218
Williams Version, 218
Williams, Wayne, 316
Windsor Hills Baptist Church, 291
Winslow, Octavius, 73
Wisconsin, 282, 320, 414, 415
Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, 414
Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, 415
Wordsworth, Charles, 121, 148
Wordsworth, Christopher, 121, 126, 148, 167, 189
Worth Bible College, 194
Wray, E. Gordon, 423
Wycliffe Bible Translators, 302
Wycliffe, John, 97
Young, Jeffrey, 377
Yugoslavian, 408
Zahn, Theodore, 182
Zwemer, Samuel, 140, 343