

THE FOUR-FOLD SUPERIORITY OF THE KING JAMES VERSION

By Dr. D.A. Waite

Dr. Donald Waite is a Baptist scholar who has written in the defense of the Received Text for many years. He is President of the Dean Burgon Society and Director of Bible for Today ministries. He has earned a B.A. in classical Greek and Latin; a Th.M. with high honors in New Testament Greek Literature and Exegesis; an M.A. and Ph.D. in Speech; a Th.D. with honors in Bible Exposition; and he holds both New Jersey and Pennsylvania teacher certificates in Greek and Language Arts. He taught Greek, Hebrew, Bible, Speech, and English for more than 35 years in nine schools. He has produced more than 700 studies on the Bible and other subjects. The following study is a summary of Waite's book *Defending the King James Bible*, which is available from Bible for Today, 900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, New Jersey 08108. Waite presents a four-fold superiority of the King James Bible: (1) SUPERIOR TEXTS (HEBREW AND GREEK); (2) SUPERIOR TRANSLATORS; (3) SUPERIOR TECHNIQUE; and (4) SUPERIOR THEOLOGY.

We begin with a couple of introductory thoughts about Bible translations:

Readability and the King James Bible. Many people say, "The KING JAMES BIBLE is too hard for people to read, they can't understand it." Well, if you consult the readability index called "Right Writer" (a computer program) that is absolutely neutral on this subject, you will find readabilities for the portions of the KING JAMES BIBLE examined as follows:

From this chart you can see that the KING JAMES BIBLE is NOT too difficult to understand--provided that you can read at a 6th to 10th grade level. Our son, D. A. Waite, Jr., has written a study he calls *Six Bible Versions Compared on Readability--A Comparison of the KJB, NKJV, ASV, RSV, NRSV, and NIV*. He took the first chapter of every book in the Bible, from Genesis through Revelation and compared the six versions of the Bible mentioned above. In this sampling, the KJV, over all, has a "Flesch Grade Level" of from 6.1 to 8.6. The NIV, on the other hand, has a "Flesch Grade Level" of from 6.1 to 11.0!! The NIV is not only less accurate by far, but also less readable than the King James! From this evidence, we see that it's not too hard to understand the KING JAMES BIBLE.

I know hundreds of people whose intelligence and educational levels have not reached as high as some of these ... people who say they can't understand this King James Bible, yet these people do understand it. How do you figure that out? Remember 1 Co. 2:14 which states, 'But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.' This verse is still true, regardless of which translation is used.

Some people say they like a particular version because they say it's more readable. Now, readability is one thing, but does the readability conform to what's in the original Greek and Hebrew language? You can have a lot of readability, but if it doesn't match up with what God has said, it's of no profit. In the King James Bible, the words match what God has said. You may say it's difficult to read, but study it out. It's hard in the Hebrew and Greek and, perhaps, even in the English in the King James Bible. But to change it around just to make it simple, or interpreting it, instead of translating it, is wrong. You've got lots of interpretation, but we don't want that in a translation. We want exactly what God said in the Hebrew and Greek brought over into English.

Do we need more "translations" of the Bible? It can be asked: "Do we really need more 'translations' of the Bible? Are these new versions really necessary?"

1. Complete English Bibles. In the back of our book, *Defending the King James Bible*, there's a chart that lists the number of "complete English Bibles" by years. From the 1300's through the 1900's, there were a total of 135 "complete English Bibles." This is taken from a research that's been done on English Bibles of all kinds. We notice that, on the average, there has been one complete English Bible every 4.4 years. Do you think we need more Bibles? In the last 604 years (from 1388 through 1991) complete English Bibles have increased in frequency. In the 1300's, there were only three; in the 1400's, there were none; in the 1800's, there were forty-five; in the 1900's, there were fifty-three (averaging one every 9.9 years).

2. Complete English New Testaments. In the same book, there is a chart that lists the number of "complete English New Testaments" by years. From the 1300's through the 1900's, there were a total of 293 "complete English New Testaments." This is, on the average, one complete English New Testament every 2.1 years. Do you think we need more New Testaments? Even if they were all presently available, imagine someone reading all of them. In the last 612 years (from 1380 through 1991) complete English New Testaments have also increased in frequency. In the 1300's there was only one complete English New Testament; in the 1400's, there was none; in the 1800's, there were ninety; and in the 1900's, there were 144 (averaging one every .69 years). That's quite a jump--from ninety to 144!

3. Complete English Bibles and New Testaments combined. If you put the charts together we can see that during the 612 years, from the 1300's to the 1900's, there were a total of 135 complete English Bibles, and 293 complete English New Testaments. This totals 428. It means that, on the average, there was either one complete English Bible or complete English New Testament published every 1.4 years. Do we need more complete English Bibles or complete English New Testaments? That's the question. I believe that the major factor in the production of Bibles and New Testaments is money. When the publishers discover that a certain version no longer brings financial profit to their treasuries, that version runs out of print in a hurry! Very few churches are doing what the Berean Baptist Church in Greenwood, Indiana, is doing--printing Bibles and giving them out at low cost. In fact, they give many of them away without charge. To my knowledge, only those who have the real truth found in the King James Bible are doing this. You will find few, if any, publishers of these false perversions printing them at low cost or without charge!

Now we move to the fourfold superiority of the King James Bible:

#1: THE KING JAMES BIBLE HAS SUPERIOR ORIGINAL LANGUAGE TEXTS. The first reason for defending the KJV is because it has superior texts, both Hebrew and Greek. This correctly implies that the various versions and perversions of the Bible have inferior texts, both Hebrew and Greek.

THE KJV HAS A SUPERIOR O.T. HEBREW TEXT. There are two basic texts in existence in Hebrew, the false one, edited by Ben Asher, and the true one, edited by Ben Chayyim. The Ben Asher is exhibited in Rudolf Kittel's BIBLIA HEBRAICA (BHK) (1937) with all of his suggested footnote changes, as well as in the Stuttgart edition of BIBLIA HEBRAICA (BHS) (1967-77) with all of their suggested footnote changes. The true text of Ben Chayyim on which our KJV is based is also available. It is called the Daniel Bomberg edition or the Second Great Rabbinic Bible (1524-25). We carry this Hebrew Bible in the Bible for Today ministry. It is the Letteris text, printed in 1866. It has the Masoretic Hebrew text in the center and the King James Bible in the margins. This Ben Chayyim Masoretic Hebrew text was the unquestioned Hebrew text for the next 400 years. Nobody questioned it. In fact, Rudolf Kittel, in his first two editions of 1906 and 1912, used that text in his BIBLIA HEBRAICA. It was not until 1937, that he switched Hebrew texts and substituted the spurious and inferior text which uses the Leningrad Manuscript (B19a or "L"). He used this because he claimed it was the oldest single Hebrew manuscript, dating from about 1008 A.D.

Both of these false Biblia Hebraica (BHK & BHS) Hebrew texts offer in their footnotes about fifteen to twenty suggested changes per page. This adds up to about 20,000 to 30,000 changes in the entire Hebrew Old Testament text. One or the other of these false Hebrew texts, either BHK or BHS, are used as the basis for the O.T. in all modern versions, as can be shown by reading their introductory pages. How many of these changes in the Hebrew text are you ready to accept? Do you want to accept 30,000? How about 20,000? 10,000? How about 5,000? How about 1,000? How many of you would like to accept 500 changes?

If you do not start with an absolute, where there is no doubt, you're going to continue to move and to accept more and more changes. Where can you stop, once you have begun to slide? Doubts will arise in your mind. We don't want to move from the Hebrew O.T. on which our KJV is based. We must have an absolute.

My personal belief is that the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew text that underlies the KJV is not only the "closest to the original autographs," but that it is IDENTICAL to those original autographs. I can't prove that to anybody, but I accept it as a matter of personal faith. I believe we have the very Words that God has preserved through the years. I believe every Word in the Hebrew text is God's Word, preserved because He

told us He would preserve it for the next 20,000 to 30,000 years--to a "thousand generations."

The New Versions attempt to "CORRECT" The Hebrew Text in at Least 19 different ways. The NIV uses all nineteen of these, by the way. In effect, the new version "translators/paraphraser" might say, "Oh, I don't want to take this Hebrew word here. I want to take the Septuagint (LXX) reading instead." But the Septuagint (LXX) version for the most part is worse than a Living Version. It is the Old Testament written in Greek. It is rotten. Its text is corrupt. Even the ISBE article, (the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia) on the Septuagint (LXX) states that it has a very tattered and inferior Greek text. Remember, the ISBE is no friend of the King James Bible's text. The use of the Septuagint (LXX) by these new versions instead of using the Hebrew text is a serious error.

Another one of the nineteen methods is when they have no textual proof at all. It is pure conjecture. They might say, "I don't have any proof, but I think it sounds better this way." When this is done, they often print in the footnote an "L" which stands for "legendum," meaning in Latin, "which read." I remember Dr. Merrill F. Unger, my Hebrew teacher at Dallas Theological Seminary. He has written many books, including Unger's Bible Dictionary. He was an apt and humble man, though he reminded me of an "absent-minded professor" at times. He taught us Isaiah in our second year Hebrew class. On one occasion, he read a verse in a way that differed from the Hebrew text. I raised my hand and said, "Why did you read it that way? It doesn't read that way in the Hebrew text?" Dr. Unger replied, "Well, I just thought it sounded better that way, so I changed it." Dr. Unger went to the Johns Hopkins University for his Ph.D. work. He was taught by Dr. Albright who was far from sound in his theology. Perhaps Dr. Unger learned this doubt of the Hebrew text from his professor. What was Dr. Unger doing? He was "CORRECTING" the Hebrew text by conjecture.

Some "CORRECT" the Hebrew with the Syriac Version. Some "CORRECT" the Hebrew with just "a few Hebrew manuscripts" rather than the entire Masoretic Traditional Hebrew text. Some "CORRECT" the Hebrew with the Latin Vulgate. Some "CORRECT" the Hebrew with the Dead Sea Scrolls. With the Dead Sea Scrolls, there are a few problems. Problem #1: How do you know which Hebrew manuscripts this heretical cult (called the Essenes) took with them when they left the temple of Jerusalem and went to the area of the Qumran caves? Problem #2: How do you know the methods they used and the accuracy with which they copied and recopied those manuscripts? It just so happens that the Dead Sea Scrolls, probably 99% of the time, did concur with the Hebrew text that underlies the King James Bible. But, in the places where they don't, we should stick to the Masoretic Traditional Hebrew text.

Some, like the NIV, use "quotations from Jerome" to "CORRECT" the Hebrew text. Some use Josephus, an unsaved Jew, to "CORRECT" the Hebrew text. Some use a "variant Hebrew Reading in the margin" to "CORRECT" the Hebrew text. Some use "words in the consonantal text divided differently" to "CORRECT" the Hebrew text. Some use quotations from Jerome, Aquila, the Samaritan Pentateuch, or Symmachus to "CORRECT" the Hebrew text. Some use the Hebrew Targums, Theodotion, or the "Juxta Hebraica of Jerome for the Psalms" to "CORRECT" the Hebrew text. Why are they taking Jerome as a substitute for the Hebrew Word of God? Was he there? Still others use a "different set of Hebrew Vowels" to "CORRECT" the Hebrew text. Some use "an ancient Hebrew scribal tradition" to "CORRECT" the Hebrew. Some use the BIBLIA HEBRAICA of Kittel or Stuttgartensia to "CORRECT" the Hebrew. These are 19 of the different methods that other English versions have used to "CORRECT" the Masoretic Traditional Hebrew Old Testament text, thus changing the very Words of God!

God authorized the Jews to be the exclusive guardians of His Words. The Jews were to be the guardians of the O.T. Hebrew text. God did not give that privilege and responsibility to any other race or people. "What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God" (Ro. 3:1,2).

It was the Hebrew O.T. text that God preserved, not some text in Greek, Latin, or Syriac, or any of these other documents. It must be Hebrew. There were eight or more important, strict rules that were followed by the Hebrew scribes who copied and recopied the Masoretic Hebrew O.T. text. These rules were to insure that each letter, word, and sentence of the Hebrew text was preserved exactly. The Jews were meticulous and reverent in the copying and recopying of our Hebrew manuscripts. That's why I believe that we should not change any of the Hebrew Words of God that underlie the KJV.

The Ben Chayyim Hebrew Old Testament Text is available today. I hope that the American Bible Society and the British and Foreign Bible Society keep printing and circulating this Letteris Hebrew text. That's what they call it, the Letteris text of 1866. This came out before Kittel decided to scrap it for his false Ben Asher text. These same Bible Societies print the false Hebrew texts, too. If they stop printing the true Ben Chayyim Hebrew Old Testament text, by God's grace, we will do every thing in our power to see that it's reprinted page by page and get it back into circulation. We'll preserve the very O.T. Hebrew Words of God ourselves, if that becomes necessary. Sometimes this Hebrew Bible has gone out of stock at the American Bible Society, but it has always come back in stock by a shipment from England.

THE KING JAMES BIBLE HAS A SUPERIOR NEW TESTAMENT GREEK TEXT. There is a simple table in our book which speaks volumes concerning the New Testament Greek text debate. Here it is:

1. The Greek Text that underlies the KJV. If you examine this table carefully, you will learn much about the debate that is raging concerning the Greek N.T. On the left of the table are some facts about the Textus Receptus that underlies the KJv. The Trinitarian Bible Society has published this text and made it available to anyone. The TBS took this text from that of Dr. Frederick Scrivener who was commissioned in about 1885, by the Cambridge University Press, to come up with the exact Greek text that underlies the King James Bible. Scrivener set down all of the Greek words used by the KJV, but he did something else as well. He put in bold face type all of the alterations made by editors Westcott and Hort in their 1881 English Revised Version. He inserted the exact alterations in the footnotes. These consisted of either additions of Greek words, subtractions of Greek words, or changes of Greek words in some other way. This Greek text edition has been reprinted by the Bible for Today. It is a very useful tool. Scrivener's Greek text is also available on the LOGOS Computer Program which enables the student to study more carefully. Dr. Jack Moorman counted 140,521 Greek words in the Textus Receptus. Scrivener's Greek edition has 647 pages which would average 217 Greek words per page. That's what the Textus Receptus has.

2. The Greek Text of Westcott and Hort that underlies the Modern Versions. Though there were some scattered opposition to the Received Text in years before, the concerted effort against the Received Text came in 1881, and after. In 1881, two theological heretics (posing as conservatives) from the Anglican Church, B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, published their Greek text that rejected the TR in 5,604 places by my actual count. This included 9,970 Greek words that were either added, subtracted, or changed from the TR. This involves, on the average, 15.4 words per page of the Greek N.T., or a total of 45.9 pages in all. It is 7% of the total of 140,521 words in the TR Greek N.T. It was a radically new Greek text. Westcott and Hort concocted a new Greek text and changed the TR that had been used in the Church from the beginning of the writing of the N.T.

You might rightfully ask, "How did you come up with this number of changes?" That's a valid question. I took a copy of the original Scrivener's Greek N.T. to a summer Bible Conference where I was preaching. During the afternoon, when there were no meetings, I studied that volume carefully, making notations on it as I read. When I indicate that there are 5,604 places in the Greek N.T. where Westcott and Hort actually altered the Greek Textus Receptus used by the KING JAMES BIBLE translators, it is because I actually counted that many places. I have the data in my copy of Scrivener's Greek New Testament. These 5,604 places involve a total of 9,970 Greek words. How do I know that? Again, I counted them. I saw from the footnotes exactly how many Greek words each of the 5,604 places involved. As you might know, some of the places involve twelve entire verses (Mk. 16:9-20 and John 7:53-- 8:11). In each of the 5,604 places, compared to the Textus Receptus that underlies the KJV, Westcott and Hort either added Greek words, subtracted Greek words, or changed the Greek words in some other way. You can see that the Westcott and Hort alterations amount to just thirty words short of 10,000 Greek words. This means that there are almost 10,000 Greek words that are different in the Westcott and Hort Greek New Testament (and probably about the same or more in the Nestle/Aland 26th edition Greek text) as compared to the Greek text that underlies our KJV.

This FALSE Greek text, with its approximate 10,000 alterations, was the basis for virtually all of the modern English versions and perversions, including the ERV, ASV, NIV, NASV, NKJV, RSV, NRSV, TEV, JB, NEV, LV and the rest.

Hort's own three estimates on the extent of the Greek textual problems between his text and the Textus Receptus. In 1882, Hort wrote an Introduction to the so-called Westcott and Hort Greek Text of 1881. In his Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek--The Text Revised by Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D., and Fenton John Anthony Hort, D.D., Hort made an estimate of the differences between various Greek texts. His estimate had three parts. Let me quote each of the parts:

(1) Hort's estimate of the proportion of the Greek New Testament that was virtually accepted by everyone. He wrote: "With regard to the great bulk of the words of the New Testament, as of most other ancient writings, there is NO VARIATION or other ground of doubt, and therefore no room for textual criticism; . . . The proportion of words virtually accepted on all hands as raised above doubt is VERY GREAT, not less, on a rough computation, than SEVEN EIGHTHS OF THE WHOLE. The REMAINING EIGHTH therefore, formed in great part by changes of order and other comparative trivialities, constitutes the whole area of criticism" (Hort, p. 2).

Since the "whole" in numbers of Greek words and pages in the Greek N.T. as seen in our table, is 140,521 Greek words (100%=647 pages), Hort's 7/8ths of the Greek New Testament virtually agreed to by all would be 122,956 Greek words (87.5%=566 pages). Hort's 1/8th of the Greek N.T. that he claimed was in dispute would be 17,565 Greek words (12.5%=81 pages). In point of fact, as seen in the above table, the area of dispute between the Westcott and Hort Greek text as opposed to the Textus Receptus that underlies the KJV is only 9,970 Greek words (7%=45.9 pages). So Hort's estimate in this area is incorrect.

(2) Hort's estimate of the proportion of the Greek New Testament that would still be in doubt if his principles were followed. He wrote: "If the principles followed in the present edition are sound, this area may be very greatly reduced. Recognising to the full the duty of abstinence from peremptory decision in cases where the evidence leaves the judgement in suspense between two or more readings, we find that, setting aside differences of orthography, the words in our opinion still subject to doubt only make up about ONE SIXTIETH of the whole New Testament" (Hort, loc. cit.).

Since the "whole" in numbers of Greek words and pages in the Greek New Testament, as seen in the table above, is 140,521 Greek words (100%=647 pages), Hort's 1/60th of the Greek New Testament still subject to doubt if his principles were followed, would be 2,342 Greek words. This represents 1.76% of the Greek words, or 11.4 pages in a Greek New Testament if put all in one place. But we don't follow Hort's "principles" at all. Because of this, we who hold to the Greek text that underlies the KJV are still disputing 9,970 Greek words (rather than only 2,342 Greek words). This represents 7% of the Greek words (rather than only 1.76%), or 45.9 pages in a Greek New Testament if the words were put in one place (rather than only 11.4 pages). So Hort's estimate in this area is incorrect again. We still maintain that the of Greek words in dispute are vastly more in number than Hort has stated.

(3) Hort's estimate of the proportion of the Greek New Testament that contains "SUBSTANTIAL VARIATION." He wrote: "In this second estimate the proportion of comparatively trivial variations is beyond measure larger than in the former; so that the amount of what can in any sense be called SUBSTANTIAL VARIATION is but a small fraction of the whole residuary variation, and can hardly form more than A THOUSANDTH PART of the entire text" (Hort, loc. cit.).

Since the "whole" in numbers of Greek words and pages in the Greek New Testament, as seen in the table above, is 140,521 Greek words (100%=647 pages), Hort's 1/1000th of the Greek New Testament that he thought could be called "SUBSTANTIAL VARIATION" would be 140.5 Greek words (.1%=.647 pages). This would be a little over one half a page in the Greek N.T. This is extremely wide of the mark of truth! Since we don't follow Hort's "principles" at all, we who hold to the Greek text that underlies the KJV are still disputing, either in "SUBSTANTIAL VARIATION" or otherwise, a total of 9,970 Greek words (7%=45.9 pages). It is Hort's last estimate that has been seized by his modern day puppets and grossly distorted in order to fool people into thinking that the problem is very tiny, when in reality, it is much, much larger!

The misquotation of Hort by his followers on the extent of the Greek textual problems between his text and the Textus Receptus. Modern disciples of this false Westcott and Hort Greek text have enlarged upon Hort's estimates. They say, in effect: "If all of the variant readings between the Westcott and Hort-type text and

the Textus Receptus-type text were assembled together in one place, they would amount to a little over one half a page in the Greek New Testament."

Hort's pupils are either knowingly or unknowingly misquoting their teacher. They want to make the DIFFERENCES in the Greek texts very, very slight so as to minimize the arguments against the false Westcott and Hort-types Greek text. From the above quotations from Hort's Introduction, his differences in Greek texts would be either 81 pages (1/8th), or 11.4 pages (1/60th), or .647 pages (1/1000th). Rather than merely "a little over one half a page," Hort's 1/8th of total differences would amount to 81 pages. In reality, we are faced with 45.9 pages of difference!

A current illustration of this practice of distorting the facts in this area is found in a tape-recorded message given by Dr. Kenneth Barker, the chairman of the translation committee responsible for the New International Version. Dr. Barker spoke in the Sunday evening service, September 12, 1993, at the Southside Baptist Church in Greenville, South Carolina. A friend recorded the message and gave me a copy. Dr. Barker stated:

"There are over 5,000 Greek manuscripts, and all of them are AGREED 98% of the time. So all of this debate that Carson refers to in The King James Version Debate, all of this debate, all of the hullabaloo is over less than 2% of the entire text of the New Testament. And in that less than 2%, you can select any reading that you wish among the manuscripts, (that's not our approach, but you can) and it won't change Christian doctrine one bit."

Dr. Barker is wrong on TWO COUNTS! (1) His "less than 2%" difference between any of the Greek manuscripts would be 2,810 Greek words (12.9 pages). The truth of the matter is that there is a 7% difference between the Westcott and Hort Greek text and the Textus Receptus that underlies the KJV. This would be 9,970 Greek words (45.9 pages). This is a most serious error. It is a blatant falsehood that is being promulgated by the chairman of the NIV translation committee. It would give false confidence to the pastor and members of this church that had just recently given up the KJV in favor of Dr. Barker's NIV. (2) The second serious error is Dr. Barker's statement relative to the fact that variations in manuscripts "won't change Christian doctrine one bit." In our book, we specify 158 such passages. Dr. Jack Moorman lists 356 such passages. These two falsehoods, from someone who should know better, are the major ones used to lull Bible believing Christians into deep slumber concerning the Bible version controversy that has been raging.

The King James Bible's Greek text is worth fighting for! The Greek Text of the New Testament is truly a BATTLEGROUND! Someone might say to you that there is really very little difference in the two Greek texts. They may tell you that you shouldn't be fighting about these differences. It seems to me that almost 46 pages of the Greek N.T. ARE worth fighting about. 9,970 Greek words are worth fighting about. 7% of the Greek N.T. is worth fighting about. This is a BATTLEGROUND! We must not retreat. We must do battle for the Lord's Words! We must stand fast. If we lose in this battle between truth and error, there's no stopping the onrush of more error. In the tug of war with truth and error, there is no middle ground. Those of us who believe in standing up for the Lord Jesus Christ should remember His Words: "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of Me and of My Words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when He cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" (Mk. 8:38).

THE KING JAMES BIBLE'S GREEK TEXT IS ATTESTED BY THE EVIDENCE. Here is a table that is printed on page fifty-seven of *Defending the King James Bible*. It gives us a summary of the manuscript evidence that is available to us today.

As of 1967, Kurt Aland, of Munster, Germany, counted a total of 5,255 Greek manuscripts still in existence. Though there are a few others since 1967, I use these figures which are still very close. Aland is the lead editor of the 26th edition of the Nestle/Aland Greek New Testament which is being used as the critical text of today. I am using Aland's 1967 figures.

As you can see from the table, there are 81 (now 88) papyrus fragments. There are 267 uncial manuscripts. These are large, capital letter documents. There are 2,764 cursives manuscripts. These are the flowing

hand manuscripts. There are 2,143 lectionary manuscripts. These are portions of Scripture that were read on certain days of the church year. This totals at least 5,255 Greek manuscripts of the N.T. that have been preserved and are available for us today.

The table gives the approximate number and percent of each type of Greek manuscript that supports the Westcott-Hort (WH) Greek text, as well as the number and percent of each class that supports the Textus Receptus (TR) Greek text. These approximations are taken from the careful research of Dr. Jack Moorman in his book *Forever Settled* (see Bibliography).

The WH figures are given first and those for the TR second. For the papyrus fragments the score is 13 to 75 (15% to 85%). For the uncial manuscripts the score is 9 to 258 (3% to 97%). For the cursive manuscripts the score is 23 to 2,741 (1% to 99%). For the lectionary manuscripts the score is 0 to 2,143 (0% to 100%). For the totals for all classes of manuscripts the score is 45 to 5,210. This is a ratio of less than 1% to more than 99%!

THE KING JAMES BIBLE'S GREEK TEXT HAS BEEN PRESERVED BY GOD. Which of the two kinds of Greek text has God preserved? How do you define preservation? The Scripture says:

"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" (Ps. 12:6,7).

Obviously God has "KEPT" and "PRESERVED" His Words in the 99% of the evidence, rather than in the 1%. By very definition, this is "PRESERVATION." Suppose I had 100 million dollars to begin with and a thief stole it from me. Suppose I reported this to the police; and after long investigation, they were able to recover 99 million dollars out of the 100 million dollars. The thief would keep one million dollars. Which of the two parties could most accurately be described as having "PRESERVED" the 100 million dollars: the thief who had the one million dollars, or the police who recovered the 99 million dollars? The one million would be a "PRESERVATION" of practically nothing (1%) compared to the 99 million (99%). And so it is with the Greek manuscripts of the N.T. The fulfillment of God's promise to "KEEP" and "PRESERVE" His Words is to be found in the more than 99% of the manuscripts we have today. And these support the Greek Text that underlies the KJV, and NOT the Greek text that underlies the modern versions and perversions!

THE FALSE GREEK TEXTS OF "B" AND "ALEPH" CONTRADICT ONE ANOTHER IN OVER 3,000 PLACES IN THE GOSPELS ALONE. In the total numbers of manuscripts, you'll notice that the Westcott-Hort type has only 45 manuscripts that go along with it as over against 5,210 that go along with the TR that underlies the KJV. This 45 includes "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) and forty- three of their little heretical puppets that follow them. The theory behind the acceptance of these less than 1% is that "The oldest are the best." The oldest are not necessarily the best, especially if they have been tampered with by heretics!

Both Dr. Frederick Scrivener and Dean John William Burgon agreed that the greatest pollution of the stream of pure manuscripts was accomplished in the first 100 years after the New Testament was written! So the oldest are not necessarily the best! This is especially true since the heretics had their knives out "correcting" the Greek N.T. almost as soon as it was written. The Egyptian scribes and editors of "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) were some of the most vicious "correctors" of God's Words; yet these two Greek texts form the very bedrock of the new versions and perversions of our day. "B" and "Aleph" contradict each other, as Herman Hoskier has so accurately pointed out in his two volume work entitled *Codex B and Its Allies*, in over 3,000 places in the four Gospels alone! So, they are not good witnesses. They are false witnesses indeed!

#2: THE KING JAMES BIBLE HAS SUPERIOR TRANSLATORS. The second reason for defending the KJV is because it has superior translators. This correctly implies that the various versions and perversions of the Bible have inferior translators.

Let's take a brief look at the superior translators of the KJV. Why do I say that the KJV translators are superior? I say they are superior because they ARE superior! I think that there is no question about the expertise and ability of the translators who gave us our KJV. The new version people often say that the KJV

translators were rather ignorant and didn't know as much about translating as the "translators/paraphrasers" of today. This is not only prideful, but completely false. Their linguistic qualifications are unequaled!

The accomplishments of Lancelot Andrews. Let's mention Dr. Lancelot Andrews. He was certainly a superior KJV translator. He had mastered fifteen languages. Someone said that if Dr. Andrews had been present at the confusion of tongues at the tower of Babel, he could have served as interpreter general. I don't know any of the modern "translator/paraphrasers" who have mastered fifteen languages, do you? Send me their names, if you have proof of this.

The acumen of William Bedwell. How about Dr. William Bedwell? He was famed in Arabic learning. I don't know how many of these new men who are "translating/paraphrasing" for these modern versions and perversions who have studied as much of the Arabic language as he had. In fact, he published in quarto, an edition of the Epistles of St. John in Arabic with a Latin version. I don't know how many men today could do that. Dr. Bedwell left many Arabic manuscripts in the University of Cambridge, with numerous notes and a font of types for printing them. In fact, he wrote an Arabic lexicon, or dictionary, in three volumes. He also began a Persian dictionary which is among Archbishop Laud's manuscripts, still preserved in the Bodleian Library at Oxford today. I don't think anyone among our modern "translators/paraphrasers" of today has done this or could do this! Do you know any of these men who have written an Arabic dictionary and begun a Persian dictionary, or done anything similar in the scholarly world that will even come close to the accomplishments of William Bedwell? If so, send me their names and the proof. In our day, many people watch too much television. They attend too many football games, baseball games. and basketball games. We are ignoramuses today compared to the scholars who gave us our KJV!

The acceptability of Miles Smith. Look at the acceptability of Dr. Miles Smith. He was an expert in Hebrew, in Chaldee, in Syriac, and in Arabic. They were almost as familiar to him as his native tongue. Dr. Smith went through both the Greek and Latin church Fathers, making annotations on them all.

The activities of Henry Savile. Sir Henry Saville was proficient in both Greek and mathematics. He became tutor in these two subjects to Queen Elizabeth. I don't know how many queens or kings our modern "translators/paraphrasers" have tutored, do you? Saville translated the histories of Cornelius Tacitus and published the same with notes. He published, from the manuscripts, the writings of Bradwardin against Pelagius, the Writers of English History Subsequent to Bede, and Prelections on the Elements of Euclid. He was the first to edit the complete works of Chrysostom, the most famous of the Greek Fathers. He was a profound, and exact scholar.

The academics of John Bois. John Bois was expert in Hebrew as well as Greek. He studied at his father's knee. In fact, at the age of five, he had read the whole Bible IN HEBREW!! At the age of six, John Bois was able to write Hebrew in a clear and elegant style. If you know anything about the Hebrew letters, it's difficult to write in an elegant style, or in any style, for that matter. Much more could be said about John Bois.

The superior translators in general. Have you ever heard of Gulliver's Travels? It tells of Gulliver's adventures with the inhabitants of Lilliput. Do you remember what the Lilliputians did to poor Gulliver? They were tiny, tiny people, and Gulliver was like a giant to them. While he was asleep, they tied up Gulliver with tiny cords so he couldn't move. I liken the KJV translators to the giant Gulliver and the "translators / paraphrasers" of today to tiny Lilliputians. It states in Ge. 6:4: "There were GIANTS in the earth in those days..." It was true also from 1604 to 1611, when these profound scholars gave us our incomparable King James Bible! They had mastered English as well as the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek.

They also knew the cognate or brother-sister- cousin related languages that shed light on the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek such as the Aramaic, the Arabic, the Persian, the Coptic, the Syriac, and the others. When the modern "translators/paraphrasers" come upon a word they don't understand, they throw up their hands in dismay. The KJV translators did not meet with such difficulty because they knew the cognate languages so well that they could unlock such mysteries. Our modern "translators/paraphrasers" are linguistically illiterate when compared to the men who gave us our KJV. They truly were "GIANTS"!!

#3: THE KING JAMES BIBLE HAS SUPERIOR TECHNIQUE. The third reason for defending the KING JAMES BIBLE is because it has superior technique of translation. This correctly implies that the

various versions and perversions of the Bible have inferior technique of translation.

The KJV translators used the superior technique of verbal equivalence and formal equivalence--not dynamic equivalence. The modern versions and perversions have used, to a greater or lesser degree, the inferior technique of dynamic equivalence and have disdained both verbal and formal equivalence.

Alleged exceptions.

1. "God Forbid." Some people allege that the KJB translators used dynamic equivalence in their expression "God forbid." Even if it were the case (and I do not accept that it is), it is found only fourteen times in the New Testament: Ro. 3:4,6,31; 6:2,15; 7:7,13; 9:14; 11:1,11; 1 Co. 6:15; Ga. 2:17; 3:21; 6:14. It is a rendering of "mE genoito" which is "may it not be" or "let it not be." This is perfect 1611 parlance for "God forbid." It was quite literal in 1611. If you don't believe it, consult the Oxford English Dictionary which gives you the meaning of "God forbid" in 1611. It is found only seven times in the O.T.: Ge. 44:7,17; Jos. 22:29; 24:16; 1 Sa. 12:23; 1 Ch. 11:19; Job 27:5. It is a rendering of "chalal" which is "may it be something profane" or "may it be far from me." Again, "God forbid" is a perfect 1611- parlance for the Hebrew words used.

2. "God Save the King." Another favorite allegation of dynamic equivalency in the KJV is the expression "God save the king." Even if it were the case (and I do not accept that it is), it is only found four times in the O.T.: 1 Sa. 10:24; 2 Sa. 16:16; 2 Ki. 11:12; 2 Ch. 23:11. It means "may the king live long" or "may the king be preserved or safe." Well, if the king lives long, he is "saved" is he not? [Editor: The term "salvation" was used in a much broader sense in past centuries.] So why not let the 1611-parlance of "God save the king" alone? The fact is that such examples are very, very few in the KJV, whereas they abound in the modern versions and perversions because in those, the dynamic equivalent technique is the rule rather than the exception.

The King James Bible's verbal and formal equivalence. The KJV basically uses the technique of verbal equivalence and formal equivalence. Verbal equivalence means that the very words, wherever possible, are brought over from Hebrew into English and from Greek into English. The KJV also uses the technique of formal equivalence, that is, the translators brought over, wherever possible, the very forms of the Hebrew and Greek words into English. They didn't transform the grammar. They didn't take a noun and make a verb out of it. They brought a verb into a verb and a noun into a noun wherever possible. They were skilled craftsmen who had a proper concept of what "translation" really is. It comes from translatus which in turn comes from two Latin words, trans ("across") and latus which is the past participle of fero ("to carry"). It means to "carry across" from one place to another, or from one language to another. It does not seek to CHANGE, or to ADD, or to SUBTRACT!

Let me illustrate "translation." If I have my wife's pocketbook and I want to translate it from one side of the church to the other, I would simply pick it up, take it across the aisle, and put it on the other side of the church. I wouldn't leave any of it behind, even though there may be some things in it I wouldn't want to take over. I wouldn't add anything to it, and I wouldn't drop any of it in the center aisle. Now that's translation, translatus. That's what the KJV translators did. They just simply took the Hebrew words and put them into English. They picked up the Greek words and put them into English. That's translation. That's the superior technique.

The modern versions' use of dynamic equivalence. I have a computer print-out research of three of these modern versions--the New King James, the New American Standard, and the New International. When compared to the Hebrew and Greek texts, I found that the New King James Version had over 2,000 examples of dynamic equivalency, that is, adding to, subtracting from, or changing the Words of God. In a similar study of the New American Standard Version, I found over 4,000 such examples. In a similar study of the New International Version I found over 6,653 such examples.

What is meant by dynamic equivalency? "Dynamic" means "moving or changing." "Equivalence" means "the same or unchanging." You can't have it both ways! It is either changing or unchanging. Those who use this false technique in the various "translations/paraphrases" think it's a great technique. The bottom line for such a technique is that it gives a human being the right to ADD to God's Words (which is sin), to

SUBTRACT from God's Words (which is sin), or to CHANGE God's Words (which is sin). God pronounces the strongest possible CURSE on anyone who dares to do any of those three things to God's Words!! Those who use this false technique are really paraphrasing rather than translating. Paraphrase comes from two Greek words, para ("along side or beside") and phrasis ("a word or phrase"). It means to use a word or phrase that is along side of the real meaning. It is to state something in other words. We should seek, as the KJV translators sought, to put into English the exact and accurate meaning of the Hebrew and Greek Words of God rather than to give something that is "beside" or "along side of" the word or phrase.

#4: THE KING JAMES BIBLE HAS SUPERIOR THEOLOGY. The fourth reason for defending the KING JAMES BIBLE is because it has superior theology. This correctly implies that the various versions and perversions of the Bible have inferior theology.

Some denials that theology is affected by Greek or English versions. It is said by those who use the new versions and perversions of the Bible that there is no difference in any of them when it comes to theology. It is also said that there is no difference in any of the Greek texts in the matter of theology. This is even said by those who are looked up to as Bible believing leaders. There are two phases of their theological denial:

(1) These men believe that the Greek textual variants between the two basic Greek texts do not affect theology or doctrine. They believe that the false Westcott and Hort Greek text (when compared to the Greek text of the KJV) contains nothing that is theologically deficient or doctrinally incorrect. This is false.

(2) These men also believe that the modern English versions do not contain changes from the KJV that affect theology or doctrine. They believe that you can take any modern English version you wish and when you compare it to the KJV, that version does not have anything in it that is theologically deficient or doctrinally incorrect. This is also false.

Dr. John R. Rice stated: "The differences in the translations are so minor, so insignificant, that we can be sure not a single doctrine, not a single statement of fact, not a single command or exhortation, has been missed in our translations." (meaning the English Revised Version of 1881 or the American Standard Version of 1901)

This statement is clearly false. It is not true to the evidence. Dr. Sumner wrote: "The rare parts about which there is still uncertainty do not effect [sic] in any way any doctrine." This is false! Doctrine IS affected. Dr. Robert L. Thomas, John MacArthur's professor in his California Seminary, wrote: "No major doctrine of scripture is affected by a variant reading." False, again. Dr. H.S. Miller wrote: "No doctrine is affected." False again. Dr. Stanley Gundry stated: "Only a few outstanding problems remain, and these do not affect doctrine or divine command to us." False again. Dr. Ernest Pickering wrote: "Important differences of textual readings are relatively few and almost none would affect any major Christian doctrine." False again!

Some examples of theology that is affected by Greek and English versions. I have given 158 examples of the theological superiority of the KJV in my book. I selected these from Dr. Jack Moorman's compilation of a total of 356 doctrinal passages that have been changed in the Egyptian heretical Greek texts of "B" (Vatican), "Aleph" (Sinai), and others. I'll give you some examples of doctrines that are affected by these false Greek texts and new versions.

1. John 3:15. "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life."

Do you know what the "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) manuscripts do to the three words, "should not perish"? They REMOVE them. So, in the two false Greek texts, there's no hell in Jn. 3:15. What versions follow these corrupted Greek texts? The NIV follows them, the NASV follows them, and the NKJV in the footnotes, follows them. So do the other modern versions and perversions. For them, there is no hell in Jn. 3:15. Is this not a major doctrine?

2. Mark 9:44 and 9:46. Another example is Mark 9:44 and 46. Both verses are gone: "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched".

Because "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) remove both verses, so does the NKJV in the footnotes; so does the NASV (by putting them in brackets); and so does the NIV. So do the other modern versions and perversions. In so doing, they take away the fires of hell. Is this not a major doctrine? [O Timothy Editor: While it is true that verse 48 is retained in this passage in the modern versions, the power and authority is weakened by two-thirds. The God-honored Received Text says Jesus repeated this statement three times to emphasize the horrors of going to hell. The critical text removes two of these statements, thus weakening the force of the doctrine.]

When you take the "literal fire" out of hell, as many new-evangelicals and (and even some fundamentalists) have done, and as all of the apostates have done, and as Mary Baker Eddy and all false cults have done, you are in serious trouble and in grievous doctrinal error! For centuries, many have removed the fire out of hell even though the KJV keeps it in. Now these false Egyptian Greek texts and the false English perversions will assist them in their heresy of a "fireless hell"!

3. John 6:47. Let me see if you can accurately lead a soul to Christ using exclusively Jn. 6:47 as rendered in the new versions. Note John 6:47 in the KJV, where the Lord Jesus declared: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life."

That verse is as clear as a bell, on how to receive "everlasting life." But, the Westcott and Hort Greek text, following the "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) manuscripts, takes out those two vital and precious words, "on me." Because of their reliance on these false Egyptian Greek texts, the NIV also removes "on me." So does the NASV. So does the NKJV in the footnotes. So do the other modern versions and perversions. If you're trying to lead a soul to Christ with those new versions and perversions, using Jn. 6:47 exclusively, you'll never lead them to Christ, because "on me" (Christ) is gone from that verse in their perversions! All they say is something like this: "Whoever believes has everlasting life." Believes what? Their verse doesn't say. Their verse merely says "believes." According to these perversions of John 6:47, if I were to believe in atheism, Christ promises me everlasting life. The same if I believe in humanism, or in the Easter Bunny, or the Tooth Fairy, or in Santa Claus, or in Rudolph the Red-Nose Reindeer, or in Bugs Bunny, or in Buddhism, Taoism, Judaism, Modernism, or in anything else! That's major false doctrine in my judgement, and it stems directly from false Greek texts and false English perversions!

4. Romans 1:16. Here's what it says in the accurate KJV: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek."

The heretical Greek texts of "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) remove the two words, "of Christ" in this verse. Because of this, the NIV also removes these words. So does the NASV. So does the NKJV in the footnotes. So do the other modern versions and perversions. This certainly is doctrine. "Gospel" means "good news" or a "good announcement." What "gospel" could be inserted there instead of the "gospel of Christ"? Was it the good news about a pay raise? Was it the good news about a new car, a new hat, or a new house? No! It's the gospel or good news about Christ. That's doctrine! That's theology!

5. John 7:8. Was the Lord Jesus Christ a liar? If you believe the false Greek text, "Aleph" (Sinai), and some of the versions, He was. Note Jn. 7:8: "Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up yet unto this feast; for my time is not yet full come."

According to the Greek text "Aleph" (Sinai), the word "yet" must be removed. The NASV omits it also. So does the NKJV in the footnotes. So do some other modern versions and perversions. Why do I say this removal of "yet" makes the Lord Jesus Christ out to be a liar? Because He went up to the feast in question. If He told his brethren that He was NOT going up to the feast, and then later went up to that feast, He would have told a lie, would He not? This certainly is a major theological doctrine. As in all of the other 356 doctrinal passages, the KJV has superior theology here. The perversions are inferior in their theology and doctrine! Stay away from them!

Concluding remarks: I believe that in the King James Bible we have the Word of God kept intact in English. I believe we should defend the KJV for four reasons: (1) It has superior original language texts (Hebrew and Greek); (2) It has superior translators; (3) It has superior technique; and (4) It has superior theology.

We ought not to be ashamed of the Book of books that has stood the test of time and will continue standing. Let's stand for it and with it. I hope the reader will secure for himself a copy of our book, Defending the King James Bible--A Four-fold Superiority--Texts, Translators, Technique, and Theology. In it we have elaborated on each of the above considerations. The KJV, which is being hammered and beaten on every hand today (by so-called "friend" and foe alike), can be very much likened to the "ANVIL" in that famous poem with which I close:

THE ANVIL OF GOD'S WORD

Last eve I passed beside a blacksmith's door
And heard the anvil sing the vesper chime;
Then, looking in, I saw upon the floor
Old hammers, worn with blasting years of time.

"How many anvils have you had," said I,
"To wear and batter all these hammers so?"
"Just one," said he; and then, with twinkling eye,
"The anvil wears the hammers out, you know."

And so I thought, the anvil of God's Word
For ages, skeptic blows have beat upon.
Yet tho' the noise of falling blows was heard
The anvil is unharmed--the hammers gone.

--John Clifford

[Copyright 1992 by Bible for Today, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, New Jersey 08108. ISBN # 1-56848-000-8. Used by permission.]



Bible Dictionary

faith (fāth) n. 1. The assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen.

Vaticanus, Codex

Vaticanus, Codex - is said to be the oldest extant vellum manuscript. It and the Codex Sinaiticus are the two oldest uncial manuscripts. They were probably written in the fourth century. The Vaticanus was placed in the Vatican Library at Rome by Pope Nicolas V. in 1448, its previous history being unknown. It originally consisted in all probability of a complete copy of the Septuagint and of the New Testament. It is now imperfect, and consists of 759 thin, delicate leaves, of which the New Testament fills 142. Like the Sinaiticus, it is of the greatest value to Biblical scholars in aiding in the formation of a correct text of the New Testament. It is referred to by critics as Codex B.

THE MINORITY TEXTS

Vaticanus (B) & Sinaiticus (Aleph)

There are other extant Greek texts which are referred to as the '**Minority Texts**' simply because they represent only about 5% of existing manuscripts. Another 5% are **Neutral Texts**: sometimes agreeing with the majority and at others with the minority. The '**Minority Texts**' are also known as the **Alexandrian Texts** because they were produced in Alexandria in Egypt. The Minority Texts were rejected by the **early Christians** and also by all the **Protestant Reformers** of the 16th and 17th centuries. The Reformers, who were well aware of the existence of the Minority Texts, considered them unfit for translation purposes. These are very important points to bear in mind. **Why did the early Christians and the Protestant Reformers reject the Minority Texts?**

The answer is:

- The **Minority Texts** were the work of unbelieving Egyptian scribes who did not accept the Bible as the **Word of God** or **JESUS as the SON of GOD!**
- The **Minority Texts** abound with alterations, often a single manuscript being amended by several different scribes over a period of many years; something the Aaronic priests and Masorites would never have tolerated when making copies of the Scriptures.
- The **Minority Texts** omit approximately **200 verses** from the Scriptures. This is equivalent to 1st and 2nd Peter. Pause and consider that stunning fact!
- The **Minority Texts** contradict themselves in hundreds of places.
- The **Minority Texts** are doctrinally weak and often dangerously incorrect.

Proof of these astonishing allegations will follow in **Part Two** where we will take a close look at some **80+** Bible verses corrupted by the Minority Text.

Yet, startling as it may sound, **virtually every modern English Bible relies on the Minority Text as its underlying New Testament text in preference to Textus Receptus!** Isn't that an amazing revelation? What brought about this almost incredible switch from the reliable **Textus Receptus**, beloved by the early Christian church and the **Protestant Reformers**, to the corrupt minority text favoured by the Roman Catholic Church? **It is important that you find out soon: because the modern "Bible" you may be faithfully studying every day is really nothing more than a counterfeit posing as the Word of God!** If it is any consolation to you, do remember that I was equally in the dark and totally devastated by my findings.

Misleading Footnotes

Modern translations abound with misleading footnotes, which do little else but cast doubt on the King James Version. Examples are:

- *The Hebrew of this line is obscure.*

- *The meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain - or unknown.*
- *Other ancient mss add ...*
- *Other ancient mss omit...*
- *Other ancient mss read ...*
- *Other ancient mss insert...*
- *Some early mss read...*
- *The most ancient authorities omit John 7:53 - 8:11*
- *The best manuscripts omit this verse. (e.g. Matt.17:21, 18:11, 23:14, Mark 7:16, John 5:4)*
- *Some of the most ancient authorities bring the book (Mark) to a close at the end of Mark 16:8*
- *Many mss do not contain the remainder of this verse. (e.g. Acts 8:37)*
- *Many ancient authorities read...*
- *Not found in most of the old mss.(e.g. John 7:53-8:11)*

In this article we will not analyse these footnotes, simply because there are scores of them scattered throughout the modern translations and each has a slightly different slant. However, one thing they **all** have in common: and that is, **they ALL cast doubt on the accuracy of the Authorised King James Bible!** By implication they all claim to be more accurate and reliable than the King James Version. In the preface of the Revised Standard Version (RSV) we read this misleading statement. "**Yet the King James Version has grave defects.**" Oh how subtle is Satan, how evil and how sinister! The stunning fact is: the very opposite is true. **The King James Version is infinitely more accurate and reliable than ANY modern English translation on the market today.** And that is why for nearly 400 years it has had - and continues to have - the blessing of the Almighty God upon it: something no modern version or translation can come anywhere near. Most, after a decade or two, disappear from the book shops, only to re-appear some years later with a few alterations under a new name.

How did it happen that the **Minority Text** supplanted the trustworthy and respected **Textus Receptus** which triggered the great **Protestant Reformation** during which tens of thousands of true believers perished by flame, famine and torture? Who is behind this dangerous deception that has engulfed the Christian Church? Do you know? Do you care? Is it important? Does it really matter?

I most certainly didn't know. But I do believe that it is vitally important that every believer know that **Satan** is behind it: not any particular Church, its leaders or its members - but the great **enemy of souls!** He is behind every deception ever aimed at the human race and millions, in and out of the church, believe his lies. I for one had been living in blissful ignorance of the danger for many years; till a massive heart attack laid me flat on my back and I was moved - yea inwardly compelled - to make a deep study of the **History of God's Word** and how He has **providentially preserved it till today.**

Now let us turn our attention to the **Minority Text's** two most prominent manuscripts on which most modern translations of the Bible heavily rely. They are called **Codex Sinaiticus (Aleph)** and **Codex Vaticanus (B).** The word '**codex**,' incidentally, means that the manuscript is in book form,

with pages, as opposed to being a scroll. But first a little about the man whom God raised up over 150 years ago to expose the errors of the Minority Texts. His name is **John Burgon**.

Dean John William Burgon

John Burgon was undoubtedly one of the greatest defenders of the Greek text of the New Testament. He exposed the hundreds of amendments, deletions and additions in the Minority Text and defended the reliability of **Textus Receptus** till the day of his death. Unlike most Bible students and ministers of today, **John Burgon was a masterful Greek scholar of the highest rank** who spent much of his life browsing through the museums and libraries of Europe examining the ancient Greek manuscripts. He had first hand experience examining the **Vatican** texts whilst he ministered as a **chaplain** to a congregation in Rome. His findings are of utmost value in these days of wilful, spiritual ignorance and sin. I will quote a few extracts about this magnificent warrior from **David O Fuller's** book **Which Bible?**

Quote: *"**John William Burgon** was born August 21, 1813. He matriculated at Oxford in 1841, taking several high honours there, and his B.A. 1845. He took his M.A. there in 1848...the thing about **Burgon**, however, which lifts him out of the nineteenth century English setting and endears him to the hearts of earnest Christians of other lands and other ages is his steadfast defence of the scriptures as the **infallible Word of God**. He strove with all his power to arrest the modernistic currents which during his lifetime had begun to flow within the Church of England, continuing his efforts with unabated zeal up to the very day of his death. With this purpose in mind he laboured mightily in the field of New Testament textual criticism.*

*In 1860, while temporary chaplain of the English congregation at Rome, he made a personal examination of Codex B (Vaticanus), and in 1862 he inspected the treasures of St. Catherine's Convent on Mt. Sinai. Later he made several tours of European libraries, examining and collating New Testament manuscripts wherever he went...Of all the critics of the nineteenth century **Burgon** alone was consistently Christian in his vindication of the **Divine inspiration** and **providential preservation** of the text of Holy Scripture...*

***Burgon** regarded the good state of preservation of B (Codex Vaticanus) and Aleph (Codex Sinaiticus) in spite of their exceptional age as proof not of their goodness but of their badness. **If they had been good manuscripts, they would have been read to pieces long ago.** 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 wastepaper basket of the Convent at the foot of Mount Sinai.*

*Had B (Vaticanus) and Aleph (Sinaiticus) 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. **Thus the fact that B and Aleph are so old is a point against them, not something in their favour.***

It shows that the Church rejected them and did not read them. Otherwise they would have worn out and disappeared through much reading.

*For an orthodox Christian **Burton's** view is the only reasonable one. If we believe that God gave the Church guidance in regard to the New Testament books, then surely it is logical to believe that God gave the church similar guidance in regard to the text which these books contained...*

Who but those with Roman Catholic sympathies could ever be pleased with the notion that God preserved the true New Testament text in secret for almost one thousand years and then finally handed it over to the Roman pontiff for safekeeping? Surely every orthodox Protestant will prefer to think with Burton that God preserved the true text of the Greek New Testament in the usage of the Greek-speaking Church down through the centuries and then delivered it up intact to the Protestant reformers." (Ref:F11)

Codex Sinaiticus (Aleph)

This codex was produced in the 4th century. In his book **Let's Weigh the Evidence**, Barry Burton writes of **Codex Sinaiticus**:

Quote: *"The Sinaiticus is a manuscript that was found in 1844 in a trash pile in St. Catherine's Monastery near Mt. Sinai, by a man named Mr Tischendorf. It contains nearly all of the New Testament plus it adds the 'Shepherd of Hermes' and the 'Epistle of Barnabas' to the New Testament. The Sinaiticus is extremely unreliable, proven by examining the manuscript itself. John Burton spent years examining every available manuscript of the New Testament. He writes about Sinaiticus...*

'On many occasions 10, 20, 30, 40 words are dropped through very carelessness. Letters, words or 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.

THAT'S NOT ALL!

On nearly every page of the manuscript there are corrections and revisions, done by 10 different people. Some of these corrections were made about the same time that it was copied, but most of them were made in the 6th and 7th century.

*... **Phillip Mauro**, a brilliant lawyer who was admitted to the bar of the US Supreme Court in April 1892, wrote a book called "**Which Version**" in the early 1900s. He writes concerning the Sinaiticus... 'From these facts, therefore, we declare: first that the impurity of the Codex Sinaiticus, in every part of it, was fully recognized by those who were best acquainted with it, and that from the very beginning until the time when it was finally cast aside as worthless for any practical purpose.' " (Ref:C1)*

In his excellent book **An Understandable History Of The Bible**, Rev. Samuel Gipp writes of **Codex Sinaiticus**:

Quote: "One of the MSS is called **Sinaiticus** and is represented by the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet, **Aleph**. This MS from all outward appearances looks very beautiful. It is written in book form (codex) on vellum. It contains 147 1/2 leaves. The pages are 15" by 13 1/2" with four columns of 48 lines per page. It contains many spurious books such as the '**Shepherd of Hermes**,' the '**Epistle of Barnabas**' and even the **Didache**.

The great Greek scholar, Dr Scrivener, points this out in his historic work **A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus**. He speaks of correctional alterations made to the MS: '**The Codex is covered with such alterations... brought in by at least ten different revisers**, some of them systematically spread over every page, others occasional or limited to separated portions of the MS, many of these being contemporaneous with the first writer, but the greater part belonging to the sixth or seventh century.' " (Ref:B5)

Codex Vaticanus (B)

The second major manuscript of the Minority Text is known as **Codex Vaticanus**, often referred to as '**B**'. This codex was also produced in the 4th century. It was found over a thousand years later in **1481** in the **Vatican library in Rome**, where it is currently held. It is written on expensive vellum, a fine parchment originally from the skin of calf or antelope. Some authorities claim that it was one of a batch of 50 Bibles ordered from Egypt by the **Roman Emperor Constantine**; hence its beautiful appearance and the expensive skins which were used for its pages. But alas! this manuscript, like its corrupt Egyptian partner **Sinaiticus (Aleph)** is also riddled with omissions, insertions and amendments.

Of **Codex Vaticanus** Samuel Gipp writes on page 72:

Quote: "This codex omits many portions of Scripture vital to Christian doctrine. **Vaticanus** omits Genesis 1.1 through Genesis 46:28; Psalms 106 through 138; Matthew 16:2,3; Romans 16:24; the Pauline Pastoral Epistles; Revelation; and everything in Hebrews after 9:14.

It seems suspicious indeed that a MS possessed by the Roman Catholic church omits the portion of the book of Hebrews which exposes the 'mass' as totally useless (Please read Hebrews 10:10-12). The 'mass' in conjunction with the false doctrine of purgatory go hand-in-hand to form a perpetual money making machine for Rome. Without one or the other, the Roman Catholic Church would go broke!

It also omits portions of the Scripture telling of the creation (Genesis), the prophetic details of the crucifixion (Psalm 22), and, of course, the portion which prophesies of the destruction of Babylon (Rome), the great whore of Revelation chapter 17.

Vaticanus, though intact physically, is found to be in poor literary quality. Dr Martin declares, 'B' exhibits numerous places where the scribe has written the same word or phrase twice in succession. Dr J Smythe states, 'From one end to the other, the whole manuscript has been travelled over by the pen of some... scribe of about the tenth century.' **If Vaticanus was considered a trustworthy text originally, the mass of corrections and scribal changes obviously render its testimony highly suspicious and questionable."**

Rev. Gipp continues on page 73:

Quote: *"The corrupt and unreliable nature of these two MSS (**Sinaiticus** and **Vaticanus**) is best summed up by one who has thoroughly examined them, John W Burgon: 'The impurity of the text exhibited by these codices is not a question of opinion but fact...**In the Gospels alone, Codex B(Vatican) leaves out words or whole clauses no less than 1,491 times. It bears traces of careless transcriptions on every page...***

If we are to be thorough and discriminatory in our evaluation of the true New Testament text, then we must not -- we cannot -- overlook these facts.' How did these MSS come into being? How did it happen that they should be beautiful to the eye, yet within contain such vile and devastating corruption? It seems that these uncial MSS along with the papyrus MSS included in this category all resulted from a revision of the true, or Universal Text. This revision was enacted in Egypt by Egyptian scribes! " (Ref:B6)

Rev. Gipp continues:

Quote: *"So we see that once a pure copy of the Universal Text (**Textus Receptus**) had been carried down into Egypt, it was recopied. During the process of this recopying, it was revised by men who did not revere it as truly the **Word of God**. This text was examined by the critical eye of Greek philosophy and Egyptian morals. These men saw nothing wrong with putting the Book in subjection to their opinion instead of their opinion being in subjection to the book. This process produced a text which was local to the educational centre of Alexandria, Egypt. This text went no further than southern Italy where the Roman Catholic Church found its unstable character perfect for overthrowing the true Word of God which was being used universally by the true Christians."* (Ref:B7)

The **Westminster Dictionary of the Bible** has this to say about **Codex Vaticanus** (B) on page 624 under article Versions.

Quote: *" **It should be noted, however, that there is no prominent Biblical MS. in which there occur such gross cases of misspelling, faulty grammar, and omission, as in B.**"* (Ref:H2)

Barry Burton comments further:

Quote: *"For one thing...Vaticanus and Sinaiticus disagree with each other over 3000 times in the gospels alone... **Facts about the Vaticanus.***

*"It was written on fine vellum (tanned animal skins) and remains in excellent condition. It was found in the **Vatican Library** in **1481 AD**. In spite of being in excellent condition, it omits Genesis 1:1-Gen.46:28, Psalm 106-138, Matt.16:2-3, the Pauline pastoral Epistles, Hebrews 9:14-13:25, and all of Revelation. These parts were probably left out on purpose."*

*"Besides all that - in the gospels alone it leaves out 237 words, 452 clauses and 748 whole sentences, which hundreds of later copies agree together as having the same words in the same places, the same clauses in the same places and the same sentences in the same places... **The Vaticanus was available to the translators of the King James Bible, but they did not use it because they knew it is unreliable.**"* (Ref:C2)

Dean Burgon comments on Codices Sinaiticus (Aleph) and Vaticanus (B).

Quote: *"Compromise of any sort between the two conflicting parties, is impossible; for they simply contradict one another. Codd.B and Aleph are either amongst the purist of manuscripts,- or else **they are among the very foulest**. The Text of Drs. Westcott and Hort is either the very best which has ever appeared,- or **else it is the very worst**; the nearest to the sacred Autographs,- or **furthest from them**."... "There is no room for both opinions; and there cannot exist any middle view."* (Ref: P3)

Oldest and Best

Bible students are often told that Codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are older and better than other manuscripts: the implication being that they must, therefore, be **more accurate**. But this conclusion is wrong. We have already seen how Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are corrupt beyond measure. To be sure they are '**better**' in appearance, but certainly not in their content. Remember they are written on expensive vellum; so they ought to be in good shape. They are older, but older than what? They are older than other Greek manuscripts of the New Testament. But **they are not older than the earliest versions of the Bible**: the Peshitta, Italic, Waldensian and the Old Latin Vulgate: versions which agree with the Majority text. **These ancient versions are some 200 years older than Aleph and B**. Yes Aleph and B are older than other Greek mss, but for anyone to suggest that they are **more accurate** is absurd. It is like someone saying '*You will find the greatest TRUTH being preached in the oldest and most beautiful cathedrals of the world,*' or, '*the most beautiful women have the best characters.*'

In his masterful book **Revision Revised** Dean Burgon wrote, over a hundred years ago, concerning the ages of Codices Vatican (B) and Sinai (Aleph):

Quote: *"Lastly, - 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."* (Ref: P1)

In short these two codices are old simply because:

- **First:** They were written on extremely expensive and durable antelope skins.
- **Second:** They were so full of errors, alterations, additions and deletions, that they were **never** used by true believers and **seldom** even by their own custodians. Thus they had little chance of wearing away.

Can any true believer imagine **JEHOVAH, the Holy One of Israel**, hiding Codex Vaticanus away for over 1000 years in the **Vatican Library** till 1481? or prompting the deeply religious monks of **St Catherine's Monastery** to dump Sinaiticus into a waste basket? The very idea is ridiculous.

A vital fact to remember is that though codices Aleph and B (produced in the 4th century) are older than other Greek manuscript copies of the Scriptures, they are not older than the Peshitta, Italic, the Old Latin Vulgate and the Waldensian versions which were produced 200 years earlier in the 2nd century. All these versions, copies of which are still in existence, agree with Textus Receptus, the underlying text of the King James Bible. I repeat: these ancient versions are some **200 years older** than Vaticanus and Sinaiticus: so the '**oldest is best**' argument should not be used. All Bibles fall, basically, into one of two categories.

- Those based on the **Majority Text**. (Textus Receptus)
- Those based on the **Minority Text**. (Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus etc.)

Which Bible you select for study each day is going to have an enormous effect on your spiritual growth and well being. Bear this vital fact in mind.

The Invention of Printing

The invention of the printing press in the 15th century was a giant step forward in the circulation of the Bible. The printing press reduced the time taken to produce a Bible from about nine or ten months to a few hours: and once proof reading had been done, every copy was as good as the master. Printing also greatly reduced the price of a Bible.

*"In the reign of Edward 1 of England, about 1272, the price of a complete (hand-written) Bible was from £30 to £37, and occupied a careful scribe in his scriptorium about ten months, while the days wage of a working man only averaged 1.5 pennies. When it is borne in mind that it only cost £25 to build two arches of London Bridge in 1240, while the price of a complete Latin Bible was considerably more, it will readily be allowed that only the rich and scholarly had access to the Word of God." "While Martin Luther called the art of printing '**the last and best gift of providence**' the Catholic Rowland Phillips, in a sermon preached at St.Paul's Cross, London in the year 1535, frightfully remarked.*

***'We must root out printing
or printing will root us out.'***
(Ref:E3)

Elder: David B Loughran
Stewarton Bible School, Stewarton, Scotland

THE KING JAMES VERSION OF 1611:

THE MYTH OF EARLY REVISIONS

By Pastor David Reagan

Introduction

Men have been "handling the word of God deceitfully" (II Cor. 4:2) ever since the devil first taught Eve how.

From Cain to Balaam, from Jehudi to the scribes and Pharisees, from the Dark Age theologians to present-day scholars, the living words of the Almighty God have been prime targets for man's corrupting hand. The attacks on the Word of God are threefold: addition, subtraction, and substitution. From Adam's day to the computer age, the strategies have remained the same. There is nothing new under the sun.

One attack which is receiving quite a bit of attention these days is a direct attack on the Word of God as preserved in the English language: the King James Version of 1611. The attack referred to is the myth which claims that since the King James Version has already been revised four times, there should be and can be no valid objection to other revisions. This myth was used by the English Revisers of 1881 and has been revived in recent years by Fundamentalist scholars hoping to sell their latest translation. This book is given as an answer to this attack. The purpose of the material is not to convince those who would deny this preservation but to strengthen the faith of those who already believe in a preserved English Bible.

One major question often arises in any attack such as this. How far should we go in answering the critics? If we were to attempt to answer every shallow objection to the infallibility of the English Bible, we would never be able to accomplish anything else. Sanity must prevail somewhere. As always, the answer is in God's Word. Proverbs 26:4-5 states: Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him. Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit.

Obviously, there are times when a foolish query should be ignored and times when it should be met with an answer. If to answer the attack will make you look as foolish as the attacker, then the best answer is to ignore the question. For instance, if you are told that the Bible cannot be infallible because so-and-so believes that it is, and he is divorced, then you may safely assume that silence is the best answer. On the other hand, there are often questions and problems that, if true, would be serious. To ignore these issues would be to leave the Bible attacker wise in his own conceit. I believe that the question of revisions to the King James Version of 1611 is a question of the second class. If the King James Version has undergone four major revisions of its text, then to oppose further revisions on the basis of an established English text would truly be faulty. For this reason, this attack should and must be answered. Can the argument be answered? Certainly! That is the purpose of this book.

I. THE PRINTING CONDITIONS OF 1611

If God did preserve His Word in the English language through the Authorized Version of 1611 (and He did), then where is our authority for the infallible wording? Is it in the notes of the translators? Or is it to be found in the proof copy sent to the printers? If so, then our authority is lost because these papers are lost. But, you say, the authority is in the first copy which came off the printing press. Alas, that copy has also certainly perished. In fact, if the printing of the English Bible followed the pattern of most printing jobs, the first copy was probably discarded because of bad quality. That leaves us with existing copies of the first printing. They are the ones often pointed out as the standard by which all other King James Bibles are to be compared. But are they? Can those early printers of the first edition not be allowed to make printing errors? We need to establish one thing from the outset. The authority for our preserved English text is not found in any human work. The authority for our preserved and infallible English text is in God! Printers may foul up at times and humans will still make plenty of errors, but God in His power and mercy will preserve His text despite the weaknesses of fallible man. Now, let us look at the pressures on a printer in the year of 1611.

Although the printing press had been invented in 1450 by Johann Gutenberg in Germany (161 years before

the 1611 printing), the equipment used by the printer had changed very little. Printing was still very slow and difficult. All type was set by hand, one piece at a time (that's one piece at a time through the whole Bible), and errors were an expected part of any completed book. Because of this difficulty and also because the 1611 printers had no earlier editions from which to profit, the very first edition of the King James version had a number of printing errors. As shall later be demonstrated, these were not the sort of textual alterations which are freely made in modern bibles. They were simple, obvious printing errors of the sort that can still be found at times in recent editions even with all of the advantages of modern printing. These errors do not render a Bible useless, but they should be corrected in later editions.

The two original printings of the Authorized Version demonstrate the difficulty of printing in 1611 without making mistakes. Both editions were printed in Oxford. Both were printed in the same year: 1611. The same printers did both jobs. Most likely, both editions were printed on the same printing press. Yet, in a strict comparison of the two editions, approximately 100 textual differences can be found. In the same vein the King James critics can find only about 400 alleged textual alterations in the King James Version after 375 years of printing and four so-called revisions! Something is rotten in Scholarsville! The time has come to examine these "revisions."

II. THE FOUR SO-CALLED REVISIONS OF THE 1611 KJV

Much of the information in this section is taken from a book by F.H.A. Scrivener called *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611), Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*. The book is as pedantic as its title indicates. The interesting point is that Scrivener, who published this book in 1884, was a member of the Revision Committee of 1881. He was not a King James Bible believer, and therefore his material is not biased toward the Authorized Version. In the section of Scrivener's book dealing with the KJV "revisions," one initial detail is striking. The first two so-called major revisions of the King James Bible occurred within 27 years of the original printing. (The language must have been changing very rapidly in those days.) The 1629 edition of the Bible printed in Cambridge is said to have been the first revision. A revision it was not, but simply a careful correction of earlier printing errors. Not only was this edition completed just eighteen years after the translation, but two of the men who participated in this printing, Dr. Samuel Ward and John Bois, had worked on the original translation of the King James Version. Who better to correct early errors than two who had worked on the original translation! Only nine years later and in Cambridge again, another edition came out which is supposed to have been the second major revision. Both Ward and Bois were still alive, but it is not known if they participated at this time. But even Scrivener, who as you remember worked on the English Revised Version of 1881, admitted that the Cambridge printers had simply reinstated words and clauses overlooked by the 1611 printers and amended manifest errors. According to a study which will be detailed later, 72% of the approximately 400 textual corrections in the KJV were completed by the time of the 1638 Cambridge edition, only 27 years after the original printing!

Just as the first two so-called revisions were actually two stages of one process--the purification of early printing errors--so the last two so-called revisions were two stages in another process--the standardization of the spelling. These two editions were only seven years apart (1762 and 1769) with the second one completing what the first had started. But when the scholars are numbering revisions, two sounds better than one. Very few textual corrections were necessary at this time. The thousands of alleged changes are spelling changes made to match the established correct forms. These spelling changes will be discussed later. Suffice it to say at this time that the tale of four major revisions is truly a fraud and a myth. But you say, there are still changes whether they be few or many. What are you going to do with the changes that are still there? Let us now examine the character of these changes.

III. THE SO-CALLED THOUSANDS OF CHANGES

Suppose someone were to take you to a museum to see an original copy of the King James Version. You come to the glass case where the Bible is displayed and look down at the opened Bible through the glass.

Although you are not allowed to flip through its pages, you can readily tell that there are some very different things about this Bible from the one you own. You can hardly read its words, and those you can make out are spelled in odd and strange ways. Like others before you, you leave with the impression that the King James Version has undergone a multitude of changes since its original printing in 1611. But beware, you have just been taken by a very clever ploy. The differences you saw are not what they seem to be. Let's examine the evidence.

For proper examination, the changes can be divided into three kinds: printing changes, spelling changes, and textual changes. Printing changes will be considered first. The type style used in 1611 by the KJV translators was the Gothic Type Style. The type style you are reading right now and are familiar with is Roman Type. Gothic Type is sometimes called Germanic because it originated in Germany. Remember, that is where printing was invented. The Gothic letters were formed to resemble the hand-drawn manuscript lettering of the Middle Ages. At first, it was the only style in use. The Roman Type Style was invented fairly early, but many years passed before it became the predominant style in most European countries. Gothic continued to be used in Germany until recent years. In 1611 in England, Roman Type was already very popular and would soon supersede the Gothic. However, the original printers chose the Gothic Style for the KJV because it was considered to be more beautiful and eloquent than the Roman. But the change to Roman Type was not long in coming. In 1612, the first King James Version using Roman Type was printed. Within a few years, all the Bibles printed used the Roman Type Style.

Please realize that a change in type style no more alters the text of the Bible than a change in format or type size does. However, the modern reader who has not become familiar with Gothic can find it very difficult to understand. Besides some general change in form, several specific letter changes need to be observed. For instance, the Gothic "s" looks like the Roman "s" when used as a capital letter or at the end of a word. But when it is used as a lower case "s" at the beginning or in the middle of a word, the letter looks like our "f." Therefore, also becomes alfo and set becomes fet. Another variation is found in the German "v" and "u." The Gothic "v" looks like a Roman "u" while the Gothic "u" looks like a Roman "v." This explains why our "w" is called a double-u and not a double-v. Sound confusing? It is until you get used to it. In the 1611 edition, love is loue, us is vs, and ever is euer. But remember, these are not even spelling changes. They are simply type style changes. In another instance, the Gothic "j" looks like our "i." So Jesus becomes Iefus (notice the middle "s" changed to "f") and joy becomes ioy. Even the Gothic "d" had the stem leaning back over the circle in a shape resembling that of the Greek Delta. These changes account for a large percentage of the "thousands" of changes in the KJV, yet they do no harm whatsoever to the text. They are nothing more than a smokescreen set up by the attackers of our English Bible.

Spelling Changes

Another kind of change found in the history of the Authorized Version are changes of orthography or spelling. Most histories date the beginning of Modern English around the year 1500. Therefore, by 1611 the grammatical structure and basic vocabulary of present-day English had long been established. However, the spelling did not stabilize at the same time. In the 1600s spelling was according to whim. There was no such thing as correct spelling. No standards had been established. An author often spelled the same word several different ways, often in the same book and sometimes on the same page. And these were the educated people. Some of you reading this today would have found the 1600s a spelling paradise. Not until the eighteenth century did the spelling begin to take a stable form. Therefore, in the last half of the eighteenth century, the spelling of the King James Version of 1611 was standardized.

What kind of spelling variations can you expect to find between your present edition and the 1611 printing?

Although every spelling difference cannot be categorized, several characteristics are very common.

Additional "e"'s were often found at the end of the words such as feare, darke, and beare. Also, double vowels were much more common than they are today. You would find mee, bee, and mooued instead of me, be, and moved. Double consonants were also much more common. What would ranne, euill, and ftarres be according to present-day spelling? See if you can figure them out. The present-day spellings would be ran, evil, and stars. These typographical and spelling changes account for almost all of the so-called thousands of changes in the King James Bible. None of them alter the text in any way. Therefore they cannot be honestly compared with thousands of true textual changes which are blatantly made in the modern versions.

Textual Changes

Almost all of the alleged changes have been accounted for. We now come to the question of actual textual differences between our present editions and that of 1611. There are some differences between the two, but they are not the changes of a revision. They are instead the correction of early printing errors. That this is a fact may be seen in three things: (1) the character of the changes, (2) the frequency of the changes throughout the Bible, and (3) the time the changes were made. First, let us look at the character of the changes made from the time of the first printing of the Authorized English Bible. The changes from the 1611 edition that are admittedly textual are obviously printing errors because of the nature of these

changes. They are not textual changes made to alter the reading. In the first printing, words were sometimes inverted. Sometimes a plural was written as singular or vice versa. At times a word was miswritten for one that was similar. A few times a word or even a phrase was omitted. The omissions were obvious and did not have the doctrinal implications of those found in modern translations. In fact, there is really no comparison between the corrections made in the King James text and those proposed by the scholars of today.

F.H.A. Scrivener, in the appendix of his book, lists the variations between the 1611 edition of the KJV and later printings. A sampling of these corrections is given below. In order to be objective, the samples give the first textual correction on consecutive left-hand pages of Scrivener's book. The 1611 reading is given first; then the present reading; and finally, the date the correction was first made.

Variations In Additions Of The KJV From 1611 Through Later Printings

1. this thing--this thing also (1638)
2. shalt have remained--ye shall have remained (1762)
3. Achzib, nor Helbath, nor Aphik--of Achzib, nor of Helbath, nor of Aphik (1762)
4. requite good--requite me good (1629)
5. this book of the Covenant--the book of this covenant (1629)
6. chief rulers--chief ruler (1629)
7. And Parbar--At Parbar (1638)
8. For this cause--And for this cause (1638)
9. For the king had appointed--for so the king had appointed (1629)
10. Seek good--seek God (1617)
11. The cormorant--But the cormorant (1629)
12. returned--turned (1769)
13. a fiery furnace--a burning fiery furnace (1638)
14. The crowned--Thy crowned (1629)
15. thy right doeth--thy right hand doeth (1613)
16. the wayes side--the way side (1743)
17. which was a Jew--which was a Jewess (1629)
18. the city--the city of the Damascenes (1629)
19. now and ever--both now and ever (1638)
20. which was of our father's--which was our fathers (1616)

Before your eyes are 5% of the textual changes made in the King James Version in 375 years. Even if they were not corrections of previous errors, they would be of no comparison to modern alterations. But they are corrections of printing errors, and therefore no comparison is at all possible. Look at the list for yourself

and you will find only one that has serious doctrinal implications. In fact, in an examination of Scrivener's entire appendix, it is the only variation found by this author that could be accused of being doctrinal. I am referring to Psalm 69:32 where the 1611 edition has "seek good" when the Bible should have read "seek God." Yet, even with this error, two points demonstrate that this was indeed a printing error. First, the similarity of the words "good" and "God" in spelling shows how easily a weary typesetter could misread the proof and put the wrong word in the text. Second, this error was so obvious that it was caught and corrected in the year 1617, only six years after the original printing and well before the first so-called revision. The myth that there are several major revisions to the 1611 KJV should be getting clearer. But there is more.

Not only does the character of the changes show them to be printing errors, so does their frequency. Fundamentalist scholars refer to the thousands of revisions made to the 1611 as if they were on a par with the recent bible versions. They are not. The overwhelming majority of them are either type style or spelling changes. The few which do remain are clearly corrections of printing errors made because of the tediousness involved in the early printing process. The sample list given above will demonstrate just how careful Scrivener was in listing all the variations. Yet, even with this great care, only approximately 400 variations are named between the 1611 edition and modern copies. Remember that there were 100 variations between the first two Oxford editions which were both printed in 1611. Since there are almost 1200 chapters in the Bible, the average variation per chapter (after 375 years) is one third, i.e., one correction per every three chapters. These are changes such as "chief rulers" to "chief ruler" and "And Parbar" to "At Parbar." But there is yet one more evidence that these variations are simply corrected printing errors: the early date at which they were corrected.

The character and frequency of the textual changes clearly separate them from modern alterations. But the time the changes were made settles the issue absolutely. The great majority of the 400 corrections were made within a few years of the original printing. Take, for example, our earlier sampling. Of the twenty corrections listed, one was made in 1613, one in 1616, one in 1617, eight in 1629, five in 1638, one in 1743, two in 1762, and one in 1769. That means that 16 out of 20 corrections, or 80%, were made within twenty-seven years of the 1611 printing. That is hardly the long drawn out series of revisions the scholars would have you to believe. In another study made by examining every other page of Scrivener's appendix in detail, 72% of the textual corrections were made by 1638. There is no "revision" issue.

The character of the textual changes is that of obvious errors. The frequency of the textual changes is sparse, occurring only once per three chapters. The chronology of the textual changes is early with about three fourths of them occurring within twenty-seven years of the first printing. All of these details establish the fact that there were no true revisions in the sense of updating the language or correcting translation errors. There were only editions which corrected early typographical errors. Our source of authority for the exact wording of the 1611 Authorized Version is not in the existing copies of the first printing. Our source of authority for the exact wording of our English Bible is in the preserving power of Almighty God. Just as God did not leave us the original autographs to fight and squabble over, so He did not see fit to leave us the proof copy of the translation. Our authority is in the hand of God as always. You can praise the Lord for that!

IV. CHANGES IN THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES

An in-depth study of the changes made in the book of Ecclesiastes would help to illustrate the principles stated above. The author is grateful to Dr. David Reese of Millbrook, Alabama, for his work in this area. By comparing a 1611 reprint of the original edition put out by Thomas Nelson & Sons with recent printing of the King James Version, Dr. Reese was able to locate four variations in the book of Ecclesiastes. The reference is given first; then the text of the Thomas Nelson 1611 reprint. This is followed by the reading of the present editions of the 1611 KJV and the date the change was made:

1 1:5 the place--his place (1638)

2 2:16 shall be--shall all be (1629)

3 8:17 out, yea further--out, yet he shall not find it; yea farther (1629)

4 11:17 thing is it--thing it is (?)

Several things should be noted about these changes. The last variation ("thing is it" to "thing it is") is not mentioned by Scrivener who was a very careful and accurate scholar. Therefore, this change may be a misprint in the Thomas Nelson reprint. That would be interesting. The corrected omission in chapter eight is one of the longest corrections of the original printing. But notice that it was corrected in 1629. The frequency of printing errors is average (four errors in twelve chapters). But the most outstanding fact is that the entire book of Ecclesiastes reads exactly like our present editions without even printing errors by the year 1638. That's more than 350 years ago. By that time, the Bible was being printed in Roman type. Therefore, all (and I mean all) that has changed in 350 years in the book of Ecclesiastes is that the spelling has been standardized! As stated before, the main purpose of the 1629 and 1638 Cambridge editions was the correction of earlier printing errors. And the main purpose of the 1762 and 1769 editions was the standardization of spelling.

V. THE SO-CALLED JUSTIFICATION FOR OTHER REVISIONS

Maybe now you see that the King James Version of 1611 has not been revised but only corrected. But why does it make that much difference? Although there are several reasons why this issue is important, the most pressing one is that fundamentalist scholars are using this myth of past revisions to justify their own tampering with the text. The editors of the New King James Version have probably been the worst in recent years to use this propaganda ploy. In the preface of the New King James they have stated, "For nearly four hundred years, and throughout several revisions of its English form, the King James Bible has been deeply revered among the English-speaking peoples of the world." In the midst of their flowery rhetoric, they strongly imply that their edition is only a continuation of the revisions that have been going on for the past 375 years. This implication, which has been stated directly by others, could not be more false. To prove this point, we will go back to the book of Ecclesiastes.

An examination of the first chapter in Ecclesiastes in the New King James Version reveals approximately 50 changes from our present edition. In order to be fair, spelling changes (cometh to comes; labour to labor, etc.) were not included in this count. That means there are probably about 600 alterations in the book of Ecclesiastes and approximately 60,000 changes in the entire Bible. If you accuse me of including every recognizable change, you are correct. But I am only counting the sort of changes which were identified in analyzing the 1611 King James. That's only fair. Still, the number of changes is especially baffling for a version which claims to be an updating in the same vein as earlier revisions. According to the fundamentalist scholar, the New King James is only a fifth in a series of revisions. Then pray tell me how four "revisions" and 375 years brought only 400 changes while the fifth revision brought about 60,000 additional changes? That means that the fifth revision made 150 times more changes than the total number of changes in the first four! That's preposterous!

Not only is the frequency of the changes unbelievable, but the character of the alterations is serious. Although many of the alterations seem harmless enough at first glance, many are much more serious. The editors of the New King James Version were sly enough not to alter the most serious blunders of the modern bibles. Yet, they were not afraid to change the reading in those places that are unfamiliar to the average fundamentalist. In these areas, the New King James Version is dangerous. Below are some of the more harmful alterations made in the book of Ecclesiastes. The reference is given first; then the reading as found in the King James Version; and last, the reading as found in the New King James Version.

Ecclesiastes

King James Version	New King James Version
1:13 sore travail	grievous task
1:14 vexation of spirit	grasping for the wind
1:16 my heart had great experience of wisdom	My heart has understood great wisdom
2:3 acquainting	guiding
2:3 to give myself unto	to gratify my flesh with
2:21 equity	skill
3:10 the travail, which God hath given	the God-given task
3:11 the world	eternity
3:18 that might manifest them	God tests them
3:18 they themselves are beasts	they themselves are like beasts

3:22 portion	heritage
4:4 right work	skillful work
5:1 Keep thy foot	Walk prudently
5:6 the angel	the messenger of God
5:8 he that is higher than the highest	high official
5:20 God answereth him	God keeps him busy
6:3 untimely birth	stillborn child
7:29 inventions	schemes
8:1 boldness	sternness
8:10 the place of the holy	the place of holiness
10:1 Dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour	Dead flies putrefy the perfumer's ointment
10:10 If the iron be blunt	If the ax is dull
10:10 wisdom is profitable to direct	wisdom brings success
12:9 gave good heed	pondered
12:11 the masters of assemblies	scholars

This is only a sampling of the changes in the book, but notice what is done. Equity, which is a trait of godliness, becomes skill (2:21). The world becomes eternity (3:11). Man without God is no longer a beast but just like a beast (3:18). The clear reference to deity in Ecclesiastes 5:8 ("he that is higher than the highest") is successfully removed ("higher official"). But since success is what wisdom is supposed to bring us (10:10), this must be progress. At least God is keeping the scholars busy (5:20). Probably the most revealing of the above mentioned changes is the last one listed where "the masters of assemblies" become "scholars." According to the New King James, "the words of scholars are like well-driven nails, given by one Shepherd." The masters of assemblies are replaced by the scholars who become the source of the Shepherd's words. That is what these scholars would like us to think, but it is not true.

In conclusion, the New King James is not a revision in the vein of former revisions of the King James Version. It is instead an entirely new translation. As stated in the introduction, the purpose of this book is not to convince those who use the other versions. The purpose of this book is to expose a fallacious argument that has been circulating in fundamentalist circles for what it is: an overblown myth. That is, the myth that the New King James Version and others like it are nothing more than a continuation of revisions which have periodically been made to the King James Version since 1611. There is one problem with this theory. There are no such revisions.

The King James Bible of 1611 has not undergone four (or any) major revisions. Therefore, the New King James Version is not a continuation of what has gone on before. It should in fact be called the Thomas Nelson Version. They hold the copyright. The King James Version we have today has not been revised but purified. We still have no reason to doubt that the Bible we hold in our hands is the very word of God preserved for us in the English language. The authority for its veracity lies not in the first printing of the King James Version in 1611, or in the character of King James I, or in the scholarship of the 1611 translators, or in the literary accomplishments of Elizabethan England, or even in the Greek Received Text. Our authority for the infallible words of the English Bible lies in the power and promise of God to preserve His Word! God has the power. We have His Word.

Individual copies of Dr. Reagan's excellent pamphlet can be obtained by sending one dollar to:

Trinity Baptist Temple Bookstore
5709 N. Broadway
Knoxville, Tennessee 37918
(615) 688-0780

ARE MODERN BIBLE VERSIONS BASED ON WESTCOTT-HORT?

Updated June 10, 2000 (first published March 7, 2000) (David W. Cloud, Fundamental Baptist Information Service, 1701 Harns Rd., Oak Harbor, WA 98277) - The theories of textual criticism which underlie the Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament of 1881 have been somewhat discredited by textual critics of the 20th century. It is not surprising, therefore, that modern version proponents today often disassociate themselves from Westcott-Hort and claim that they merely use an "eclectic" Greek text. ("Eclectic" means to "select or employ individual elements from a variety of sources, systems, or styles.")

James White, author of the popular and influential book "The King James Only Controversy," does this. He says, "While modern Greek texts are not identical to that created by Westcott and Hort, one will still find defenders of the AV drawing in black and white, saying that all modern versions are based upon their work" (White, p. 99).

I have heard other modern version defenders imply that Westcott and Hort are irrelevant to the subject of the biblical text because "no textual critic now holds to the Westcott and Hort theories of textual criticism."

This position dodges THE REAL ISSUE, WHICH IS THE FACT THAT WESTCOTT AND HORT REPRESENTED THE SIGNAL DEPARTURE FROM THE RECEIVED TEXT THAT IS REPRESENTED TODAY IN THE POPULAR THEORIES OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM. Westcott and Hort built upon the foundation established by their predecessors, such as Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorf. Westcott and Hort adapted the textual theories of these men into their own unique blend.

While today's textual scholars do not always admit that they follow Westcott and Hort, many of the more honest ones do admit that they are powerfully influenced by the these men. Bruce Metzger is probably the most influential textual critic alive. He is one of the editors of the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament and the author of many widely-used books on textual criticism. In his 1981 book *The Westcott and Hort Greek New Testament--Yesterday and Today*, Metzger makes the following plain admission: "The International committee that produced the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament, NOT ONLY ADOPTED THE WESTCOTT AND HORT EDITION AS ITS BASIC TEXT, BUT FOLLOWED THEIR METHODOLOGY IN GIVING ATTENTION TO BOTH EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL CONSIDERATION" (Metzger, cited by James Brooks, *Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century*, p. 264). In light of this admission by such a prominent textual authority, James White needs to explain for his readers why he condemns King James Bible defenders for claiming that Westcott-Hort are still followed.

Brooks further states, "There is nothing unique about Metzger's theory of textual criticism. It is simply a refinement of Westcott and Hort's theory in the New Testament in the Original Greek (1881). . . . this theory is dominant today in part because of Metzger's great influence. It was the theory employed in producing the United Bible Societies Greek text. It is the theory lying behind the Greek text used by most modern versions: The Revised Standard, the New Revised Standard, the New English Bible, the Revised English Bible, the New American Bible, the New American Standard, the Good News Bible, the New International Version, and to a lesser extent, also the Jerusalem Bible and the New Jerusalem Bible" (Ibid.).

This should be enough to demonstrate our point, but we offer more.

Consider the following quotation by Ernest Cadman Colwell, a textual scholar who has published a number of widely used grammars and text books, including *A Beginners Reader-Grammar for New Testament Greek* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), *A Greek Papyrus Reader, with Vocabulary* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935), *A Hellenistic Greek Reader* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), and *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969).

"THE DEAD HAND OF FENTON JOHN ANTHONY HORT LIES HEAVY UPON US. In the early years of this century Kirsopp Lake described Hort's work as a failure, though a glorious one. But HORT DID NOT FAIL TO REACH HIS MAJOR GOAL. HE DETHRONED THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS. ... Hort's success in this task and the cogency of his tightly reasoned theory shaped—AND STILL SHAPES—the thinking of those who approach the textual criticism of the NT through the English language" (emphasis added)

(Ernest Cadman Colwell, "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text," *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed. J.P. Hyatt, New York: Abingdon Press, 1965, p. 370).

In the introduction to the 24th edition of the Nestle's Greek New Testament, editors Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland make the following admission:

"Thus the text, built up on the work of the 19th century, has remained as a whole unchanged, particularly since the research of recent years has not yet led to the establishment of a generally acknowledged N.T. text" (Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 24th edition, 1960, p. 62).

James White is failing to acknowledge a fact that modern textual authorities such as Colwell and Nestle do acknowledge--that Westcott and Hort are key, pivotal men in the modern history of textual criticism and that the current "eclectic" Greek New Testaments continue to reflect the decisions made by Westcott and Hort. To deny their influence is similar to denying the influence of Darwin on contemporary evolutionary thought. Many planks of Darwin's theories have been discredited, but Darwin and his theories are important because of their key, pivotal role in the field.

Consider another quote, this one from Dr. Zane Hodges:

"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" (emphasis added) (Zane C. Hodges, "Rationalism and Contemporary New Testament Textual Criticism," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January 1971, p. 35).

Zane Hodges is not a fundamental Baptist, but he is more honest about the influence of Westcott and Hort upon modern textual scholarship than James White.

White and many others attempting to discredit King James Bible defense also claim that Westcott and Hort are not important because (they say) "the modern versions (NASV and NIV) are not based on the Alexandrian text or on the Westcott and Hort text. They are based on an eclectic text which sometimes favors the TR over Aleph or B."

This is true as far as it goes, but it ignores the heart of the issue. The fact is that the United Bible Societies (UBS) text is almost identical to the W-H text of 1881 IN SIGNIFICANT DEPARTURES FROM THE RECEIVED TEXT. For example, both the W-H and the UBS delete or question almost the same number of verses (WH--48, UBS--45). Both delete almost the same number of significant portions of verses (WH--193, UBS 185). Both delete almost the same number of names and titles of the Lord (WH--221, UBS--212). An extensive comparison of the TR against the WH text, the Nestle's Text, the UBS text, and key English versions was done by the late Everett Fowler and can be found in his book *Evaluating Versions of the New Testament*, available from Bible for Today.

The W-H text of 1881 and the latest edition of the United Bible Societies' text differ only in relatively minor points. BOTH REPRESENT THE SAME TYPE OF TEXT WITH THE SAME TYPE OF DEPARTURES FROM THE RECEIVED TEXT.

The fact is that the Westcott-Hort text represents the first widely-accepted departure from the TR in the post-Reformation era, and the modern English versions descend directly from it. It is a very significant text and its editors are highly significant to the history of textual criticism. Any man who discounts the continuing significance of Westcott-Hort in the field of Bible texts and versions is probably trying to throw up a smoke screen to hide something.

BIBLE DOCTRINES

AFFECTED BY MODERN VERSIONS

By Paul L. Freeman

610 Race Street, Catasauqua, PA 18032

INTRODUCTION

The battle for the Word of God is going on today as it always has. The work of the Evil One himself has ever been to cause men to doubt the Word (Gen. 3:1), to corrupt the Word (2 Cor. 2:17), and to misquote the Word (Luke 4:10,11). There are many Modern Versions on the scene today all claiming to be more accurate or more readable renderings of the Word of God. Most of these versions follow the MINORITY Greek Text even though that text exhibits a corruption throughout. The King James Version was translated from the MAJORITY Greek Text which agrees with about 95% of all available manuscripts. The MAJORITY Greek Text can be traced back to the Peshitta (Syriac Version) about 150 A.D.

Many Christian Colleges and Universities have switched over to the MINORITY Greek Text (known as Westcott and Hort or Nestle and Aland) for the classroom while still using the King James Version in public preaching. Since there are over 5,000 differences between the MAJORITY and MINORITY texts a problem immediately faces the student. The King James Version he brings to the classroom is subjected to constant editing by the teacher who is using a Greek Text different from the one the King James Version was translated from. The student is well aware that God did not inspire two different Bibles. He must make a choice and for the sake of harmony or teacher satisfaction he will usually accept his King James Version minus the MINORITY Text corrections as the Word of God. Should there be an area where agreement cannot be reached he is told to decide on the proper rendering by exercising his spiritual discernment. The schools that are following this double standard will admit that when the King James Version is no longer needed for Public Relations they will make the complete change to the New American Standard or the New International Version. These two are seen to follow the MINORITY Greek Text.

Those who want to replace our King James Version with new Modern Versions are constantly stating that no Bible Doctrines are affected by the changes. One school recently published an article by one of its' teachers in which he said that, "BOTH TEXTS ARE THE WORD OF GOD." It is difficult to understand how two texts differing in over 5,000 places can both be the Word of God. It only serves to show the absolute desperation on the part of the MINORITY Text champions to defend their indefensible position. The purpose of this volume is to show the changes made by the MINORITY text and how they affect the Bible Doctrines which Christians have always believed. Though I do not consider any change in the Word of God to be unimportant, I have singled out the most glaring examples. A careful reading will show that the Fundamental Doctrines of the Christian faith have been affected many times.

Are we to believe the scholars when they tell us that no important doctrines are affected by the new Modern Versions? It is obvious that they are not correct. What they really mean to say is that when all the changes have been made the Bible Doctrines are still there somewhere else in the Bible. If there are ten verses showing the Virgin Birth of Christ, and they have removed two, there are still eight remaining to prove the doctrine. That may satisfy them, but the Fundamental believer sees that as a piece by piece destruction of the Word of God.

We would accuse them of taking away from the Word of God. They would accuse us of using a Bible which has many additions inserted by overzealous Christian copyists. The issue now becomes quite clear. We must either believe that overzealous heretics have corrupted the original Word of God or believe that overzealous believers have added to the original Word of God. I can understand why heretics would want to corrupt the original Word of God, but I cannot believe that Christians would add one word to the Word of God which they have been entrusted to copy and pass along. The Spirit of God within Christians would put a holy awe and reverence around the sacred word and guided by that same Spirit they would copy what God had given them. My conclusion is that the new Modern Versions are based on Greek manuscripts that have been corrupted by heretics who changed the Word of God to agree with their rejection of the Deity of Christ and their Humanism regarding salvation. The Greek Text underlying the King James Version is not filled with additions made by overzealous Christians. It is the Word of God preserved by the Spirit of God and it exalts the Lord Jesus Christ, giving him his proper place and the glory due unto his name.

THE CHANGES IN THEIR PROPER NEW TESTAMENT ORDER ARE NOW LISTED:

MATTHEW

1:25 "her firstborn" is omitted. That Jesus was her firstborn indicates that Mary and Joseph had sexual relations after the birth of Jesus and that others were born of her. The omission here seeks to add credence to the false doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church concerning the perpetual virginity of Mary. The Bible is clear that Jesus had brothers and sisters.

5:22 "without a cause" is removed. In the Sermon on the Mount the Lord warned of judgment for those who were angry with a brother without a cause. Should this change be accepted everyone who is angry with his brother may be judged. The effect is to bring Jesus into judgment for failing to observe his own words (see Mark 3:5). Such is contrary to the doctrine of the sinlessness of Christ.

6:4, 6, 18 "openly" is out. It is a Bible Doctrine that Christian work done unnoticed for the glory of the Lord will one day be rewarded openly (Col. 3:4).

6:13 "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever, Amen" is deleted. This ascription of praise to "Our Father" is found in 491 out of 500 existing manuscripts. This statement was made a century ago by Dean John Burgon.

8:29 "Jesus" is left out. The demons bore witness to the fact that Jesus was the Son of God. It was an identification of Jesus (in humanity) as the Son of God (in Deity). It affects the doctrine of the Person of Christ.

9:8 "marvelled" is changed to "were afraid." There is no reason to believe that the people were afraid because Jesus healed the sick of the palsy. There is every reason for them to marvel at the miracle.

9:13 "to repentance" is left out. The Bible doctrine of repentance is one that men would like to do away with. God requires that in order to be saved one must truly repent (Acts 17:30; 2 Peter 3:9). The word means "a change of mind" and there must be that concerning God, sin and salvation. Men think that sin does not really separate them from God--they must change their mind about that. Men think that salvation is by works--they must change their mind about that. There is nothing more evident today than the absence of repentance among those who are professing to be converted.

15:8 "draweth nigh unto me with their mouth" is left out. According to Isaiah 29:13 it belongs in because Isaiah prophesied of these hypocrites exactly that way.

16:2,3 "When it is evening ... the signs of the times" is all omitted. The Pharisees and Sadducees came looking for a sign and the signs were all around them. Jesus called them hypocrites because they could not tell the signs of the times.

17:21 Whole verse is left out. Power with God is to be had by prayer and fasting. That is a fundamental truth of the Word of God.

18:2 "Jesus" is left out. This is done many times by the corrupt Greek Text of Westcott and Hort. I have not chosen to remark about each instance because it would add many pages to this work. The MAJORITY Text continuously places the word "Jesus" in the narrative with the definite article preceding it. Thus it places him in the center of things and in command. It is doctrinally unsound for such prominence to be discarded for the word "he."

18:11 The whole verse is omitted. This verse tells us that man is lost, that he needs to be saved, and that the Son of man is the one who can do that. The doctrine of salvation through Jesus Christ is affected by this change.

18:15 "against thee" is omitted. This omission sets us up as watchdogs over others and if one sins we are to go and tell him. Such is not the teaching of Scripture. Were we to declare every sin we would be constantly busy (bodies) judging the actions and motives of everyone. This change is a very bad error.

18:35 "their trespasses" is omitted. Same thought as mentioned in 18:15.

19:9 "and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery" is removed. This is a very important doctrinal change which concerns divorce and remarriage. A man who divorces his wife and remarries commits adultery, and also the man who marries the divorced wife commits adultery.

19:16,17 "Good" before Master is omitted. In addition to that, the phrase "Why callest thou me good?" is changed to "Why askest thou me concerning the good?" Good Master is correct and Jesus responded to show the young man that only one was good and that one was God. The conclusion should have been obvious. Since Jesus was good he was necessarily God. The omission and change destroys the intended testimony to the Deity of Christ.

20:16 "for many be called, but few chosen" is left out. The Lord would have us know that many are called to inherit eternal life, but few are chosen by virtue of believing in Christ. It is a Bible doctrine that God wants all men to be saved but few will come to Christ for salvation.

21:12 "of God" is out. Jesus, who was God in the flesh, came to his own temple and said, "My house shall be called the house of prayer." It was the temple of God and the God of the temple was there.

22:30 "of God" is removed. There are good angels and fallen angels. The believers, in the resurrection, will be like the good angels "of God" who alone are in heaven.

23:8 "Master" is changed to "teacher." There are many teachers but only one master. The change here takes away the pre- eminence that God intends for his Son.

25:13 "wherein the Son of man cometh" is omitted. The warning to watch is tied to the imminent return of the Lord. The omission here does away with the doctrine of the Lord's second advent.

26:28 "new" is dropped before testament. The apostle Paul tells us that Jesus said, "this cup is the NEW testament in my blood." The change here is intended to corrupt the Word of God and to confuse Christians.

27:35 "that it might be fulfilled ... did they cast lots" is all omitted. It is very important in Matthew's gospel, where Jesus is portrayed as the King of Israel, to show that he is the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies. Here the parting of his garments and casting lots is the fulfillment of Psalm 22:18 which portrays the crucifixion of Christ. To omit this is to show the intended corruption of the Word of God by the textual critics.

28:6 "the Lord" is omitted. The very reverent angels said, "see the place where the Lord lay." They would not say, "see the place where he lay." The constant attempt to humanize Jesus and take away from his Deity does not endear the Westcott and Hort Greek Text to believers.

MARK

1:1 "the Son of God" is left out. These words present Jesus Christ as Deity. Such an omission is a direct attack on the person of Christ and is without doubt a doctrinal error.

1:31 "immediately" is dropped. The descriptive word tells us when the fever left her and therefore provides us with a miracle. The word left out denies the miracle and thus the one who performed it.

2:17 "to repentance" is left out. See comments on Matt. 9:13.

3:15 "to heal sicknesses" is omitted. Jesus gave them authority to heal diseases as well as to cast out demons. Sickness is the result of sin (Adam's) and the only one who has authority to eliminate it is the one who would die for sin. On the basis of his approaching death for sin

on Calvary he could say, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee" and "Rise up and walk."

4:24 "and unto you that hear shall more be given" is left out. It is a Bible teaching that those who seek truth from the Lord shall be given more truth (see John 7:17).

5:36 "as soon" is dropped. The word in the Greek is "immediately." The word immediately is constantly dropped by the Revisers of 1881. It is a key word in Mark which is the Gospel of the Servant of the Lord who came "not to be ministered unto, but to minister."

When Jairus was told that his daughter was dead and that he should not trouble Jesus further, the Lord "immediately" encouraged him to believe.

6:11 "Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city" is removed from the text. This passage emphasizes the great degree of responsibility that was upon those cities who heard the Lord's apostles as they preached repentance and worked miracles before them. Sodom and Gomorrah did not have such light, yet they are still suffering the eternal wrath of God (see Jude 7 where "suffering" is in the present tense). How much more the judgment of America today where people sit in an abundance of complete revelation from God and choose to remain in darkness.

7:8 "as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do" is omitted. The Lord not only condemns the Pharisees for traditions of men, but he names them. There are traditions of men today which are sending people to Hell and preachers need to name them. It is doctrinally unsound to let men go on in traditions and not expose them.

9:23 "if thou canst believe" is dropped. The father had said to Jesus, "if thou canst do anything." To this lack of faith Jesus answered, "if thou canst believe." It was at once a rebuke and an encouragement to have faith in him. The father's answer in the next verse is beautiful but the Revisers ruined that also. They omitted "with tears, Lord" from the most precious answer as recorded by the Spirit of God.

9:45 "into the fire that never shall be quenched" is dropped. The character and duration of Hell is described here and the doctrine of eternal retribution is affected by this change.

9:47 "fire" is omitted. The words are inspired and in complete agreement with Rev. 20:15. The consignment of the lost to the lake of fire is a Bible doctrine.

10:21 "take up the cross" is left out. The word to the young man was to divest himself of the riches in which he trusted, consider himself dead to the world, and follow Christ into eternal life. There are many who will let go of riches and seek to emulate some of Christ's teachings, but the way of the cross they refuse. The cross for Christ and for believers is Fundamental in Christian doctrine.

10:24 "for them that trust in riches" is left out. This is a very glaring doctrinal error. It is not hard to enter into the kingdom of God (salvation is a free gift through faith in Jesus Christ) but it is hard for those who trust in riches to trust Christ alone for salvation. Their God is their wealth and it is no more compatible with Christ than Dagon was with the Ark of God (see 1 Sam. 5:1-5).

11:26 The whole verse is removed. It is a Bible doctrine that if we regard iniquity in our heart the Lord will not hear us. Answered prayer and clean vessels go together. When I confess my sins and ask God for favor he requires that my confession of sin include forgiveness of those who have sinned against me. If I refuse to forgive others it becomes sin to me (see Eph. 4:32).

13:14 "spoken of by Daniel the prophet" is dropped. Without the reference to Daniel the appeal to understand is without force. Though some might connect it in their thoughts because they are familiar with Scripture, it does not follow that he is referring to Daniel. The reference to Daniel by the Lord also authenticates his writing as inspired Scriptures.

14:22 "eat" is dropped. Our Lord did not give them a relic from the Last Supper to take home and cherish. He gave them broken bread to eat which (when observed) would always remind them of his body which was broken for them.

15:28 The whole verse is left out. Jesus was crucified between two thieves in fulfillment of Isaiah 53:12. It is doctrinal error to eliminate clear statements concerning the fulfilling of prophecy (see Luke 24:27).

16:9-20 Twelve verses are omitted. These verses are found in every known manuscript but two (the oldest of those two leaves a blank space where it belongs). They are found in all the Versions, quoted by the church fathers, and seen in the lectionaries of the church. There are many doctrines affected by the omission of these twelve verses. The resurrection of Christ is deleted. The great commission, baptism, eternal damnation and His ascension into Heaven are all taken out of the Word of God. Certainly the gospel does not end with "they were afraid." Some say the ending has been lost (see Dr. Ryrie's Study Bible) but that destroys the Bible Doctrine that God preserves His Word (see 1 Peter 1:23-25). The evidence is clear that these verses are original and to cut them out is to affect many doctrines of the Christian faith.

LUKE

1:28 "blessed art thou among women" is omitted. There were many virgins in Israel at the time, but God chose Mary. The Son that she bore would be her Saviour from sin. The Roman Catholic doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary (concerning her birth) is nothing but pagan fiction. Mary was blessed AMONG women, but not ABOVE women. The worship of Mary is contrary to Scripture. This omission is designed to lift her above others and eventually deify her.

2:14 "peace, good will toward men" is changed to "peace among men of good will." The first talks of the birth of Christ as bringing God's peace and good will (reconciliation) to men. Faith in the death of Christ for our sins brings justification and peace with God. The change offers God's peace to men who are good. That is doctrinally unsound since there is none good.

2:33 "Joseph and his mother" is changed to "his father and mother." The Spirit of God is very careful to show that our Lord Jesus Christ was born of a virgin and that he did not have a human father who begat him. The change casts doubt upon the doctrine of the virgin birth of Christ as the "seed of the woman." Later, when Mary refers to Joseph as "thy father," Jesus answers with, "wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business," meaning that God was his father (see 2:48,49).

2:40 "in spirit" is left out. That the child grew and waxed strong in spirit (meaning that he was spiritually strong) is evident from verse 47. It is unlikely that the Spirit of God wanted us to see how strong Jesus was with reference to his physique.

2:43 "and Joseph and his mother knew not of it" is changed to "and his parents were unaware of it." The first retains the teachings of the virgin birth, the second discards it. The virgin birth is a Fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith and the MAJORITY Text upholds it. Let us not hear of supposed overzealous copyists but rather let us beware of overzealous heretics who would deny the fundamentals of the faith.

4:4 "but by every Word of God" is dropped. Many are willing to agree that bread alone cannot satisfy man, but few are willing to live by every word of God. This quotation is from Deut. 8:3 where the omitted words are found. The same one who said, "Yea, hath God said?" is the author of this omission. The Revisers could not leave this passage in because they have changed "every word of God" in over 5,000 places in the New Testament. Satan does not mind if we read the Bible as long as we have a Swiss cheese Bible (full of holes). Holes in the Word cause doubts in the Word, doubts cause faith to be lost, and without faith it is impossible to please him.

4:8 "Get thee behind me, Satan" is omitted. The devil had tempted Jesus to bypass the cross and receive the kingdom over the world. Jesus, whose face was set as a flint to go to the cross, refused to worship him.

6:10 "whole as the other" is left out. These words tell us that not only was his hand restored to use but it was whole as the other. The completeness of the miracle is attested to by these words.

9:54 "even as Elias did" is omitted. Apart from this word they had no precedent for doing such a thing.

9:55, 56 "and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them" is omitted. In reply to the disciples who thought that they could call down fire from heaven, Jesus told them that he came to save men. This passage is consistent with John 3:17, "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved."

11:2-4 "Our ... which art in heaven" is deleted along with "Thy will be done as in heaven, so in earth" and "but deliver us from evil." Only corrupt manuscripts can produce so many departures from the disciples prayer which is found without deletions in Matt. 6:9-13.

14:5 The word "ass" is changed to "son." The use of "son" is too much for the comparison the Lord is making. Only a slavish loyalty to a corrupt Greek text can produce such a foolish change.

22:31 "And the Lord said" is dropped. The Lord Jesus was God and as such he was omnipresent and omniscient. He was present when Satan came before God and asked permission to try Peter's faith. He had prayed to the Father, as Peter's intercessor, that his faith would not fail. It was the Lord who knew all of this and warned Peter specifically.

22:64 "they struck him on the face" is dropped. It is error to minimize the sufferings of Christ. His facial appearance was marred more than any man (see Isaiah 52:14 and 53:5).

23:23 "and of the chief priests" is omitted. The Lord was careful to let us know that the religious priests were involved in the rejection of Christ. Those who call themselves priests today do likewise.

23:42 "And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom" is changed to "Then he said, Jesus remember me when you come into your kingdom." The confession that Jesus is Lord is doctrinally correct because it is required for salvation (see Rom. 10:9,13).

23:45 "the sun was darkened" is changed to "the sun was eclipsed." The Greek word in the corrupt Greek Text is EKLIPONTOS from which we derive the word ECLIPSE. An eclipse is caused by the natural occurrence of the moon passing between the sun and the earth and usually lasts for about 3-5 minutes. The sun being darkened for three hours was a miracle of God and will be repeated again prior to the Lord's return to earth (see Matt. 24:29) Many modern versions try to hide the Greek word they are using to translate from the corrupt Greek text by using words like: obscured (NASV), faded (AMPLIFIED), stopped shining (NIV), failed (NEW WORLD), but some honestly translate the word "eclipse" (20th CENTURY, MOFFAT, NEB, PHILLIPS). Humanism would try to find some way to explain away the miracles of God's Word lest they be forced to accept it as the revelation from God concerning salvation.

24:36 "and saith unto them. Peace be unto you" is omitted. Jesus had said to them, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you" (John 14:27). He was now risen from the dead and in their midst to guarantee that peace to them. One of the greatest benefits of our salvation is to have peace with God (Rom. 5:1) and the peace of God ruling in our hearts (Phil. 4:7).

24:40 The whole verse is omitted. The bodily resurrection of Christ is proven here as he showed them his hands and his feet. The omission affects Bible doctrine very much.

24:51 "and carried up into heaven" is left out. The bodily ascension of Christ into heaven is a Bible doctrine that is denied here. It leaves the Lord parted from them but does not tell us where he went. The Revisers removed the doctrine and left the Word in a poor state of disarray. Acts 1:1, 2 tells us that the "former treatise" (Luke) ended with Jesus being "taken up." That ought to be sufficient to show the Revisers are wrong.

24:52 "And ... worshipped him" is omitted by the NASV. The MAJORITY Text says, "And they having worshipped him returned to Jerusalem with great joy." The picture we have is of our Lord receiving their worship because he is God (see 4:8 where worship is to be to God only) and then before their very eyes ascending into heaven. It is a Bible doctrine that we are to worship Jesus and the omission by the NASV is a clear denial of that doctrine.

JOHN

1:18 "the only begotten Son" is changed to "The only begotten God." Such a phrase is foreign to Scripture. It accommodates the Arian

teaching that Christ was a lesser deity created by God. It agrees with the teaching of Origen that Christ was not equal with God in essence and nature. Sound Fundamental doctrine concerning Christ is that he is one person of the Triune God and that he proceeds from the Father by an eternal generation and reveals God to men as the Son of God.

1:27 "He it is ... who is preferred before me" is removed. This change removes the pre-eminence and pre-existence of Christ. John wanted us to see that though Christ came after him, he in reality preceded and ranked above him.

3:13 "which is in heaven" is omitted. This change affects the doctrine of the omnipresence of Christ. As man he was here on earth, as God he was able to be everywhere present. The omission is a corruption introduced by those who do not believe in the perfect and absolute Deity of Christ.

3:15 "should not perish" is removed. This deletion removes the opposite of everlasting life, which is to perish. The doctrine of eternal damnation is weakened by the change.

3:16 "his only begotten Son" is changed to "the only begotten Son." The word HIS marks Jesus Christ out as God's own peculiar son in a relationship that no one else has. It marks him as of the same essence and nature. The Deity of Christ is involved and is thereby weakened (3:17 also changed).

4:42 "the Christ" is left out. The purpose of John's gospel as given in 20:31 was to lead people to believe that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God. That belief was to bring life to them. To omit it here is to deny the purpose of the inspired writer.

5:3b, 4 The statement regarding the moving of the water by an angel and subsequent miraculous healing is removed. Should this deletion be permitted there would be no sense to verse 7 since that verse presupposes 5:3b, 4. This is an effort to remove the miraculous from the Bible and thus accommodate humanism.

5:16 "and sought to slay him" is omitted. The Scripture teaches us that on many occasions they tried to kill Jesus but by supernatural power were kept from doing so (see John 18:6). He was omnipotent and there was no way they could take him until his hour was come.

6:47 "on me" is left out. The object of faith has been removed here. Everlasting life does not come to those who believe, but to those who believe on Christ. This is doctrinal error of the gravest sort and has been carried over into the NASV and NIV.

7:8 The little word "yet" is dropped and the result is that the Lord appears to lie to his brothers, since he did go up to the feast. There is a world of difference between "I go not up YET" and "I go not up." The sinlessness of Christ is an indispensable doctrine of the Christian faith and lying is sin.

7:53-8:11 The whole story of the woman taken in adultery is omitted. This is one of the most blessed portions of the Word of God. It is intended by God through the inspired writer to amplify what came before in 3:17. The law was given by Moses but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ (1:17).

8:38 The words "my Father" and "your father" are intended to show the difference between his father and their father, who was Satan. By removing the word "my" and "your" there is a deliberate attempt to remove the offence and cater to the false dream of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man.

8:39 "If ye were Abraham's children" is changed to "if ye are Abraham's children." The Lord intended them to see that they were not Abraham's children at all. The change gives us to see that they were Abraham's children and therefore they ought to act like it. This is pure humanism and contrary to sound doctrine.

9:4 "I must work the works of him that sent me" is changed to "We must work the works of him that sent us." The uniqueness of Christ as the Sent One of the Father is destroyed and he is placed equally with the disciples as sent from God to do the work of God. This is an attack on the Person and Work of Christ and it exalts humanism. Jesus was sent by the Father and the disciples were sent by Jesus, "as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you."

9:35 "the Son of God" is changed to "the Son of man." The thing to be believed in John's gospel is that Jesus is the Son of God (20:31). The change by the minority texts is not warranted.

10:38 "that ye may know, and believe" is changed to "that ye may know, and understand." The union of Christ and the Father within the Godhead is that which we are to believe and rely upon for the certainty of our salvation. To understand the union is beyond human comprehension and if it could be understood, that would still not be the equivalent of salvation.

11:41 "where the dead was laid" is removed. God intends that we should know that this was the very same place where Lazarus was laid. This is an attempt to cloud the evident miracle which followed. (see also 12:2 where "which had been dead" is also removed).

ACTS

Title "of the Holy Apostles" is deleted. To leave us with "ACTS" means nothing. That the Apostles were sanctified (holy) by the Lord Jesus and sent forth as his sent ones is evident from John 17:17-19. The title in the MAJORITY Text is doctrinally correct.

2:30 "according to the flesh he would raise up Christ" is omitted. It was not just that one of David's descendants would sit upon the throne, but that his greater Son would be raised from the dead in a body of flesh.

2:31 "his soul" is omitted. The body of Christ was in the tomb but his soul went down into Hades (Hell), the place of departed spirits. The teaching of the Bible is that our Lord had a body, soul and spirit.

2:47 "to the church" is left out. Believers are added to the Church which is Christ's body. The Church is an organism, and when persecutors touched the Church they touched Christ (see 9:5).

3:21 "all" is dropped in front of "his holy prophets." God has spoken of the Kingdom age by the mouth of ALL his prophets since the world began. In harmony with this Jesus spoke to the two on the road to Emmaus about himself from "all the prophets" (see Luke 24:27). There are others in the world who claim to be prophets but they do not speak of Jesus and his kingdom, therefore they are not of God.

3:26 "Jesus" is dropped. The specific name leaves no doubt as to whom God raised up from the dead to offer again the kingdom to Israel.

4:24 "thou art God" is changed to "thou art he who." There is no reason to accept MINORITY manuscripts when they want to change "God" to "he who" (see 1 Tim. 3:16).

6:3 The word "Holy" is dropped. When God led the Church to choose deacons he made it clear that they should be controlled by the Holy Spirit. Many churches since have appointed men who had a lot of spirit and were full of enthusiasm, but that is not the same as being full of the "Holy Ghost." Godly living is required of deacons and it is contrary to sound doctrine to leave out "Holy." The Greek word for spirit can refer to man's spirit or God's spirit and lest we should err here God inserted the word "Holy" before spirit.

6:8 "faith" is changed to "grace." The Bible does not teach that Christians are full of grace but rather that they receive grace. The only one who was "full of grace" was our Lord Jesus Christ (see John 1:14). The measure of faith is given to every believer to profit thereby.

7:30 "of the Lord" is omitted. It was not just an angel that appeared to Moses at the burning bush, it was an angel of Jehovah (the Lord). This was an Old Testament appearance of the eternal Son of God in angelic form. In plain words it was the Lord who appeared to Moses (see Exodus 3:1-5).

7:37 "The Lord your" and "him shall ye hear" are omitted. This is contrary to the original quotation as found in Deut. 18:15. In Stephen's sermon the "him shall ye hear" is most important since those who refuse Christ's words will be judged by God.

8:18 "Holy" is dropped. Four times here in four verses the Holy Ghost is mentioned. To drop the word Holy in one out of the four times is to create confusion and doubt concerning the Word of God.

8:37 The whole verse is omitted. This leaves the question of the Ethiopian eunuch unanswered. Philip's answer is correct in that belief must be from the heart prior to baptism. The eunuch's confession of faith is in exact agreement with what is required for salvation as given in John 20:31. Souls have been led to Christ with this verse of Scripture and it is doctrinally unsound to remove it.

9:5,6 "it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him" is all omitted. This passage gives us a picture of Saul resisting the Spirit of God as he was under conviction. Saul's response is to submit to the Lord's direction, having been humbled before the Lord. Without Saul's "what wilt thou have me to do?" there could be no "arise and go."

9:29 "Jesus" is left out. The reason the Jews went about to slay Saul was not because he spake boldly in the name of the Lord, but because he spoke of the Lord Jesus. As we well know in this day of Modernism there is a great difference.

10:6 "he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do" is left out. The would- be correctors of the MAJORITY Text would have us believe that Cornelius was already saved and that it would be good for him to have fellowship with Peter. The truth is that Cornelius was not saved (see 11:14) and that there was something which he had to do. He must believe on the Lord Jesus Christ or he would be lost and go to Hell.

10:30 "fasting" is left out. Fasting, to find the will of God, is a Biblical doctrine. Though it is little used today, especially since we have the completed Word of God, it was evident in the New Testament apostolic times.

10:32 "who, when he cometh, shall speak unto thee" is omitted. See above comments under 10:6.

15:24 "Ye must be circumcised and keep the law" is left out. This is exactly the reason why the Jerusalem council was called or convened. There is no doubt that the reply to the Gentile converts made mention of the all important question.

16:31 "Christ" is omitted. The word speaks of the Deity of Christ. It pointed the Philippian jailer to the God he must believe in for salvation.

18:5 "was pressed in the Spirit" is changed to "was engrossed with the word." When Paul was teaching he was always engrossed with the Word. In Corinth Paul had been laying the groundwork at the synagogue concerning what the Scriptures had to say about their Messiah (Christ). When Silas and Timothy came, Paul was under compulsion to show that Jesus was the Christ.

19:10 "Jesus" is left out. For the heathen to hear about the Lord is not enough. They must hear that Jesus is that Lord.

20:28 "of God" is changed to "of the Lord." The word lord is sometimes used of men and sometimes of God. Therefore, the change does not affirm the Deity of Christ. Our Authorized King James Version shows that God purchased the church with his own blood. This establishes the Deity of Christ irrefutably.

21:25 "they observe no such thing, save only that" is omitted. The Gentiles had been told that they did not have to observe the law of Moses nor circumcise their children (see Acts 15:23-29). James was in error when he sought to keep the Jews obedient to the Law after he had written to the Gentiles that they were not under it. The omission here leaves one with the impression that the Law was optional for the Gentiles and possibly preferable. Tampering with God's Word always leaves the door open for doctrinal error.

26:28 "almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian" is changed to "do you think that in such a short time you can persuade me to be a Christian?" King Agrippa was "almost persuaded" and he was in possession of the truth concerning salvation. The change would have us believe that he needed more information and perhaps Paul was too quick to expect a decision.

ROMANS

1:16 "of Christ" is omitted. The gospel message is of Christ and centers around his Person and Work. This is an inexcusable attempt to leave

Christ out of the good news of salvation.

3:22 "and upon all" is dropped. The doctrine of imputed righteousness is most blessed to the believer. We are clothed in his righteousness and God sees us in Him, therefore it is "upon us."

8:1 "Who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" is dropped. To the truth that there is no condemnation to those who are in Christ, the Word adds the truth that they are characterized by a walk in the Spirit. It is a Bible doctrine that those who are saved are characterized by a changed life.

11:6 "But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work" is dropped. The first part of the verse shows that grace rules out works. The second part of the verse shows that works rules out grace. It is intended for those who want to intrude works into the established state of grace for good measure (or safekeeping in salvation). This is a very important doctrinal passage in its' entirety.

13:9 "thou shalt not bear false witness" is dropped. Those who wrote the corrupt manuscripts had no trouble with the other commandments shown here. It is obvious that a smiting conscience would not permit them to include this commandment since it directly involved what they were engaged in, bearing false witness about God's Word.

14:9 "and rose" is left out. Many heretics are willing to say that he died and that he lives again, but that he rose (bodily out from among the dead) they reject outright. The bodily resurrection of Christ is a cardinal doctrine of the Christian faith.

1 CORINTHIANS

2:4 "man's wisdom" is changed to "wisdom." Paul did not reject wisdom in his teaching, he rejected MAN'S wisdom.

3:4 "are ye not carnal?" is changed to "are ye not men?" It should be obvious that they were men, but the Bible truth to be taught was that in their divisions they were being controlled by fleshly (carnal) desires and not spiritual desires.

5:7 "for us" is omitted. This affects the vital doctrine of the substitutionary atonement of Christ. If Christ did not die for our sins then we are still under the wrath of God and without hope.

5:12 The little word "also" is dropped. That word indicated that Paul did judge those who were within the church. Those who were outside the church were for God to judge. The responsibility for believers to carry out discipline within the church is a Bible doctrine.

6:4 "set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church" is changed to "do you appoint them as judges who are of no account in the church?" The Word of God teaches that it is better to suffer wrong than to go to court against another Christian before a lost world. It is better to leave the judgment of the matter to the least Christian than to the greatest worldly judge. The change here completely turns around the way of God and seems to rebuke the church for leaving the matter in the hands of the least Christians.

6:20 "and in your spirit which are God's" is omitted. The body gives us world consciousness and the spirit gives us God consciousness. We are to glorify God in our body by holy living and in our spirit by walking in fellowship with God. Verses 16 and 17 talk about both.

10:9 "Christ" is changed to "Lord." In the Old Testament they tempted Christ and that rock that followed them was Christ (see verse 4). The word Lord can be used of the Father and the Son. Changing to that word here eliminates the pre-existence of Christ.

11:24 "take eat" is omitted along with "is broken." The symbolic bread was broken and given to the disciples with instruction to eat it. It typified his flesh which "is being broken for you" (literal Greek). Though not a bone of him was broken it is true that his flesh was broken in many places before he died on our behalf.

11:29 "unworthily" is dropped. The word gives the picture of a believer treating the Lord's Supper as a common meal, not reverencing the symbolic meaning and spiritual impact it is intended to make upon his soul and spirit. To remove this word is a very great doctrinal error. When you consider that sickness and death was the result of such unworthy participation, it is no light matter.

11:29 "not discerning the Lord's body" is changed to "if he does not judge the body rightly" (NASV). When we partake of the Lord's Supper we are to see through the elements to the Lord's body. As you think of the cost of your redemption there ought to be more holy living. The change brings absolute confusion concerning what body is meant, the Lord's or the believers. It is hallowed ground and the corrupters of God's Word have dared to tread upon it.

15:47 "the Lord" is left out. God is contrasting Adam and Christ. To say that the second man is from heaven is not enough. There have been men from heaven who were angels. Here the man from heaven is the Lord. This is an attempt to do away with the Deity of Christ.

15:49 "we shall also bear the image of the heavenly" is changed to "we should bear the image of the heavenly." The first is a fact based upon the certainty of our eternal salvation in Christ. The second is an exhortation based upon the uncertainty of a salvation by works. The first is sound doctrine, the second is unsound doctrine.

16:22 "Jesus Christ" is omitted. In a phrase with such import as to be accursed it is unthinkable that the test should center around the general term "Lord." The curse of God is upon those who do not love the Lord Jesus Christ. When his person and work is refused there is nothing to look for but wrath.

2 CORINTHIANS

4:4 "unto them" is omitted. The devil does not have power to keep the light of the gospel of Christ from shining, but he does have power to blind men lest it shine "unto them."

5:17 "all things" is left out. The believer is brought into vital union with Christ so that it is declared that he is in Christ. In the sight of God "old things" of the sinful nature are passed away. It only remains for those old things to be unwound, like Lazarus' graveclothes, in his daily

life. In the sight of God "all things" are become new though they make their appearance in the life of the believer as he grows in grace and knowledge. To deny that "all things" are become new is to deny the finished work of Christ whereby we are made accepted in the beloved.

12:11 "in glorying" is dropped. The Corinthians had compelled Paul to talk about his experiences with the Lord. He did not want to brag about his spirituality. He felt that he had become foolish in boasting or glorying. The change would have Paul saying, "I have made a fool of myself." That is not what we are to understand.

GALATIANS

3:1 "that ye should not obey the truth" is omitted. The Galatians had been bewitched by the Jewish legalizers who had put them under the Law to keep saved. Paul tells them that in so doing they were not obeying the truth. The truth was that they were saved by grace and that all spiritual blessings were theirs in Christ. To turn from that is to be in error.

3:17 "in Christ" is dropped. Paul is talking about the covenant with Abraham through his seed which was Christ. The law was added later and did not affect the covenant of promise to those who would be saved by believing as Abraham did. God promised Abraham that through his seed (singular) all the families of the earth would be blessed. That was a covenant confirmed before of God "in Christ."

4:7 "an heir of God through Christ" is changed to "an heir through God." The inheritance is to the children of God through the mediatorship of Christ. We are not heirs of God through God, but through Christ. The change here is intended to destroy the reliance upon the Lord Jesus Christ who said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me."

EPHESIANS

1:1 "at Ephesus" is left out. It is hard to conceive that the Spirit of God addressed an epistle and then lost the address.

3:9 "by Jesus Christ" is removed. It is a Bible doctrine that all things were created by Jesus Christ and without him was not anything made that was made. This change detracts from the Deity of Christ which is made evident by the fact that ALL THINGS were created by Him.

5:30 "of his flesh, and of his bones" is left out. The Bible teaching is that the believer is vitally conjoined to Christ for a new life and walk in the Spirit. We are "quickened together with Christ," "raised up together," and "seated together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." God likens this to the marriage relationship where two people become one flesh.

6:10 "my brethren" is dropped. These words make it very clear that Paul's instructions concerning Christian living are for Christians who by the new birth have become Paul's "brethren." There is a great danger that unsaved people might get the impression that by imitating the things that Christians do they can become Christians.

PHILIPPIANS

4:13 "Christ" is changed to "him." It is precious to the believer to know that Christ will give him strength for spiritual living. Christ himself said, "without me ye can do nothing" (John 15:5). The word "him" is quite indefinite and can be misconstrued by Modernists to include the "him" of any religious group believing in a Supreme Being.

COLOSSIANS

1:2 "and the Lord Jesus Christ" is omitted. Along with the Father he is the source of grace and peace.

1:14 "through his blood" is left out. Redemption and forgiveness of sins is through the direct agency of his shed blood. Many Modernists today can work around the words "redemption" and "forgiveness of sins," but they cannot work around the shed blood. Therefore they must deny it and be in direct opposition to it.

2:11 "of the sins" is removed. What is left to work with brings the NIV to translate "In him you were also circumcised, in the putting off of your sinful nature." It is an established Bible doctrine that by the circumcision of our heart which the Lord made, we are able to overcome the sins of our flesh. But the putting off of our sinful nature will not take place until we are changed in the Rapture. Errors like this can only occur as the group of translators persist in following the MINORITY Text.

2:18 "those things which he has not seen" is made to read "those things which he has seen." Men were vainly attempting to worship angels as emanations from God in a step-ladder effort to reach God. Paul exhorted them to hold fast to the Head (our God-man Christ Jesus) who proceeded forth and came from God (himself being of the Trinity) that he might bring us to God. Paul says they DID NOT see them, heretics say THEY HAVE.

1 THESSALONIANS

1:1 "from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" is dropped. Are we to think that grace and peace is bestowed by Paul? No, that is not within his power. They have their source in the Father and the Son.

5:27 "holy" is dropped from before "brethren." Paul had other brethren according to the flesh who were not saved (Rom. 9:1-3; 10:1). These were sanctified and preserved brethren and they were "holy" because they were accepted in the beloved.

1 TIMOTHY

3:3 "not greedy of filthy lucre" is omitted. The phrase has to do with obtaining earthly gain through disgraceful means. This happens everyday within professing Christendom. It is inspired of God and belongs in the text.

3:16 "God was manifest" is changed to "He was manifest." The reference is to Christ manifest in the flesh, etc. The MAJORITY Text tells

us that this Christ was God. There are 252 copies of Paul's Epistles which have "God" and only 2 copies which have "he." The MINORITY Text leaves us in doubt as to who "he" is. The doctrine of the Deity of Christ is greatly harmed here by the corrupt text.

4:12 "in spirit" is left out. To be an example of the believer it is necessary to have a spiritual man guided by the indwelling Holy Spirit.

4:16 "if any man" is omitted. It is unthinkable that the head of the house should be removed here from the responsibility to provide for widows.

6:5 "from such withdraw thyself" is dropped. The Bible doctrine of separation is affected by this corruption. We are to withdraw from teachers who are destitute of the truth.

6:19 "eternal life" is changed to "that which is truly life." The first talks about the length of life, the second talks about the quality of life. You cannot have the first without being saved. You can have the second but still be lost, depending on what you think is "truly life."

2 TIMOTHY

1:11 "of the Gentiles" is omitted. That Paul was appointed to teach the gospel to the Gentiles is indisputable (see Gal. 2:7-9).

HEBREWS

1:3 "When he had by himself purged our sins" is changed to "when he had made purification of sins." The omission of the word "our" leaves us to wonder whose sins were purged, his own or others. It is not plain and therefore the substitutionary atonement of Christ is affected by the change. With the words "by himself" the Holy Spirit wanted us to see that the atonement for our sins was accomplished by Christ alone. The damage to this verse is awesome in its' consequences.

3:1 "Christ" is omitted. Our High Priest must be anointed of God to that office and the word Christ means the Messiah or Anointed one of God.

10:34 "in heaven" is left out. Those who had lost all their earthly goods certainly had no enduring substance here, but in heaven was their treasure and reward.

JAMES

2:20 "faith without works is dead" has been changed to "faith without works is useless." There is a great difference between dead faith and useless (or idle) faith. The first indicates that no faith exists and the person is lost. The second implies that faith exists but it is not being used. Again we see humanism and the false idea of a little divinity in each one which only needs to be fanned into a flame. The change promotes false doctrine.

4:4 "ye adulterers" is dropped from the text. No reason to excuse the men from the scathing denunciation of God's Word.

4:14 "It is even a vapour" is changed to "Ye are just a vapour." In describing the length of our life, God tells us it will pass quickly like a vapour. The change would have US OURSELVES to exist as a little steam. There is a leaning here toward annihilationism.

5:16 "Confess your faults" becomes "confess your sins." In a context where God talks about sin in relationship to sickness, he moves on to talk about faults (a side-slip or deviation). The change "faults" to "sins" leads to the priesthood and the confession box which is contrary to all of Scripture.

1 PETER

1:22 "through the Spirit" is removed. The Bible teaches that it is through the agency of the Holy Spirit that men are brought to believe in Christ. In John 16:8,9 he convicts the world (all men) and draws them to faith in Christ.

1:23 "for ever" is dropped and thereby the preservation of the Word of God is called into question. The agency here of the new birth is the Word of God, which is eternal. Our new birth therefore is as eternal as the Word which originated it.

2:2 The phrase "unto salvation" is added by Westcott and Hort to "that ye may grow thereby." This puts a question mark over the certainty of our present salvation. It makes salvation a process rather than an accomplished fact. The doctrine of eternal security is denied by the new exhortation to grow UNTO SALVATION.

3:18 "suffered for sins" is changed to "died for sins." The context has Christians suffering for well doing and they are exhorted to keep on because Christ also has suffered for us. It is a Bible teaching that Christ not only died for our sins, but that he suffered for our sins (see Isaiah 53:5-7).

3:18 "quickened by the Spirit" is changed to "quickened in the spirit." The correct rendering attributes the resurrection of Christ to the Holy Spirit. This completes the truth that all three persons of the Trinity were involved in the resurrection of Christ (see John 2:19; Rom. 8:11).

4:1 "for us" is left out. Christ suffered for us, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.

5:2 "taking the oversight thereof" is omitted. To watch over the flock of God with authority is a clear teaching of the Word.

5:12 "wherein ye stand" is changed to "wherein stand." By the removal of the word "ye" there is a change from our standing in grace to an exhortation to stay there standing. The blessing of a perfected standing in grace is thereby removed.

2 PETER

2:17 The words "for ever" are dropped. Peter, in the word concerning false teachers, states that their darkness is to last forever. The change

leaves us with no definite word as to their end.

2:18 "those that were clean escaped" is changed to "those that are scarcely escaping." The change from past tense to present tense moves us from a completed salvation to a hope-so salvation. Those who are saved are in possession of eternal life (see John 5:24).

2:20 "the Lord and Saviour" becomes "our Lord and Saviour." The false teachers had escaped some of the world's worst sins by following the teachings of "the Lord" but they had never come to know him as "our Lord" is known to real Christians. They were not saved and then lost, but never saved at all.

3:2 "us the apostles" is changed to "your apostles." The Church is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (Eph. 2:20) and there are no apostles and prophets today nor is there any such thing as an apostolic succession. The phrase "your apostles" indicates that the people he was writing to had special apostles designated for them and lends support to the continuance of a so-called "Apostolic Succession."

1 JOHN

1:7 "Christ" is dropped. This word brings the cleansing blood into relationship with our great anointed High Priest who ever liveth to make intercession for us. Many cults believe that Jesus (as man) died for the original sin of Adam and that Christ (as a spirit) rose without the body. John would have us know that the one who died and the one who arose are the same.

3:5 "our" is removed from before "sins." Once again the question of whose sins were taken away is raised. There have been sins committed by angels and men. The "our sins" refers the atonement to those of men. (see my comments under Hebrews 1;3).

3:14 "his brother" is removed. The teaching of the Word is that a true Christian will love his brother in Christ. If a man does not love a true Christian, then it is evident that he is still lost and abides in death. The test of spiritual life is not that we love, but that we love the brethren (see John 13:34,35).

4:19 "We love him" is changed to "We love." The object of God's love is us, and the object of our love is him. Christians are not just people who love, but people who love God because of his grace. The very next verse deals with the professor who says he loves God but is a liar. Lost people may love, but saved people love God.

5:7 The whole verse bearing testimony to the Triune God is discarded. There are at least 20 Greek manuscripts which have this verse in. It is also seen in the writings of the church fathers and lectionaries. It directly affects the Bible doctrine of the Trinity.

REVELATION

5:10 "kings and priests" is changed to "a kingdom of priests." The 24 elders are representative of all the redeemed who in Christ are constituted kings and priests. A kingdom of priests smells of Nicolaitanism (the rule of the clergy over the laity) and the priesthood for a select few as in the Roman Catholic Church. (The same change is seen in 1:6)

8:13 "an angel" is changed to "an eagle." This is most amusing and shows how captive the Revisers are to their corrupt text. In a setting replete with angels we are told about a talking eagle who pronounces three more "Woes" to the inhabitants of the earth.

14:5 "before the throne of God" is dropped. This phrase speaks of the perfect standing that the saved have in Christ. They are without fault before God because they are, like the church, "accepted in the beloved" (Eph. 1:6).

20:9 "from God" is dropped. At the end of the Kingdom Age the enemies of God are destroyed by fire "from God out of heaven." God is the one who will destroy all enemies and create a new heaven and a new earth.

20:12 "before God" is changed to "before the throne." The dead will be raised, not to stand before an impersonal throne, but to stand before "the God" [literal]. Many would like to change the personal God into some kind of Divine Mind or Supreme Being.

CONCLUSION

All that has gone before makes it very clear that Christian Doctrine is greatly affected by the changes. The MINORITY Text is the source of these changes and the New Modern Versions usually follow that Text. It is unthinkable that men of God would continue to advocate the use of these versions when they are in complete possession of all the facts. The ministry of the Holy Spirit is to guide us into "all truth." May he be allowed to have his way in our hearts. If you have read this book and are of the same persuasion as the author, I would exhort you to give copies to your Christian friends. It is very important that they understand the issue confronting the Church today. As great numbers of Christian people let their voices be heard for the retention of God's Word, as given to us in the Traditional Text, there will be a restoration of the same in the pulpits and in the Christian schools of our land. [Way of Life Literature, 1701 Harns Rd., Oak Harbor, WA 98277 Phone--(360) 675-8311]

THE "HERESY" OF BELIEVING THE KJV-TR IS ***THE PRESERVED WORD OF GOD***

Republished April 10, 2000 (first published April 8, 1999) (David W. Cloud, Fundamental Baptist Information Service, 1701 Harns Rd., Oak Harbor, WA 98277) –

The article I published recently on the preservation of the Holy Scriptures ("Preservation Is Missing in Standard Works on Textual Criticism," March 30, 1999; see the Bible Version section of the Fundamental Baptist Information Service topical listing at the Way of Life web site) struck a sore spot with some men. I could tell by the vehemence of their letters to me. I refer to those who believe it is heresy to claim that the standard old English Bible and its underlying Greek and Hebrew text is the preserved Word of God. These men, as a rule, don't get very upset about the rationalism of modern textual critics. (They will even quote approvingly from the writings of heretics such as Bruce Metzger, Fredric Kenyon, and F.F. Bruce, rarely, if ever, warning their readers that these men deny the supernatural infallibility of Holy Scripture.) But they become exceedingly fierce and bold when a man claims that the King James Bible and its underlying text is the preserved Word of God and when he refuses to correct it. Friends, I believe something is wrong with this picture.

I will illustrate from recent correspondence I have received:

LETTER FROM READER: "The mystical need of the KJV & it's underlying TR should be replaced with the honest truth that it is as fallible as the men who put it together. The Lord Jesus Christ will give us that perfect Greek and Hebrew text at the proper time. I honestly believe we will have to reach the perfection that comes with death or the rapture to be able to fully appreciate it without worshipping it" (Don D. Srail, Northwest Independent Church Extension).

COMMENT BY BROTHER CLOUD: Mr. Srail thinks the Received Text is as fallible as the men who put it together. For him, the infallible Word of God does not exist anywhere in the world. He believes it is mystically scattered throughout the manuscripts and versions; and though he says he hopes it might be recovered some day, he fears that men would worship it if it were ever recovered! Those who accept the King James Bible and its Received Text as the preserved Word of God are close to idolaters, in this man's book. He told me I am in danger of falling into the error of the Jews who worshipped the Brazen Serpent. What unmitigated nonsense! I don't worship the King James Bible. I worship the God of the King James Bible. But I do revere the King James Bible and its Received Text as the infallible Word of my God, and God Himself has stated that he has magnified His Word above all His name!!! This man does not revere any Bible as the holy infallible Word of God, because he does not believe such a thing exists. There is something wrong with this picture, friends. There is something wrong with a position on Bible preservation that leaves a man with no preserved Bible, that motivates a man to mock those who hold an existing Bible as the inspired Word of God, labeling them idolaters and heretics.

LETTER FROM READER: "God willed that His Church should enjoy the benefit of His written word, at once as a rule of doctrine and as a guide unto holy living. For this cause He so enlightened the minds of the Apostles and Evangelists by His Spirit, that they recorded what He had imprinted on their hearts or brought to their remembrance, without the risk of error in anything essential to the verity of the Gospel. But this main point once secured, the rest was left, in a great measure, to themselves" (Doug Kutilek, quoting F.H.A. Scrivener without qualification).

COMMENT BY BROTHER CLOUD: Kutilek believes both the inspiration and preservation of the Bible are human enterprises by and large. God helped a little, but man was left "in great measure" to himself. That is his flimsy view of Bible inspiration and preservation. How does Kutilek know that the Scripture was inspired in such a hazy manner? His doctrine certainly did not come from what the Bible itself says. We know that God used the personalities of the writers of Scripture somewhat, but the Bible nowhere says that the Spirit of God inspired the Scripture in the manner described by Kutilek. Nowhere are we told that inspiration involved only the Spirit's general guidance. The Apostle Peter tells us authoritatively and dogmatically that Scripture was written by holy men who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Peter 1:21). That tells me that the Spirit of God guided every single word. What they spoke and wrote was Holy Ghost language. The Apostle Paul also said the Scriptures are inspired in the very words (1 Cor. 2:13). 2 Timothy 3:16 says the Scripture "is given by inspiration of God." The Scripture is said to be wholly the product of divine inspiration." Nothing is said about the writers being left to put the message into his own words. They were moved by the Holy Spirit in every detail they wrote, every word, every jot, every tittle. Let the unbelievers mock this as "mechanical dictation," if they so please. I will tell you a little secret here that will help you discern belief from unbelief. Dr. Bruce Lackey explained this to me as a Bible school student

THE

25 years ago. It is this: Unbelievers emphasize man's part in the writing and preserving of the Bible. Believers emphasize God's part. Kutilek is denying (in practice, at least) the verbal inspiration of Holy Spirit. No wonder he does not understand Bible preservation. He does not even understand Bible inspiration.

LETTER FROM READER: "Many see you as Ruckman's equal because we can not tell any difference in your conclusions. I cannot see when either of you have had enough desire for truth about Bible translations to point at a passage in the KJV and flatly say 'this is an error'" (Ron Minton).

COMMENT BY BROTHER CLOUD: To be an "honest Bible believer," to those with the mindset of Minton, a man must believe there are errors in the Authorized English Bible. Amazing! By this perverted standard, a "Bible believer" must believe there are errors in every Bible. What a strange kind of "Bible believer"! As for Dr. Ruckman, I have had at least as much trouble from him and those who support him as from the modern version crowd. I have written a report disagreeing with him on many points, and he has mocked me in his paper; but I definitely don't fault him for believing God has preserved a pure Bible. If that is a fault, I will have to be guilty of it.

Of course, I am a simple Bible preacher, and though I am a diligent student, I am not a scholar of the biblical languages. On the other hand, men like Dr. Donald Waite and Dr. Thomas Strouse have credentials in the biblical languages that excel that of the men I am quoting in this report, and they don't believe there are errors in the KJV, either. I will stand with them. I am deeply afraid of any position on biblical preservation that leaves a man with no preserved Bible today, that, in fact, makes him the enemy of those who do believe there is a preserved Bible.

It is not heresy or idolatry to accept the King James Bible and its Received Text as the preserved Word of God. If you hold that position, you are in good company. Millions of Christians have done just this in the past several centuries. When the great confessions of faith were written in the 17th and 18th centuries, the Protestants and Baptists of that day claimed that God has preserved the Scriptures infallibly. They were holding a King James Bible and were pointing to the Received Text when they made those claims. For example, the Philadelphia Confession of Faith (1742) stated:

"The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old) and the New Testament in Greek (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and by His singular care and providence kept pure in all ages are, therefore authentic; so as in all controversies of religion, the Church is finally to appeal unto them."

The Greek and Hebrew which the 18th century Philadelphia Baptists called the preserved, pure Word of God was the Received Text underlying the King James Bible.

The Orthodox Creed of 1679 was written by a group of General Baptists in England, with a desire to emphasize doctrines that were held in common by all Bible-believing Christians. The following is what they believed about the Bible:

"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. All which are given by the inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life."

Friends, it sounds to me that these 17th century English-speaking Christians accepted the King James Bible and its Received Text as the preserved Word of God!

For centuries, Bible-believing people did not express any reservations about the authenticity or infallibility of the Received Text. It was left for the 19th century rationalistic textual critics to deny the preservation of the Received Text. Those who want to appear scholarly today refuse to reject the heretics that gave us modern textual criticism, but I don't have that problem. Any man who denies the supernatural infallibility of Holy Scripture is an arch heretic in my book (and the vast majority of influential textual critics are in this category), and I refuse to follow his counsel. I am a diligent student and I see no advantage in ignorance, but I am not concerned with credentials or with achieving repute as a scholar. I could have advanced degrees if I pleased. My Bible Encyclopedia alone would make several good theses. I don't despise knowledge, but I do despise the pride of scholarship. Genuine scholarship is good, but the desire to be known as a scholar is evil. The condition of the human heart is what makes scholarship so dangerous in this fallen world.

One of the most serious problems among Bible-believing Fundamentalists today, in my estimation, is the lack of separation from New Evangelicalism (which in turn is yoked together with Romanism and other unscriptural isms because it refuses to practice separation from anything) and Modernism at the seminary

level of Bible training. It is extremely common for professors in Fundamentalist and fundamental Baptist seminaries to get much of their education at the feet of New Evangelicals at schools like Dallas Theological Seminary or worse. As the Bible warns, more often than not they become spiritually tainted by this illicit relationship. "Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners" (1 Cor. 15:33). (The exceptions, and they are few, are those who are unusually well grounded in the Word of God, unusually discerning, unusually militant and therefore perpetually resisting much of the instruction they are given, and unusually courageous so that they publicly repudiate the very institution that trained them.) Biblical separation from error is required because of the corrupting power of error (Rom. 16:17,18; 2 Tim. 2:16-18; etc.). If you don't believe that Fundamentalists are being influenced by New Evangelicals and worse, simply check out the textbooks used to teach textual criticism and similar disciplines in Fundamentalist seminaries. They are written by New Evangelicals and Modernists like Bruce Metzger, D.A. Carson, and F.F. Bruce. Some have protested against my applying the term "Modernist" to Bruce Metzger, but in my book, at man who says Moses did not write the Pentateuch and the Old Testament miracles are exaggerated myths and Peter did not write 2 Peter is a Modernist.

I want to be known as a simple preacher who believes and defends the infallible, preserved Word of God against all its enemies. You will have to forgive me for thinking that the effectiveness of such an endeavor BEGINS with the confidence that one has such a Bible! I want to encourage my readers that they can trust the King James Bible and its Received Text (and any good translation of the Received Text in other languages). God's people today do not have to be dependent upon textual critics to tell them which parts of the Bible are preserved. The critics themselves don't know, so why waste the time with them. Believe God, and reject the critics. You won't be able to believe both. The textual critics are the true heretics in this issue. They are also the true idolaters, because they worship scholarship and look upon the holy Bible (at least in a practical sense) as a human device.

I will gladly be called an idolater, a heretic, and a Ruckmanite before I will take the position of skepticism represented by the men who have recently written to me on this subject.

"Therefore I esteem all thy precepts concerning all things to be right; and I hate every false way" (Psalm 119:128).

IS THE RECEIVED TEXT BASED ON A FEW LATE MANUSCRIPTS?

March 16, 2000 (David W. Cloud, Fundamental Baptist Information Service, 1701 Harns Rd., Oak Harbor, WA 98277, dcloud@wayoflife.org) -- For over a hundred years modern version defenders have promoted a deception that the Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament (and its 20th century successors, such as the United Bible Societies' Greek N.T.) is founded upon the "oldest and best manuscripts," whereas the Greek text underlying the King James Bible is an inferior one that is based on a mere handful of late Greek manuscripts. Consider the following statement by D.A. Carson, author of the influential and popular book *The King James Version Debate: A Plea for Realism*:

"Although Erasmus published a fourth and fifth edition, we need say no more about them here. Erasmus's Greek Testament stands in line behind the King James Version; yet it rests upon a half dozen minuscule manuscripts, none of which is earlier than the tenth century. ... THE TEXTUAL BASIS OF THE TR IS A SMALL NUMBER OF HAPHAZARDLY AND RELATIVELY LATE MINUSCULE MANUSCRIPTS" (D.A. Carson, *The King James Version Debate*, Baker Book House, 1979, pp. 35-36).

Another example of this error is found in the book *The Bible Version Debate: The Perspective of Central Baptist Theological Seminary* (1997). Chapter four is "Defining the Terms" by W. Edward Glenny, professor of New Testament at Central --

"... the TR is only based on seven late manuscripts" (Glenny, p. 51).

This incredibly erroneous statement has been repeated so frequently by textual critics and modern version defenders that it is commonly accepted as truth. While it is not exactly surprising to see New Evangelicals like D.A. Carson fall for such things, we have seen that some fundamental Baptists are repeating the same tired errors. If scholarly fundamental Baptists of our day would spend at least as much time studying the writings of Bible-believing textual scholars such as John Burgon, Edward Miller, and E. F. Hills, who believe in infallible inspiration and divine preservation, as they do studying the writings of Modernists and New Evangelicals such as Bruce Metzger, F.F. Bruce, and Kurt Aland, who deny both inspiration and preservation, they might not be so quick to pass along fallacies to unsuspecting readers.

Be that as it will, it is not difficult to dispel the myth that the Received Greek Text underlying the King James Bible and other Reformation Bibles is merely "based on seven late manuscripts." It is true that Erasmus had in his actual possession only a few Greek manuscripts when he composed the first edition of his Greek New Testament, but he had examined a large number of other manuscripts, both Latin and Greek, and he had compared these with many ancient Bible translations and with a large number of quotations from ancient church leaders. He also was aware of the alternative readings contained in manuscripts such as the Vaticanus and Codex D. Thus he was in a position to know that those few manuscripts he had at hand represented the witness of vast numbers of other manuscripts. The fact is that the Received Text underlying the esteemed and mightily used Reformation Bibles is represented in the majority of existing Greek manuscripts, quotations from ancient church leaders, and ancient Bible translations. This is why the Received Text has commonly been called the "majority text" (though that term has been usurped in recent years by the Hodges-Farstad-Thomas Nelson Greek New Testament of 1982). Textual authorities admit that of the more than 5,200 existing Greek manuscripts, 99% contain the common traditional ecclesiastical or Received Text. Thus, on the very face of the evidence, it is nonsense to say that the Received Text is "is only based on seven late manuscripts."

THE TESTIMONY OF J.H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE DISPELS THIS MYTH

The following quotation from historian J. H. Merle D'Aubigne demonstrates that Erasmus had access to more textual evidence than his modern detractors admit:

"Nothing was more important at the dawn of the Reformation than the publication of the Testament of Jesus Christ in the original language. Never had Erasmus worked so carefully. 'If I told what sweat it cost me, no one would believe me.' HE HAD COLLATED MANY GREEK MSS. of the New Testament, and WAS SURROUNDED BY ALL THE COMMENTARIES AND TRANSLATIONS, by the writings of Origen, Cyprian, Ambrose, Basil, Chrysostom, Cyril, Jerome, and Augustine. ... HE HAD INVESTIGATED THE TEXTS ACCORDING TO THE PRINCIPLES OF SACRED CRITICISM. When a knowledge of Hebrew was necessary, he had consulted Capito, and more particularly Ecolampadius. Nothing without Theseus, said he of the latter, making use of a Greek proverb" (J.H. Merle D'Aubigne, *History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*, New York: Hurst & Company, 1835, Vol. 5, p. 157).

The popular notion that Erasmus and other 16th-century editors of the Greek New Testament worked with paltry resources is simply nonsense. The notes that Erasmus placed in his editions of the Greek New Testament prove that he was informed of the variant readings that have found their way into the modern translations since 1881. Even though Erasmus did not have access to all of the manuscripts translators can use today, there can be no doubt that he did have access to the variant readings in other ways.

"Through his study of the writings of Jerome and other Church Fathers Erasmus became very well informed concerning the variant readings of the New Testament text. Indeed almost all the important variant readings known to scholars today were already known to Erasmus more than 460 years ago and discussed in the notes (previously prepared) which he placed after the text in his editions of the Greek New Testament. Here, for example, Erasmus dealt with such problem passages as the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:13), the interview of the rich young man with Jesus (Matt. 19:17-22), the ending of Mark (Mark 16:9-20), the angelic song (Luke 2:14), the angel, agony, and bloody seat omitted (Luke 22:43-44), the woman taken in adultery (John 7:53-8:11), and the mystery of godliness (1 Tim. 3:16)" (Dr. Edward F. Hills, *The King James Version Defended*, 1956, 1979, pp. 198-199).

Not only did Erasmus consult many Greek and Latin manuscripts and ancient Bible translations to determine the proper text, he examined quotations from ancient Christian writings.

"Erasmus uses the Fathers of the Church as independent witnesses for the early text of the Vulgate. In his dedicatory letter to the pope he mentions that the special care due to the sacred writings caused him not only to compare 'the oldest and most correct manuscripts' but also to 'run through all the writings of the old theologians and to trace from their quotations and expositions what each one of them had read and changed'" (W. Schwarz, *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation*, p. 145).

We do not assign any degree of perfection to Erasmus. He had serious faults, to be sure (though more often than not modern version defenders caricature him falsely). It is a fact that Erasmus was diligent in researching the history of the transmission of the Scriptures and that he had sufficient resources for the task. The publication of the first printed Greek New Testament was in no wise the hasty, haphazard, careless thing that today's textual critics would have us believe. (We say much more about Erasmus and his role in the publication of the first printed Greek New Testament in the book *Myths about the King James Bible*.)

THE TESTIMONY OF BISHOP ELLICOTT DISPELS THIS MYTH

As for the Received Text being based on "seven late manuscripts," consider further the testimony of Bishop Ellicott, the chairman of the committee that produced the English Revised Version of 1881 (the committee also included Westcott and Hort), the predecessor of all modern versions:

"THE MANUSCRIPTS WHICH ERASMUS USED DIFFER, FOR THE MOST PART, ONLY IN SMALL AND INSIGNIFICANT DETAILS, FROM THE GREAT BULK OF THE CURSIVE MSS. 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 remote antiquity. THE FIRST ANCESTOR OF THE RECEIVED TEXT WAS AT LEAST CONTEMPORARY WITH THE OLDEST OF OUR EXTANT MSS, IF NOT OLDER THAN ANY ONE OF THEM" (Ellicott, *The Revisers and the Greek Text of the N.T.* by two members of the N.T. Company, pp. 11-12).

Dr. Ellicott was familiar with all of the textual scholarship of his day, and he had no hesitation whatsoever to say that the Received Text is based upon textual authority which is at least as old as that upon which the Westcott-Hort text rested. Dr. Ellicott was saying that the textual authority underlying the Received Text is at least as old as the famed Sinaiticus and Vaticanus manuscripts.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE TRINITARIAN BIBLE SOCIETY DISPELS THIS MYTH

The Trinitarian Bible Society (TBS) of London, England, puts the matter into a perspective that many modern version defenders seem to try their best to ignore. The TBS was formed 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, which was organized in 1804, refused to take a stand against Unitarianism, and those men who were concerned for doctrinal purity left in 1831 to form the Trinitarian Bible Society (TBS). In the early years of the TBS, the matter of different Bible texts and versions was not a serious issue in the sense it was to become at the end of the nineteenth century. Though there were textual critics in the first half of the 1800s, they did not exercise wide influence in ordinary Christian circles. The battles faced by Trinitarian in its earlier years were in other directions. With the publication of the English Revised Version (ERV) and the Westcott-Hort Greek text of 1881, the TBS began to take a more active position 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 Received Text and the King James Bible. 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 scholarly, Bible-believing 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 as follows: "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).

The following testimony by the Trinitarian Bible Society explodes the myth that the Received Greek Text is a "late text" whereas the eclectic Greek text is a "old text."

"It must be emphasised that THE ARGUMENT IS NOT BETWEEN AN ANCIENT TEXT AND A RECENT ONE, BUT BETWEEN TWO ANCIENT FORMS OF THE TEXT, one of which was rejected and the other adopted and preserved by the Church as a whole and remaining in common use for more than fifteen centuries. The assumptions of modern textual criticism are based upon the discordant testimony of a few specimens of the rejected text recently disinterred from the oblivion to which they had been deliberately and wisely consigned in the 4th century" (The Divine Original, TBS article No. 13, nd, p. 7).

THE TESTIMONY OF JOHN BURGON DISPELS THIS MYTH

John William Burgon (1813-1888) was one of the greatest textual scholars of the 19th century. (We have given a lengthy biography of his life in our book *For Love of the Bible: The Battle for the Received Text and the King James Bible from 1800 to Present*.) Burgon 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. In the latter half of the 1800s, Burgon defended the Bible as the infallible and inerrant Word of God, inspired to its very jots and tittles, and he fought a manly battle against the encroachment of theological modernism. The series of messages on biblical inspiration that Burgon preached at Oxford University in 1860 are apologetic masterpieces. Burgon observed: "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." Burgon defended the historicity and Mosaic authorship of Genesis and rejected any scientific theory which is contrary to Divine Revelation. He wisely stated, "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." His position was:

"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. . . . He who surrenders the first page of his Bible, surrenders all. . . . 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. . . . 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! . . . 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!"

We say to that, Amen and Amen and Amen! It is certain that such an unhesitating and glorious defense of the Bible has not been heard at Oxford University in the last one hundred years!

Observing the blossoming of modern textual criticism in his day, BURGON SAW A DIRECT CONNECTION BETWEEN IT AND THE MODERNISTIC HIGHER CRITICISM WHICH WAS PROCEEDING FROM GERMANY. Both textual criticism and higher criticism were being championed in the 19th century by enemies of Christianity, particularly Unitarians and Theological Modernists. (This is documented extensively in my 1999 book *Myths about the King James Bible*.) Burgon rose to the challenge of textual criticism. He was a first-rate textual scholar, the equal to any man alive at the time. He made 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 monastery (where Tischendorf found the Sinaiticus manuscript). Dr. Edward Hills notes the purpose of Burgon's 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).

After all of this diligent research into the text and history of the Scripture, Burgon was convinced that the Received Text underlying the King James Bible is the preserved Word of God. When the Westcott-Hort

Greek New Testament was published, together with the English Revised Version, in 1881, Burgon exposed its errors in a series of articles that appeared in the Quarterly Review. These were later incorporated into the book *The Revision Revised*, which appeared in 1883. (This book is available in a nice hardcover edition from Bible for Today, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ 08108.)

Though John Burgon did not believe the KJV is perfect in every point, he did exalt the King James Bible above all other English versions, calling it a "priceless treasure which was bequeathed to us by the piety and wisdom of our fathers," and he maintained that the Received Greek New Testament is, apart from minor improvements he felt could be made, the preserved Word of God. He soundly defended the Received Text over the critical text introduced by Westcott and Hort (and which is basically the same Greek text underlying all of the modern English versions).

BURGON'S RESEARCH INTO THE TEXT OF SCRIPTURE THROUGH CHURCH HISTORY HAS, IN SOME WAYS, NEVER BEEN EQUALED. THIS IS PARTICULARLY TRUE OF HIS RESEARCH INTO THE QUOTATIONS FROM THE SCRIPTURES OF CHURCH LEADERS OF ANTIQUITY. To discover what Scripture text the ancient church leaders were using, Burgon laboriously dug out 86,489 quotations from ancient Christian writings and compiled these into sixteen thick manuscript volumes, which are located today in the British Museum. More than 4,000 of the quotations are from writers who lived before 400 A.D. By this peerless research, Burgon was convinced that the Received Text underlying the Reformation Bibles is the very text which has been used by God's people through the centuries and is thus the preserved Word of God. He concluded: "Call this text Erasmusian or Complutensian, the text of Stephens, or of Beza, or of the Elzevirs, call it the Received or the Traditional, or by whatever 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 Fathers, and ancient Versions" (Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, 1881).

This testimony of Burgon is not to be taken lightly. He knew as much about the Bible of the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th centuries as any man who has lived in the last 200 years. When he says that the Received Text is attested by Greek manuscripts, quotations from ancient church leaders, and ancient Bible versions, he was in a position to know what he was talking about.

Burgon replied directly to the myth that the Westcott-Hort Greek text is based upon more ancient manuscript testimony than the Received Text:

"If the objection be made, as it probably will be, 'Do you then mean to rest upon the five manuscripts used by Erasmus?' I reply, that the copies employed were selected because they were known to represent with accuracy the Sacred Word; that the descent of the text was evidently guarded with jealous care, just as the human genealogy of our Lord was preserved; that IT RESTS MAINLY UPON MUCH THE WIDEST TESTIMONY; and that where any part of it conflicts with the fullest evidence attainable, there I believe that it calls for correction" (Burgon, *The Traditional Text*, 1896, Dean Burgon Society Press reprint, 1998, p. 15).

Thus we see that John Burgon, whose research into the history of the Bible was vast, testified that the Received Text rests not merely upon a handful of manuscripts gathered by Erasmus and other 16th century editors, but upon "THE WIDEST TESTIMONY." (Burgon did allow for some possible correction of the Received Text, and this has been discussed in some articles published by Bible for Today of Collingswood, New Jersey.) We need to listen carefully to Burgon's testimony in this, because not only did he know his subject, but in spite of his Church of England affiliation, he revered the Bible as the infallibly inspired, providentially preserved Word of God, something the vast majority of modern textual critics (including Thayer, Metzger, Aland, Black, Bruce, Colwell, Goodspeed, Grant, Gregory, Kenyon, Kittel, Lake, Von Soden, Robinson) deny.

Concerning the preservation of the Scriptures, our faith is not in man, but in God. Even if the Reformation editors had fewer resources than those of more recent times, we know that the God who controls the times and the seasons was in control of His Holy Word. The infallible Scriptures were not hidden away in some monastic dungeon at the foot of Mt. Sinai or in a dusty corner of the Pope's library. The infallible Scriptures were being published, read, and taught by God's people.

The vast majority of Greek manuscripts, ancient versions, and the writings of church "fathers" support the Received Text. This was a fact known by the Reformation editors. Whereas the textual critics of our day see this as a mere accident of history, the Bible-believing Reformation editors of old saw the hand of God in it. So do we.

Is The King James Bible Dependable, or Has It Changed?

By Dr. Donald A. Waite

When we say the King James Bible is "God's Word kept intact," what do we mean by "intact"? The word "intact" comes from the Latin word *intactus*--from *in* (meaning "not") and *tactus* (meaning "touched"). It means "not touched." It means "not harmed." Nothing harms or defiles it. That is what we mean when we say "GOD'S WORD KEPT INTACT." If we really want to know what the Hebrew in the Old Testament says and what the Greek in the New Testament says in the English language today, the KING JAMES BIBLE--in my studied opinion--is the only translation that completely and accurately reflects, in English, the original Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek. This brief study will attempt to convince the reader of the truth of this statement, and--failing of this--will at least show clearly why I believe it.

When we use versions other than the King James Bible, we cannot be absolutely certain that in ever verse, sentence, and word, they accurately translate the Hebrew and Greek words God has given us. Instead, we have man's words all mixed up in them throughout. This is done by their use of "Dynamic Equivalency" which permits them to ADD, SUBTRACT, and/or CHANGE God's Words. You say, "Well, the King James Bible was translated in 1611. That is over three hundred eighty-one years ago. That is quite a long time. Doesn't that time span make the King James Bible difficult to understand?"

If you come across some words used in our King James Bible that have changed their meaning since 1611, there's a Bible Word List published by the Trinitarian Bible Society of London, England, that lists them all with a brief definition of each [order B.F.T. #1060 from Bible for Today, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ 08108]. There are only 618 of these words out of 791,328 in the King James Bible.

Using this little booklet will save you the time of looking these words up in a dictionary (although all of them are in a good dictionary). They are right there, with a brief explanation of what they mean. I've looked at all these 618 and have come up with only 257 words that I would really have to look up if I were not familiar with the King James Bible. Maybe you would have to look up more than that, but all 618 are listed. For instance, "draught" which would be "drain," or "sewer." The word "fan" is "a winnowing fan." "Press vat" is a "vat of a wine press." "Ossiphraze" is a "vulture which breaks the bones of its prey." There may be a few other words you don't understand, but the meaning can be found by a dictionary or a small pamphlet like this one which you can keep in your Bible.

THE DEFICIENCIES OF OTHER ENGLISH VERSIONS

Let me tell you what the difficulty is in trying to find the Words of God if you are not using the King James Bible. You don't know which English words are actually found in the Hebrew or the Greek. Unlike the King James Bible, most of the modern versions don't use italics to tell us what has been supplied for sense, though NOT in the original languages.

The New American Standard Version uses italics occasionally where they depart from the Hebrew or Greek, but there are so many other words added, subtracted, or changed, that you just don't know what the original words are. What you have to do is what I had to do. I read the entire NASV, from Genesis to Revelation, listening to the King James Bible on a cassette tape recording, while looking at the New American Standard Version and underlining in red some of the significant alterations and changes. Then I compared these changes with the Hebrew and Greek texts that underlie the King James Bible (which I accept as the true and accurate original language texts). I found over 4,000 examples of addition, subtraction, and change regarding the Words of God. [This study is available in B.F.T. report #1494-P.]

To be certain of the accuracy of any version other than the King James Bible, you would have to check every Hebrew and Greek word. This is much more difficult than using this simple word list to look up the mere 618 words with which you might not be familiar. The little pamphlet [mentioned earlier] is an accurate guide. There are only a few words to look up.

You have the same lack of accuracy, though in not as many places, in the New King James Version. I found over 2,000 examples of Dynamic Equivalency in that version, where the editors had added to, subtracted from, or changed God's Words. As I did the research, I indicated in red, on the version I used, the changes

from the King James Bible, and, in many instances, from the Hebrew and Greek. There are changes in the footnotes also. There are many problems in the New King James Version. You wonder which words are accurate and which ones are not. [This study is available in B.F.T. report #1442.]

The same is true for the New International Version. In 2 Samuel, for example, I have all kinds of red marks indicating changes. The major differences I put on a tape recording and said, "The Hebrew or the Greek or the King James says this and here's what the NIV says." I ended up with over 6,653 examples of additions, omissions, or changes plus departures from the proper Hebrew and Greek original language texts in the New International Version. It took me two years and eight months to complete, and then there were hundreds and hundreds of examples that were left out due to space and time factors. I came up with a computer printout like we have for the New King James and the New American Standard Version. It is 284 large pages, and is available from The Bible for Today. [B.F.T. report #1749-P.]

HAS THE KING JAMES BIBLE BEEN CHANGED SINCE 1611?

Because people often say that the present King James Bible is so very different from the original 1611 King James Bible, I looked into this question carefully. Nelson Publishers put out the 1611 King James Bible in regular Roman type script that we can read. They let it go out of print, and then brought it back into print. The original 1611 King James Bible was in German script. I have photographic copies of the original King James Bible in the German script. It is difficult to read. The "s" is different, for example. But Nelson put it into our kind of script. They did that on a page by page basis.

I have heard through the years (and perhaps you have also) that all the New King James Version was going to do was take the 1611 and make one more edition and bring it up to date. It was said that the King James Bible had undergone thousands of serious changes from 1611 to 1979, when the NKJV first came out. I said to myself, "Is that true?" So I examined the Old Scofield Reference King James Bible of 1917, by listening to it as I read that edition of the King James Bible on cassette recording. While listening to the King James Bible, I compared it diligently, word for word, from Genesis through Revelation, with the A.V. 1611 as published by Nelson.

There were very few changes that I could hear with my ear. There are many spelling changes; they spelled words differently in the original King James Bible than they do today. For instance in Joshua 31:1, "Moses went and spake these words to all Israel." In the original King James the word "words" is spelled "wordes." All I noted were the differences between sounds. Comparing the 1611 King James Bible to the King James of today I found very few changes of sound. We printed up all the details, just the way they are. The sound differences were minor.

There are only 421 changes affecting the sound throughout the entire Old and New Testaments. Do you know how many words there are in the King James Bible? There are 791,328 words. Out of that total, there are only 421 words in the 1611 King James Bible which have a different sound from the words of the King James Bible we have today. Of these 421 changes, 285 are minor changes of "form" only. There are only 136 changes of "substance," such as an added "of" or "and." Some examples of minor changes are as follows: I can hear the difference and so can you between "towards" and "toward." So, if I could hear it, I put it down. Fourteen times that happened. I could hear the difference between "burnt" and "burned" 31 times, so I put that down. As long as you could hear the difference, I recorded it as a change in this list of 421 changes. For instance, "amongst" and "among." There were 36 of those changes. "Lift up" instead of "lifted up" was used 51 times. "You" was changed to "ye" 82 times. You can see that these are extremely minor changes. This totals up to 214 of these kind of minor changes. There were 71 other minor changes which total 285 changes of form only. In summary, then, I found there were 285 changes of FORM ONLY, and only 136 changes of SUBSTANCE, making a total of 421 changes in all to the ear. This research is available as B.F.T. #1294.

Don't let people say what we have today really isn't the King James Bible. It most certainly IS! It is a lie to imply that there are 30,000, 40,000, or 50,000 important differences. If they mean differences in spelling, that is one thing; but spelling is not important as far as listening or meaning are concerned. So God's Word is still kept intact by our present King James Bible.

[O Timothy Editor: The above is excerpted from the Introduction to Dr. Donald A. Waite's book Defending the King James Bible. This excellent book presents a four-fold superiority of the KJV. It is based upon superior original language texts. It was produced by superior translators. It employs a superior translation technique. It exhibits a superior theology. Dr. Waite is a highly qualified defender of the King James Bible. He received 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 Theological 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. He has been a teacher in the areas of Greek, Hebrew, Bible, Speech, and English for over 35 years in nine schools. He has produced over 700 studies, booklets, cassettes, or VCR's in defense of the Word of God. His 307-page book Defending the King James Bible is available from Bible for Today, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ 08108.]

THE TEXT OF THE KING JAMES VERSION -- QUESTIONS AND PROBLEMS

By Edward F. Hills

The following is excerpted from the book *The King James Version Defended* by Presbyterian scholar Edward F. Hills (1912-1981). Hills was a distinguished Latin and Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Yale University. He also 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 his 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 the King James Bible and by his exposure of the unbelief underlying the theories of modern textual criticism. In 1956 he published *The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscripts*. Key chapters include "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," and "The Textus Receptus and the King James Version." Hills devastated the Westcott-Text theories and exposed the rationalistic foundation of the entire modern version superstructure. Hills' book is available from Bible for Today, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ 08108. (609) 854-4452 --

When a believer begins to defend the King James Version, unbelievers immediately commence to bring up various questions and problems in the effort to put the believer down and silence him. Let us therefore consider some of these alleged difficulties.

(A) THE KING JAMES VERSION A VARIETY OF THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS

The translators that produced the King James Version relied mainly, it seems, on the later editions of Beza's Greek New Testament, especially his 4th edition (1588-9). But also they frequently consulted the editions of Erasmus and Stephanus and the Complutensian Polyglot. According to Scrivener (1884), out of the 252 passages in which these sources differ sufficiently to affect the English rendering, the King James Version agrees with Beza against Stephanus 113 times, with Stephanus against Beza 59 times, and 80 times with Erasmus, or the Complutensian, or the Latin Vulgate against Beza and Stephanus [Scrivener, *Authorized Edition of the English Bible*, p. 60]. Hence 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.

The King James translators also placed variant readings in the margin, 37 of them according to Scrivener [Ibid., pp. 58-59]. To these 37 textual notes 16 more were added during the 17th and 18th centuries [Ibid., pp. 56-57], and all these variants still appear in the margins of British printings of the King James Version. In the special providence of God, however, the text of the King James Version has been kept pure. None of these variant readings has been interpolated into it. Of the original 37 variants some are introduced by such formulas as, "Many ancient copies add these words"; "Many Greek copies have"; "Or, as some copies read"; "Some read". Often, however, the reading is introduced simply by "Or", thus making it hard to tell whether a variant reading or an alternative translation is intended.

One of these variant readings is of special interest. After John 18:13 the Bishops' Bible (1568) had added the following words in italics, "And Annas sent Christ bound unto Caiaphas the high priest." This was a conjectural emendation similar to one which had been suggested by Luther and to another which had been adopted by Beza in his Latin version on the authority of Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444). The purpose of it was to harmonize John 18:13 with Matt. 26:57, which states that the interrogation of Jesus took place at the house of Caiaphas rather than at the house of Annas. The King James translators, however, along with Erasmus and Calvin, solved the problem by translating John 18:24 in the pluperfect, "Now Annas HAD sent Him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest." This made it unnecessary to emend the text at John 18:13 after the manner of the Bishops' Bible. Hence the King James translators took this conjectural emendation out of the text and placed it in their margin, where it has retained its place unto this day [see *The New Testament Octapla*, edited by Luther A. Weigle, New York: Nelson, 1962].

Sometimes the King James translators forsook the printed Greek text and united with the earlier English versions in following the Latin Vulgate. One well known passage in which they did this was Luke 23:42, the prayer of the dying thief. Here the Greek New Testaments of Erasmus, Stephanus, and Beza have, "Lord, remember me when Thou comest IN Thy kingdom," with the majority of the Greek manuscripts. But all the English Bibles of that period (Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James) have, "Lord, remember me when Thou comest INTO Thy kingdom," with the Latin Vulgate and also with Papyrus 75

and B.

At John 8:6 the King James translators followed the Bishops' Bible in adding the clause, "as though He heard them not." This clause is found in E G H K and many other manuscripts, in the Complutensian, and in the first two editions of Stephanus. After 1769 it was placed in italics in the King James Version.

Similarly, at 1 John 2:23 the King James translators followed the Great Bible and the Bishops' Bible in adding the clause, "he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also," and in placing the clause in italics, thus indicating that it was not found in the majority of the Greek manuscripts or in the earlier editions of the Textus Receptus. Beza included it, however, in his later editions, and it is found in the Latin Vulgate and in Aleph and B. Hence modern versions have removed the italics and given the clause full status. The Bishops' Bible and the King James Version join this clause to the preceding by the word "but," taken from Wyclif. With customary scrupulosity the King James translators enclosed this "but" in brackets, thus indicating that it was not properly speaking part of the text but merely a help in translation.

(B) THE EDITIONS OF THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS COMPARED THEIR DIFFERENCES LISTED

The differences between the various editions of the Textus Receptus have been carefully listed by Scrivener (1884) [Authorized Edition of the English Bible, pp. 56-60,242-63] and Hoskier (1890) [A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Codex Evangelium 604, by H.C. Hoskier, London: David Nutt, 1890, Appendices B & C]. The following are some of the most important of these differences.

Luke 2:22

"their purification" -- Erasmus, Stephanus, majority of the Greek manuscripts.

"her purification" -- Beza, King James, Elzevir, Complutensian, 76 and a few other Greek minuscule manuscripts, Latin Vulgate (?).

Luke 17:36

"two men shall be in the field: the one shall be taken and the other left" -- Erasmus, Stephanus 1 2 3 omit this verse with the majority of the Greek manuscripts. Stephanus 4, Beza, King James, Elzevir have it with D, Latin Vulgate, Peshitta, Old Syriac.

John 1:28

"Bethabara beyond Jordan" -- Erasmus, Stephanus 3 4, Beza, King James, Elzevir, Pi 1 13, Old Syriac, Sahidic.

"Bethany beyond Jordan" -- Stephanus 1 2, majority of Greek manuscripts including Pap 66 & 75 Aleph A B, Latin Vulgate.

John 16:33

"shall have tribulation" -- Beza, King James, Elzevir, D 69 many other Greek manuscripts, Old Latin, Latin Vulgate.

"have tribulation" -- Erasmus, Stephanus, majority of Greek manuscripts.

Rom. 8:11

"by His Spirit that dwelleth in you" -- Beza, King James, Elzevir, Aleph A C, Coptic.

"because of His Spirit that dwelleth in you" -- Erasmus, Stephanus, majority of Greek manuscripts including BD, Peshitta, Latin Vulgate.

Rom. 12:11

"serving the Lord" -- Erasmus 1, Beza, King James, Elzevir, majority of Greek manuscripts including Pap 46 Aleph A B, Peshitta, Latin Vulgate.

"serving the time" -- Erasmus 2345, Stephanus, D G.

1 Tim. 1:4

"godly edifying" -- Erasmus, Beza, King James, Elzevir, D, Peshitta, Latin Vulgate.

"dispensation of God" -- Stephanus, majority of Greek manuscripts including Aleph A G.

Heb. 9:1

Here Stephanus reads "first tabernacle," with the majority of the Greek manuscripts. Erasmus, Beza, Luther, Calvin omit "tabernacle" with Pap 46 Aleph B D, Peshitta, Latin Vulgate. The King James Version

omits "tabernacle" and regards "covenant" as implied.

James 2:18

"without thy works" -- Calvin, Beza (last 3 editions), King James Aleph A B, Latin Vulgate.

"by thy works" -- Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza 1565, majority of Greek manuscripts.

This comparison indicates that the differences which distinguish the various editions of the Textus Receptus from each other are very minor. They are also very few. According to Hoskier, the 3rd edition of Stephanus and the first edition of Elzevir differ from one another in the Gospel of Mark only 19 times. Codex B, on the other hand, disagrees with Codex Aleph in Mark 652 times and with Codex D 1,944 times. What a contrast!

The texts of the several editions of the Textus Receptus were God-guided. They were set up under the leading of God's special providence. Hence the differences between them were kept down to a minimum. But these disagreements were not eliminated altogether, for this would require not merely providential guidance but a miracle. In short, God chose to preserve the New Testament text providentially rather than miraculously, and this is why even the several editions of the Textus Receptus vary from each other slightly.

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. This text was published in 1881 by the Cambridge University Press under the editorship of Dr. Scrivener, and there have been eight reprints, the latest being in 1949. In 1976 also another edition of this text was published in London by the Trinitarian Bible Society. We ought to be grateful that in the providence of God the best form of the Textus Receptus is still available to believing Bible students. For the sake of completeness, however, it would be well to place in the margin the variant readings of Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs.

(C) THE KING JAMES OLD TESTAMENT VARIANT READINGS

Along side the text, called kethibh (written), the Jewish scribes had placed in the margin of their Old Testament manuscripts certain variant readings, which they called ken (read). Some of these ken appear in the margin of the King James Old Testament. For example, in Psalm 100:3 the King James text gives the kethibh, "It is He that hath made us and not we ourselves," but the King James margin gives the ken, "It is He that hath made us, and His we are." And sometimes the ken is placed in the King James text (16 times, according to Scrivener). For example, in Micah 1:10 the King James text gives the ken, "in the house of Aphrah roll thyself in the dust." The Hebrew kethibh, however, is, "in the house of Aphrah I have rolled myself in the dust."

Sometimes also the influence of the Septuagint and the Latin Vulgate is discernible in the King James Old Testament. For example, in Psalm 24:6 the King James text reads, "O Jacob," with the Hebrew kethibh, but the King James margin reads, "O God of Jacob," which is the reading of the Septuagint, the Latin Vulgate, and also of Luther's German Bible. In Jer. 3:9 the King James margin reads "fame" (qal) along with the Hebrew kethibh, but the King James text reads lightness (qal) in agreement with the Septuagint, and the Latin Vulgate. And in Psalm 22:16 the King James Version reads with the Septuagint, the Syriac, and the Latin Vulgate, "they pierced my hands and my feet." The Hebrew text, on the other hand, reads, "like a lion my hands and my feet," a reading which makes no sense and which, as Calvin observes, was obviously invented by the Jews to deny the prophetic reference to the crucifixion of Christ.

(D) THE HEADINGS OF THE PSALMS - ARE THEY INSPIRED?

Many of the Psalms have headings. For example, "To the chief Musician, A Psalm and Song of David" (Psalm 65). The King James translators separated these headings and printed them in small type, each one above the Psalm to which it belonged. Some conservative scholars, such as J.A. Alexander (1850) [The Psalms, New York: Scribner, 180, Vol. 1, p. viii], have criticized the King James translators for doing this. These headings, they have insisted, should be regarded as the first verses of their respective Psalms. They give three reasons for this opinion: first, in the Hebrew Bible no distinction is made between the Psalms and their headings; second, the New Testament writers recognized these headings as true; third, each heading is part of the Psalm which it introduces and hence is inspired. This position, however, may go beyond the clear teaching of Scripture. In any case, it is better to follow the leading of the King James translators and recognize the obvious difference between the heading of a Psalm and the Psalm itself.

The King James translators handled the subscriptions of the Pauline Epistles similarly, printing each one after its own epistle in small type. But this has never been a problem, since these subscriptions have never been regarded as inspired.

(E) MAXIMUM CERTAINTY VERSUS MAXIMUM UNCERTAINTY

God's preservation of the New Testament text was not miraculous but providential. The scribes and printers who produced the copies of the New Testament Scriptures and the true believers who read and cherished them were not inspired but God-guided. Hence there are some New Testament passages in which the true reading cannot be determined with absolute certainty. There are some readings, for example, on which the manuscripts are almost equally divided, making it difficult to determine which reading belongs to the Traditional Text. Also in some of the cases in which the Textus Receptus disagrees with the Traditional Text it is hard to decide which text to follow. Also, as we have seen, sometimes the several editions of the Textus Receptus differ from each other and from the King James Version. And, as we have just observed, the case is the same with the Old Testament text. Here it is hard at times to decide between the kethibh and the ken and between the Hebrew text and the Septuagint and Latin Vulgate versions. Also there has been a controversy concerning the headings of the Psalms.

In other words, God does not reveal every truth with equal clarity. In biblical textual criticism, as in every other department of knowledge, there are still some details in regard to which we must be content to remain uncertain. But the special providence of God has kept these uncertainties down to a minimum. Hence if we believe in the special providential preservation of the Scriptures and make this the leading principle of our biblical textual criticism, we obtain maximum certainty, all the certainty that any mere man can obtain, all the certainty that we need. **FOR WE ARE LED BY THE LOGIC OF FAITH TO THE MASORETIC HEBREW TEXT, TO THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXTUS RECEPTUS, AND TO THE KING JAMES VERSION.**

But what if we ignore the providential preservation of the Scriptures and deal with the text of the holy Bible in the same way in which we deal with the texts of other ancient books? If we do this, we are following the logic of unbelief, which leads to maximum uncertainty. When we handle the text of the holy Bible in this way, we are behaving as unbelievers behave. We are either denying that the providential preservation of the Scriptures is a fact, or else we are saying that it is not an important fact, not important enough to be considered when dealing with the text of the holy Bible. But if the providential preservation of the Scriptures is not important, why is the infallible inspiration of the original Scriptures important? If God has not preserved the Scriptures by His special providence, why would He have infallibly inspired them in the first place? And if it is not important that the Scriptures be regarded as infallibly inspired, why is it important to insist that Gospel is completely true? And if this is not important, why is it important to believe that Jesus is the divine Son of God?

In short, **UNLESS WE FOLLOW THE LOGIC OF FAITH, WE CAN BE CERTAIN OF NOTHING CONCERNING THE BIBLE AND ITS TEXT.** For example, if we make the Bodmer and Chester Beatty Papyri our chief reliance, how do we know that even older New Testament papyri of an entirely different character have not been destroyed by the recent damming of the Nile and the consequent flooding of the Egyptian sands?

NEW EVANGELICALISM AND BIBLE VERSIONS

Updated September 13, 1999 (David W. Cloud, Fundamental Baptist Information Service, 1701 Harns Rd., Oak Harbor, WA 98277) - ne of the many myths surrounding the subject of Bible versions is the idea that Evangelical scholarship today is trustworthy. Following is a letter from Dr. James Boice to missionary doctor Tom Hale on the subject of Bible texts and versions. In this letter, Dr. Boice advises Dr. Hale to lean on "current evangelical scholarship":

There are some in this country and elsewhere who are very zealous for the textus receptus, prepared by the humanistic scholar, Erasmus, and used as the basis for the King James translation. This has led some, quite unwisely in my judgment, to defend the King James Version as the only true and faithful English text.

Let me say that the concerns of some of these people are undoubtedly good. They are zealous for the Word of God and very much concerned lest liberal or any other scholarship enter in to pervert it. But unfortunately, the basis on which they are operating is wrong, and I have always tried to do what I could in a gentle way to lead them to appreciate good, current evangelical scholarship where the Greek text and the translations are concerned (Letter from James M. Boice, Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to Dr. Thomas Hale, United Mission to Nepal, Kathmandu, September 13, 1985).

Dr. Hale, a medical doctor working in Nepal, had written to Boice for counsel on the matter of Bible texts and versions. In the summer of 1985, Dr. Hale visited our home in Kathmandu and began a discussion about Bible versions. (My wife and I were missionaries in Nepal from 1979 to 1989, pioneering fundamental Baptist church planting work in that land.) Dr. Hale was involved with a Nepali Bible translation and wanted to know what I could share with him about the texts and versions. We had an interesting time going through some of the reasons why the new versions differ from the old Protestant ones, and after he returned to his hospital in central Nepal, we continued our conversation via correspondence. I also gave him some books on the subject, including, if I remember correctly, Dr. Edward F. Hills' Defending the King James Bible and D.O. Fuller's Which Bible?

On July 28, 1985, Dr. Hale wrote the following:

"Thank you very much for your long and thoughtful letter to me about the Greek texts. I greatly appreciate the time you took to answer me, and I have found what you have written to be most informative, and indeed, worrisome. I hadn't realized that the battleground, as it were, is in the area of the Greek texts."

I was amazed at this. The man is a student of the Scriptures and has sat under the ministries of key Evangelical leaders, yet he had never heard that one of the major differences between the King James Bible and the modern versions is the different Greek texts upon which they are founded.

As time passed it became evident that Dr. Hale had rejected the Received Text in favor of the modern critical text. A chief factor in this decision was the counsel he received from Dr. Boice, pastor of the Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and head of the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy. Hale wrote to Boice to seek his opinion on Bible versions, and Hale sent me a copy of Dr. Boice's letter when he concluded our conversations on the subject.

As we have seen, Boice encouraged Dr. Hale to trust Evangelical scholarship, ignoring the heretical New Evangelical leaven that has permeated Evangelicalism in the past 50 years.

Evangelicalism in America was identified with Fundamentalism during the first half of the century. Many historians make this connection, including Mark Ellingsen (The Evangelical Movement) and George Marsden (Reforming Fundamentalism). Marsden says, "There was not a practical distinction between fundamentalist and evangelical: the words were interchangeable" (p. 48). When the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) was formed in 1942, for example, participants included such staunch Fundamentalist leaders as Bob Jones, Sr., John R. Rice, Charles Woodbridge, Harry Ironside, David Otis Fuller, and R.G. Lee.

By the mid-1950s, though, a clear break between separatist Fundamentalists and non-separatist Evangelicals occurred. This was occasioned largely by the ecumenical evangelism of Billy Graham. The stronger men dropped out of the NAE. The terms Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism began "to refer to two different movements" (William Martin, A Prophet with Honor, p. 224).

The sons of Evangelical-Fundamentalist preachers determined to create a "New Evangelicalism." They would not be fighters; they would be diplomats, positive rather than militant, infiltrators rather than

separatists. They would not be restricted by a separationist mentality.

The term "New Evangelicalism" defined a new type of Evangelicalism to distinguish it from those who had heretofore born that label. Thus, in the very label is the witness to the fact that Evangelicalism of old, regardless of any weaknesses, was biblically dogmatic, militant, and separatistic. The term "New Evangelicalism" was possibly coined by the late Harold Ockenga (1905-1985), probably the most influential Evangelical leader of the 1940s. He was the pastor of Park Street Church (Presbyterian) in Boston, founder of the National Association of Evangelicals, co-founder and one-time president of Fuller Theological Seminary, first president of the World Evangelical Fellowship, president of Gordon College and Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, 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."

In passing, it is interesting to note that Fundamental Baptist leader Monroe Parker claimed that the term "New Evangelicalism" was used three years earlier, in 1945, by liberal ecumenist John MacKay.

"...in 1945, I was doing summer school work at Princeton Theological Seminary. The late Dr. John MacKay, then president of the seminary, returned from Amsterdam where he had helped to lay the foundation for the World Council of Churches. He gathered the faculty and students of the seminary on the campus. Dr. MacKay stood on the steps of Miller Hall and spoke on the ecumenical movement. He said that several great denominations were coming together, that the Roman Catholics would be observing, that the Greek Catholics would join, and that the Pentecostals would likely join. 'But,' he said, 'we are going to need the evangelicals.' He also said, 'There must be a neo-evangelicalism.' He then delineated what the characteristics of the so-called 'neo-evangelicalism' must be. Dr. Ockenga in that convocation speech at Fuller Theological Seminary three years later also delineated what this neo-evangelicalism must be. They were almost identical to the things Dr. MacKay had delineated and that other liberals were saying at that time" (Monroe Parker, *Frontline*, Jul.-Aug. 1991, p. 25).

While Ockenga may or may not have coined the term "New Evangelicalism," it is certain that the movement itself was not "born" with his convocation address. He did not create the movement; he merely labeled and described the new mood of positivism and non-militancy that was quickly permeating his generation. Ockenga and the new generation of Evangelicals, Billy Graham figuring most prominently, determined to abandon a militant Bible stance. Instead, they would pursue dialogue, intellectualism, and appeasement. They determined to stay within apostate denominations to attempt to change things from within rather than practice biblical separation. The New Evangelical would dialogue with those who teach error rather than proclaim the Word of God boldly and without compromise. The New Evangelical would meet the proud humanist and the haughty liberal on their own turf with so-called scholarship rather than follow the humble path of being counted a fool for Christ's sake by standing humbly and simply upon the Bible. New Evangelical leaders also determined to start a "rethinking process" whereby the old paths were to be continually reassessed in light of new goals, methods, and ideology.

Dr. Charles Woodbridge, a professor at Fuller Theological Seminary in its early days, a founding member of the National Association of Evangelicals, and a friend of men such as Harold Ockenga and Carl Henry, rejected the New Evangelicalism and spent the rest of his life warning of its dangers. In his 1969 book, *The New Evangelicalism*, he traced the downward path of New Evangelical compromise:

"The New Evangelicalism is a theological and moral compromise of the deadliest sort. It is an insidious attack upon the Word of God. ... The New Evangelicalism advocates toleration of error. It is following the downward path of accommodation to error, cooperation with error, contamination by error, and ultimate capitulation to error!" (Woodbridge, *The New Evangelicalism*, pp. 9,15).

Each passing decade witnesses more plainly to the truth of Dr. Woodbridge's observations. Toleration of error leads to accommodation, cooperation, contamination, and ultimate capitulation. This describes the history of New Evangelicalism precisely.

In 1958 William Ashbrook wrote *Evangelicalism: The New Neutralism*, which began with the following warning:

This is the age of 'isms,' some good, mostly bad! One of the youngest members of Christendom's fold is called The New Evangelicalism. It might more properly be labeled The New Neutralism. This new 'Evangelicalism' boasts too much pride, and has imbibed too much of the world's culture to share the reproach of fundamentalism. It still has enough faith and too much understanding of the Bible to appear in the togs of modernism. It seeks neutral ground, being neither fish nor fowl, neither right nor left, neither for nor against--it stands between! ...

Bible-believing Christians would do well to beware of the New Evangelicalism for four valid reasons. First, it is a movement born of compromise. Second, it is a movement nurtured in pride of intellect. Third, it is a movement growing on appeasement of evil; and finally it is a movement doomed by the judgment of God's Holy Word.

In A History of Fundamentalism in America, Dr. George Dollar observes:

"It has become a favorite pastime of new-evangelical writers, who know so little of historic Fundamentalism, to call it offensive names, as if to bury it by opprobrium. The real danger is not strong Fundamentalism but a soft and effeminate Christianity--exotic but cowardly. It is sad that these men would not heed the warning of W.B Riley about the menace of 'middle-of-the-roadism'" (Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America, 1973, p. 208).

Pastor Rolland Starr, who in the 1960s wrote The New Evangelicalism: The Deadliest Ism of All, warned that "Apostasy Avenue is a one way street and it is all downhill." The history of New Evangelicalism has demonstrated the truth of that simple statement.

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 leaveneth 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 territory, matching them scholarly degree with degree.

New Evangelical philosophy has permeated Evangelicalism

The New Evangelical leaven spread rapidly. It was popularized through pleasant personalities and broadcast through powerful print, radio, and television media. Christianity Today, for example, was founded in 1956 to voice the new philosophy. New Evangelicalism became the working principle of large interdenominational organizations such as the National Association of Evangelicals, National Religious Broadcasters, Youth for Christ, Campus Crusade for Christ, the Evangelical Foreign Mission Association, World Evangelical Fellowship, the National Sunday School Association, etc. It was spread through educational institutions such as Fuller Theological Seminary, Wheaton College, Gordon-Conwell, and Moody Bible Institute. Historian David Beale observes that the New Evangelical philosophy "captured many organizations, fellowships, associations, and denominations that originated as strictly Fundamentalist groups" (Beale, In Pursuit of Purity, p. 263).

The Evangelical movement today is the New Evangelical movement. For all practical purposes, they are one and the same.

"Part of the current confusion regarding New Evangelicalism stems from the fact that there is now little difference between evangelicalism and New Evangelicalism. The principles of the original New Evangelicalism have become so universally accepted by those who refer to themselves as evangelicals that any distinctions which might have been made years ago are all but lost. It is no doubt true to state that 'Ockenga's designation of the new movement as "New or Neo-Evangelical" was abbreviated to "Evangelical." ... Thus today we speak of this branch of conservative Christianity simply as the Evangelical movement'" (Ernest Pickering, The Tragedy of Compromise, p. 96).

NEW EVANGELICALISM IS NOT A DENOMINATION OR A GROUP.

It is a spirit of disobedience. It is a mood of compromise. It is a rejection of many of the negative aspects of New Testament Christianity. It is an attitude of positivism. Old-line Presbyterians can be New Evangelical. Old-line Methodists can be New Evangelical. Fundamental Bible churches can be New Evangelical. Southern Baptists can be New Evangelical. INDEPENDENT FUNDAMENTAL BAPTISTS CAN BE NEW EVANGELICAL. Many are, and the number appears to be growing rapidly. Beware, friends. Don't be deceived by the label. Examine the content, and avoid that which is contrary to the Word of God.

"The simple believeth every word: but the prudent man looketh well to his going" (Proverbs 14:15).

New Evangelicalism Paved the Way for Acceptance of Modern Versions

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. It is important to understand that the phenomenon of New Evangelicalism had only recently arrived on the scene when the Revised Standard Version was published. 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" (Graham, 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 (Today's English Version) which replaces the word "blood" with "death" in speaking of the atonement of Jesus Christ and which corrupts the passages presenting the Deity of Christ.

As New Evangelicalism has gradually 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.

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 a new 300-page book entitled *Evangelicals and Rome* we have documented this amazing and fearful thing. [This book is scheduled for publication in March 1999, Way of Life Literature, 1701 Harns Rd., Oak Harbor, WA 98277.] 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 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 claim that Rome has changed for the better, that Roman Catholicism is not a cult. All of them speak of Rome's heresies in gentle, "understanding" tones rather than labeling them the blasphemies they really are. Let me give you 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 Romanism in social, religious, and political causes. The cover jacket for *House United* quotes Pentecostal Vinson Synan's recommendation of the book: "Keith Fournier [a Catholic apologist] 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 QUESTIONING OF BIBLICAL INFALLIBILITY

The downgrade of the doctrine of biblical inspiration has been documented even by Evangelicalism's own leaders.

In 1976, Carl F.H. Henry, first editor of Christianity Today, lifted his voice to warn of apostasy:

"A GROWING VANGUARD OF YOUNG GRADUATES OF EVANGELICAL COLLEGES WHO HOLD DOCTORATES FROM NON-EVANGELICAL DIVINITY CENTERS NOW QUESTION OR DISOWN INERRANCY and the doctrine is held less consistently by evangelical faculties. ... Some retain the term and reassure supportive constituencies but nonetheless stretch the term's meaning" (Carl F.H. Henry, chairman for the 1966 World Congress on Evangelism, "Conflict Over Biblical Inerrancy," Christianity Today, May 7, 1976)

Almost 25 years ago this leader warned of Evangelical scholars who disowned or questioned biblical inerrancy. Henry even warned that some Evangelical scholars are deceitful in their use of biblical and traditional Christian terms. They use terms like "infallible" and "inerrant," but they do not mean by this that they believe the Bible is without error.

The same year that Dr. Henry warned of Evangelical graduates disowning inerrancy, Richard Quebedeaux, author of The Young Evangelicals and The Worldly Evangelicals, added the following details:

"Most people outside the evangelical community itself are totally unaware of the profound changes that have occurred within evangelicalism during the last several years--in the movement's understanding of the inspiration and authority of Scripture, in its social concerns, cultural attitudes and ecumenical posture, and in the nature of its emerging leadership. ... evangelical theologians have begun looking at the Bible with a scrutiny reflecting THEIR WIDESPREAD ACCEPTANCE OF THE PRINCIPLES OF HISTORICAL AND LITERARY CRITICISM ... The position--affirming that Scripture is inerrant or infallible in its teaching on matters of faith and conduct but not necessarily in all its assertions concerning history and the cosmos--IS GRADUALLY BECOMING ASCENDANT AMONG THE MOST HIGHLY RESPECTED EVANGELICAL THEOLOGIANS. ... these new trends ... indicate that evangelical theology is becoming more centrist, more open to biblical criticism and more accepting of science and broad cultural analysis. ONE MIGHT EVEN SUGGEST THAT THE NEW GENERATION OF EVANGELICALS IS CLOSER TO BONHOEFFER, BARTH AND BRUNNER THAN TO HODGE AND WARFIELD ON THE INSPIRATION AND AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE" (Richard Quebedeaux, "The Evangelicals: New Trends and Tensions," Christianity and Crisis, Sept. 20, 1976, pp. 197-202).

Another warning appeared a year later:

"A SURPRISING ARRAY OF EQUALLY DEDICATED EVANGELICALS IS FORMING TO INSIST THAT ACCEPTANCE OF HISTORIC CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES DOES NOT REQUIRE BELIEF IN AN INERRANT BOOK. ... What has made it a new ball game today is the emergence of a new type of evangelical. These persons accept the cardinal doctrines of Christianity in their full and literal meaning but agree that the higher critics have a point: there are errors in Scripture, and some of its precepts must be recognized as being culturally and historically conditioned" (G. Aiken Taylor, "Is God as Good as His Word?" Christianity Today, Feb. 4, 1977).

That same year Pastor Mark Buch of Vancouver, British Columbia, who was involved in the Fundamentalist movement from the 1930s, gave this testimony to Evangelicalism's corruption:

"[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..." (Buch, In Defence of the Authorized Version, 1977, p. 33).

In his 1978 book, The Worldly Evangelicals, Richard Quebedeaux warned that many Evangelical scholars are deceitful about their doctrinal heresies:

"Prior to the 60s, virtually all the seminaries and colleges associated with the neo-evangelicals and their descendants adhered to the total inerrancy understanding of biblical authority (at least they did not vocally express opposition to it). But it is a well-known fact that A LARGE NUMBER, IF NOT MOST, OF THE COLLEGES AND SEMINARIES IN QUESTION NOW HAVE FACULTY WHO NO LONGER BELIEVE IN TOTAL INERRANCY, even in situations where their employers still require them to sign the traditional declaration that the Bible is 'verbally inspired,' 'inerrant,' infallible in the whole and in the part,' or to affirm in other clearly defined words the doctrine of inerrancy that was formulated by the Old Princeton school of theology and passed on to fundamentalism. SOME OF THESE FACULTY INTERPRET THE CRUCIAL CREEDAL CLAUSES IN A MANNER THE ORIGINAL FRAMERS WOULD NEVER HAVE ALLOWED, OTHERS SIMPLY SIGN THE AFFIRMATION WITH TONGUE IN CHEEK" (Quebedeaux, The Worldly Evangelicals, p. 30).

We must not forget that these statements describe conditions 20 YEARS AGO and things are much worse now!

The aforementioned Harold Lindsell published two volumes on the downgrade of the Bible in 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 documentation by a man who was in the inner circle of Evangelicalism's leadership for many decades leaves no doubt that the Evangelical world of the last half of the twentieth century is leavened with apostasy.

"MORE AND MORE ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS HISTORICALLY COMMITTED TO AN INFALLIBLE SCRIPTURE

HAVE BEEN EMBRACING AND PROPAGATING THE VIEW THAT THE BIBLE HAS ERRORS IN IT. This movement away from the historic standpoint has been most noticeable among those often labeled neo-evangelicals. This change of position with respect to the infallibility of the Bible is widespread and has occurred in evangelical denominations, Christian colleges, theological seminaries, publishing houses, and learned societies" (Harold Lindsell, former vice-president and professor Fuller Theological Seminary and Editor Emeritus of Christianity Today, *The Battle for the Bible*, 1976, p. 20).

In 1984, well-known Evangelical leader Francis Schaeffer published *The Great Evangelical Disaster*. The book's title describes the 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?* (1993) 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 unrelenting 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 a telling statement that acknowledges precisely where the New Evangelical world 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).

In 1995, Dr. Carl Henry was continuing to warn about unbelief within Evangelical circles: "Much of the same revolt against truth emerged during the recent theology conference of postliberal speakers sponsored jointly with Inter-Varsity at Wheaton College. NOT A SINGLE REPRESENTATIVE OF HISTORIC EVANGELICAL ORTHODOXY COMMITTED TO THE UNBROKEN AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE WAS FEATURED..." (*Calvary Contender*, July 1, 1995).

Consider the following 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). [Hanko's book should not be confused with Harold Lindsell's book by that same name.]

The author of the above critique is a professor at the Protestant Reformed Seminary, Grandville, Michigan.

LET ME GIVE ONE SPECIFIC EXAMPLE OF THIS OF THE HUNDREDS THAT I COULD GIVE FROM MY FILES. CHARLES SCALISE is affiliated with Fuller Seminary. He is associate professor of church history and academic director of Fuller Theological Seminary in Seattle's M.Div. program. In his book *From Scripture to Theology: A Canonical Journey into Hermeneutics* (InterVarsity Press, 1996), Scalise argues for accepting the conclusions of biblical criticism while at the same time accepting the Bible as the "canonical Word of God." He proposes the "canonical approach" of Yale Professor Brevard Childs who follows Karl Barth. Scalise uncritically describes how "the 'postcritical' hermeneutics of Karl Barth assists Childs in charting his way across 'the desert of criticism'" (p. 44). It is true that modern biblical criticism is a desert, but instead of rejecting biblical criticism as the unbelieving heresy that it is, the modern Evangelical scholar tries to reconcile it with a way to allow the Bible to remain authoritative in some sense. In the first chapter of his book, Scalise plainly and unhesitatingly rejects the "facts-of-revelation" approach to Scripture that accepts the Bible as the historically accurate record of God's infallible revelation (pp. 28-31). Scalise does not believe Moses wrote the Pentateuch under divine inspiration or that the Old Testament record of miracles is accurate. He believes the Pentateuch was written by unknown editors centuries later (p. 56). He believes the Bible's accounts of miraculous events

are exaggerated. For example, he believes that the Egyptian chariots pursuing Israel got "stuck in the mud" (p. 39) rather than being overwhelmed by God's miraculous dividing and undividing of the waters. He agrees with Karl Barth that the book of Numbers contains both "history" and "storylike saga" (p. 49). He believes portions of Amos were added by an unknown editor (p. 56). He believes that to view the Bible as historical is dangerous (p. 79). He does not believe the Psalms are historical writings (p. 78). He does not believe that the Apostle Paul wrote the book of Ephesians nor that it was originally addressed to the church at Ephesus, and he doesn't believe it matters (p. 58). Scalise wants to allow the Catholic apocryphal books to be accepted as canonical (pp. 60,61). He commends an approach to biblical canon which has "a firm center and blurred edges" (p. 60). Scalise says, "The Bible is the Word of God because God speaks through it" (p. 22). That is a false, subjective Barthian view of Scripture. In fact, the Bible is the Word of God because it is the Word of God, regardless of whether man feels that God is speaking through it. Scalise claims that comparisons of the Trinity to the self by theologians like Karl Rahner and comparisons of the Trinity to community by theologians like Leonard Hodgson and Jurgen Moltmann "are within the channel of orthodoxy" (p. 103). He does not like the "negative view of tradition" that comes from the Protestant Reformation, and he believes the Protestants and Catholics simply misunderstood one another (p. 73). He believes it is possible to reconcile the differences by requiring that the Bible be interpreted within the context of church tradition (p. 74). In fact, if the Bible must be interpreted by tradition, the tradition becomes the superior authority. In the preface to his book, Scalise notes that he was guided into his critical views of the Bible during studies at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and Tübingen in Germany.

Be careful about labels in this confused hour. The term "evangelical" is meaningless. It can refer to a Modernist or a Roman Catholic or a drunk-in-the-spirit Charismatic or a Psychobabbler who believes the key to mental health is the recovery of hidden memories. I don't care what label a man bears, if he denies the perfect inspiration of Scripture he is a heretic and an apostate (both of these are biblical terms) and God's people should treat him as the dangerous false teacher that he is. The Bible is the foundation for everything in the Christian life and faith, and if the Bible is not infallible, Jesus Christ and the Apostles were either deceived or were liars and we are foolish people to follow them.

I repeat that Charles Scalise is only one of hundreds of examples we could give of Evangelical scholars who deny the infallibility of Holy Scripture. Today's Evangelicals are polluted with the Modernism from which they have refused to separate. A little leaven has indeed leavened the whole lump. (Remember these sad facts the next time you hear about how "thoroughly Evangelical" certain modern Bible translators are. Being "thorough Evangelical" today does not indicate that an individual accepts the Bible as the infallible Word of God.)

I believe a clear case can be established connecting Evangelicalism's apostasy with its acceptance of the critical text and its 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.

Evangelicalism's apostasy is not only seen in its relationship with Rome and its downgrade of biblical inspiration, it is also seen in its repudiation of biblical holiness. The old Fundamentalism 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. Many Evangelical Bible college campuses have the look and feel of secular colleges. The students wear the same clothes (or lack of clothes) 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 two decades ago in *The Worldly Evangelicals*.

Francis Schaeffer also described this 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" (p. 141).

Let us return to our subject. We are discussing the fact that many Evangelical leaders endorse the critical text and reject the Received Text and the King James Bible. Consider another statement by Dr. James Boice:

"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 concerning 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.

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 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 who profess to be Christians today.

NIV OWNER BIG PORNOGRAPHY PUBLISHER!!

The following articles by Jay Klopfenstein is from The Christian News, Dec. 20, 1993, p. 20 --

Zondervan Corp., once a respected Christian publishing firm, Grand Rapids, Michigan, became a public company via a big initial public stock offering some 15 years ago. This was about the same time the NIV Bible was published by an outfit in New York called the International Bible Society, which financed the project. They then gave Zondervan Corp. the exclusive rights to the publication of the NIV version of the Bible.

After the initial offering, the stock's price rose moderately but later the price fell sharply and many investors lost money. In 1985, a New Jersey investor filed a lawsuit which said he was induced to buy Zondervan stock because of false statements the company made to the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). In 1989 it was widely reported in the press: "Zondervan Corp. of Grand Rapids, Michigan, reached a \$3.57 million out-of-court settlement with investors who contend they lost money when irregularities were found in the religious publisher's financial records."

By 1988, Zondervan, suffering from declining sales, was in financial trouble as a result of expanding too fast in the early 1980's. In July 1985, the Wall Street Journal reported, "In 1978, the company introduced the New International Version of the Bible, which is the market leader in Bible sales--in the past two years several investors have bought and sold stakes in Zondervan, sparking speculation that the company had found a buyer. In May an investor group had made a \$10.50 a share offer, but the two sides couldn't reach an agreement."

Then, aggressive media magnate Rupert Murdoch bought Zondervan for \$56.7 million or \$13.50 per share. Zondervan's stock jumped \$4.25 per share on the announcement. Murdoch, an international world citizen who started in Australia, was building a media empire via his company, News Corp. The following month, the tycoon Murdoch gobbled up the nation's largest circulation magazine, TV Guide, also Seventeen, and Good Food magazines plus the Daily Racing Form on a \$3 billion cash binge which was the second largest media deal ever. The seller was Walter Annenberg, 80-year-old Jewish publishing patriarch, who privately owned Triangle Publications whose lucrative national magazine distribution business takes not only their magazines to newsstands but also many others including Reader's Digest."

In recent years Murdoch has built a media empire worldwide with revenues over \$10 billion (64 percent in U.S.A., 19 percent in United Kingdom and 17 percent in Australia and the Pacific Basin). Holdings include Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp., Fox Broadcasting Co., Fox Television Stations, Inc., Harper-Collins, TV Guide, and FSI (multi-page free standing inserts each week in 390 local Sunday newspapers). Also owned in the United Kingdom are The Times, The Sunday Times, Today, Sun and News of the World. These account for one-third of all national newspapers sold in the U.K. market with the latter two having the largest daily and Sunday circulations respectively in the English-speaking world. Also 50 percent owned is British Sky Broadcasting Ltd., the leading U.K. direct-to-home satellite television broadcasting service. News Corp. is also the largest newspaper publisher in Australia.

This year expansion into Asia commenced with purchase of 66 percent interest in Star Television, the Hong Kong satellite TV company that broadcasts to 38 nations, mostly in the Middle and Far East. Also purchased were Chinese newspapers. Recently News Corp. signed six cable channels that will carry News Corp's programming beginning around mid-1994, enabling the company to reach 25 percent of all U.S. households.

In October 1992, News Corp. sold \$850 million notes and bonds plus \$313 million common stock (over \$1 billion total) with \$25.5 million in underwriting fees to the offering syndicate headed by Merrill Lynch, including Allen and Co., Citicorp Securities, Donaldson, Lufkin, and J.P. Morgan Securities.

A News Corp.'s division active in the United States is Harper-Collins engaged in the educational texts markets via its Scott, Foresman School Division which publishes educational programs for school grades kindergarten through twelve, and the Harper-Collins College Division which publishes in most major disciplines in the college curriculum from the introductory level through graduate courses. The subsidiary directed at the Christian evangelical market is Zondervan Corp., holder of the valuable exclusive rights to the NIV-Bible. In the U.K., Harper-Collins' religious division publishes the Good News Bible, hymnals, and liturgical works. News Corp., American Depository Receipts (ADR's), listed on the New York Stock

Exchange, symbol NWS, had a low this year of \$36 per share, a high of \$63 and is currently trading around \$52. The Co. has long-term debt of \$7 billion (about 63 percent of capital) and is ranked by Value Line as "below average" for safety....

News Corp's owner and sales promoter of the NIV Bible, is one of the major producers of modern movies, television programs, and magazines. Occasionally some productions are clean and worthy of family viewing,. but not many! News Corp and other major studios circulate movies full of profanity. TV screens are full of disgusting trash and violence. A U.S. Senator said, "The crudeness, cursing, profanity, vice and violence we tolerate today on our TV screens will be the crudeness, cursing, profanity, vice, and violence that we will be forced to endure in our real life in the years ahead."

According to Morality in Media, "By the time the average child graduates from elementary school, he will have seen at least 8,000 murders and more than 100,000 other acts of violence on TV," and, "A typical teenager watching TV sees nearly 14,000 sexual encounters in one year."

When Rupert Murdoch bought Seventeen magazine, it was predicted it would become a perfect sister to his Elle, the hip and glossy fashion magazine published in France. Now Seventeen magazine is described as "flashy, racy, titillating, hip, jazzy, flirty, glamorous and sexy." It is probably the most widely read magazine by teenagers and pre-teens in the U.S.A. with a circulation of 1.9 million. If pastors and church leaders, who contribute to Murdoch and his News Corp. by promoting and selling the NIV Bible, would pick up the current December 1993 issue at their local magazine store, they would see 138 pages from cover to back of articles and ads, slick and sexually suggestive. These pages exude weird hair-do's, witchcraft-type attire and punk-rock sub-cultural sexually suggestive abnormalities.

Occasionally a pastor's church bulletin contains an insert from American Family Association, which lists the horrible immoralities on TV with advice to boycott the advertisers. On this same Sunday, the pastor sermonizes about the evils of rock culture, pornography and sodomy; then he urges his parishioners to buy the NIV Bible. What folly! How absurd!

(Jay Klopfenstein, The Christian News, Dec. 20, 1993, p. 20).

TWO HOMOSEXUALS

AND THE NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION

December 4, 1997 (David W. Cloud, Fundamental Baptist Information Service, 1701 Harns Rd., Oak Harbor, WA 98277) -- The following report by the FBIS editor, David Cloud, contains lengthy sections by Michael Penfold and also incorporates part of a report done by Carl Graham.

On January 25, 1997, the Fundamental Baptist Information Service published an article on Virginia Mollenkott, a literary consultant for the New International Version. Many had asked us for information on this woman because of her connection, however significant, with this popular modern version. Thus we gave a general overview of her life and writings as follows:

Mollenkott is a pro-abortion feminist who claims to be a 'left-leaning' Evangelical. In reality she denies the very God of the Bible and worships an idolatrous female god of her own imagination. She grew up in a Plymouth Brethren fellowship and moved in Fundamentalist circles during her early years. She studied at Bob Jones University and taught at Shelton College in the 1950s. She has moved miles from that position, though. Today she is an Episcopalian, serves as professor of English at William Patterson College in New Jersey, and moves in the most radical ecumenical feminist circles. In the 1970s, Virginia Mollenkott was a consultant for the New International Version translating committee. She worked on the NIV during the entire time it was being translated and reviewed.

In 1978 she co-authored (with Letha Scanzoni) the book entitled *Is the Homosexual My Neighbor?*, in which she called for nondiscrimination toward homosexuality. The book argues that the Sodom account in Genesis does not teach the evil of homosexuality, but the evils of violent gang rape and inhospitality to strangers. The book also claims that 'the idea of a life long homosexual orientation or 'condition' is never mentioned in the Bible' (p. 71), and that Romans 1 does not 'fit the case of a sincere homosexual Christian' (p. 62). This is the exact position taken by one of the actual translators of the NIV, Dr. Marten H. Woudstra, in a report he assisted in producing for the Christian Reformed Church in 1973. More on this later.

In 1979 Mollenkott participated in the 9th General Conference of the Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches (a denomination composed largely of homosexuals). In a report which was published by the *Christian Century*, Sept. 26, 1979, Mollenkott stated, 'This was the most grateful celebration of Christ I had ever attended...'

In the early 1980s Mollenkott was a member of the National Council of Churches' committee that produced an inclusive-language lectionary which addressed God in feminine terms. At a news conference at the NCC's governing board meeting on November 10, 1983, Mollenkott claimed there is some evidence that Jesus Christ was really a woman. She cited the research of biologist Edward Kessel, who argued that Jesus was "born in parthenogenesis; that parthenogenetic births are always female; that in some cases, therefore, he would be willing to refer to Jesus as 'she' -- up until the last minute of sex reversal, in which case Jesus remains chromosomally female throughout life, but functions as a normal male and looks like a normal male" (*Christian Challenge*, August 1984).

In October 1985, Mollenkott's signature appeared on a statement supporting homosexuality which was published in the *Sojourners* magazine. The statement was also signed by James B. Nelson of the American Lutheran denomination, author of a book which promotes homosexual marriages and homosexual pastors.

In her plenary address before the July 1986, convention of the Evangelical Women's Caucus International (EWCI), in Fresno, California, Mollenkott warned against "heterosexism," the idea that everyone must be heterosexual.

In 1987 Mollenkott wrote an article claiming that refusal to ordain homosexual "clergywomen" is unscriptural discrimination. She wrote: "To ask lesbians and gay men to pretend they are like the majority is to deny them the self-identification and affirmation that is the natural legacy of every healthy adult. Forcing gay Christians into silence also denies them the opportunity to celebrate in gratitude to God for their authentic nature and for their life-enriching mutual relationship with a loving partner" (*Christianity*

and Crisis, Nov. 9, 1987).

In 1988 Mollenkott published the book *Women, Men, and the Bible* (New York: Crossroad Publishing).

In the June 1991, issue of the Episcopal monthly entitled *The Witness*, she testified, "My lesbianism has always been a part of me. ... I tried to be heterosexual. I married myself off. But what I did ultimately realize was that God created me as I was, and that this is where life was meaningful."

In 1993 Mollenkott published a book entitled *Sensuous Spirituality: Out from Fundamentalism* (New York: Crossroad), in which she reflected on her rejection of fundamentalism, her lesbian "coming out," and her belief in a female God. Mollenkott concludes that "in a very physical sense we are all gay, we are all lesbian, we are all heterosexual, we are all bisexual--because we are all one" (p. 153). Her view of the kingdom of God on earth is a society in which "lesbian women, bisexual people, and gay men are going to be accepted as first-class citizens in the church and in society as a whole" (p. 153). She defines sin as "the absence of trust" (instead of disobedience to God's law) and defines salvation as "being brought back into a trusting relationship by remembering Who We Are: God's children, never actually separated from God's love even though we had imagined we were" (p. 157). Her view of the new birth is as follows: "In the instant of remembering our true identity, we are at-oned, restored to a trusting relationship with God, with our Selves, with other people, and with the universe" (p. 157). Mollenkott claims that providing mutual sexual pleasure, whether it be homosexual or bisexual or whatever, is one of the most important things in life. "Learning to love ourselves and others (including mutual pleasuring) is the greatest contribution we can make to the creation of a just society. And I am confident that the day will come when most Christian churches will teach a creation-positive method of glorifying God and enjoying Her forever" (p. 158). Mollenkott turns sin and righteousness upside down by claiming that it is the "pleasure haters" (those who believe God made the sexual relationship for heterosexual marriage only) who are the "unjust" (p. 158). She claims that her lesbianism "is simply a good gift, as all sexuality is a good gift" (p. 162). She admits that when she first started voicing her lesbianism publicly she "felt slightly soiled, as if I needed a good shower," but later she recognized "that the soiled feeling was residual heterosexism" (p. 162). Mollenkott worships a [wo]man-made idol she identifies as "our tender Father and our demanding Mother and then again our loving Friend, faithful Companion, and cosmic Lover" (p. 166).

At the November 1993 Re-imagining conference in Minneapolis, Minnesota, which was sponsored by the World Council of Churches, Mollenkott said: "[Jesus] is our elder brother, the trailblazer and constant companion for us--ultimately is among many brothers and sisters in an eternal, equally worthy sibling-hood. First born only in the sense that he was the first to show us that it is possible to live in oneness with the divine source while we are here on this planet. ... As an incest survivor, I can no longer worship in a theological context that depicts God as an abusive parent [referring to Christ's death on the cross] and Jesus as the obedient, trusting child." At the same conference, Mollenkott said she longed to see the creation of an interfaith "worship community" in which each member respected completely the religion of the others and Christians ceased to make missionary efforts to target members of other religions. She labeled soul-winning evangelism as "imperialistic attempts to make others such as I."

In 1994 Mollenkott published *The Divine Feminine: The Biblical Imagery of God as Female* (New York: Crossroad). This book is filled with such heretical statements as, "The pursuit of holy peace within and the pursuit of peace on earth are perhaps the best of all reasons for lifting up the biblical image of God as the One Mother of us all" (p. 19) and "...because God is womanlike--women are Godlike" (p. 78). Mollenkott suggests that "the Lord's prayer might be addressed to 'Our Father/Mother who is in Heaven'" (p. 116). (David W. Cloud, "Virginia Mollenkott," *Fundamental Baptist Information Service*, Jan. 25, 1997).

When we published the previous information, we hesitated to suggest that the New International Version is weak on homosexuality due to the influence of homosexuals. Having come into possession of more evidence, though, we no longer hesitate. The parallels between the translation of NIV passages dealing with homosexuality and the views of modern homosexual "Christians" are too striking to be incidental.

THERE WAS ANOTHER HOMOSEXUAL INVOLVED WITH THE PRODUCTION OF THE NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION

Mollenkott aside, we have learned that there was another homosexual involved with the production of the New International Version. This one was directly involved with the translation. His name was Dr. Marten Woudstra, and he was Chairman of the NIV Old Testament Committee.

Consider the following report by Michael Penfold, Box 26, Bicester, Oxon, OX6 8PB, England, UK.

"James White's book *The King James Only Controversy* (Bethany House Publishers, 1995) includes a question and answer section. One of the questions reads, 'I've been told that there were homosexuals on the NIV translation committee. Is this true?' On pages

245-246 of his book James White gives the following answer. 'No, it is not [true]. But due to the consistent bearing of false witness by many KJV Only advocates, Dr. Kenneth Barker, Executive Director of the NIV Translation Centre, had to write a response to the accusation, which I quote below:

[Dr. Barker writes]: 'It has come to my attention that false rumours are circulating, in both oral and written form, that the NIV is soft on sodomy (that is, homosexual sins). The alleged reason for this is that some NIV translators and editors were homosexuals and lesbians. These charges have no basis in fact. Thus they are simply untrue. And those who make such false charges could be legitimately sued for libel, slander and defamation of character. Here are the facts. It is true that in the earliest stages of translation work on the NIV (in the late 1960s and early 1970s), Virginia Mollenkott was consulted briefly and only in a minor way on matters of English style. At that time she had the reputation of being a committed evangelical Christian with expertise in contemporary English idiom and usage. Nothing was known of her lesbian views. Those did not begin to surface until years later in some of her writings. If we had known in the sixties what became public knowledge only years later, we would not have consulted her at all. But it must be stressed that she did not influence the NIV translators and editors in any of their final decisions.'

"This is a very cleverly worded statement and one which we can allow Virginia Mollenkott to answer herself. In a letter to me [Michael J. Penfold] dated Dec. 18th 1996, in reply to my investigation into her true role on the NIV, Mollenkott wrote the following revealing letter:

"[Virginia Mollenkott writes] 'I worked on the NIV during the entire time it was being translated and reviewed, although I was never free to attend the summer sessions even when I was invited to do so. Elisabeth Elliot and I were the Stylistic Consultants: our job was simply to make sure the translation would communicate clearly to modern American readers, and that the style was as smooth and understandable as possible. I was never removed, sacked, or made redundant from my work on the NIV; if I were, my name would not have appeared on the list sent out by the IBS. It was Dr. Edwin Palmer, who lived near my college, who invited me to work on the NIV. He had heard me speak and respected my integrity and my knowledge. So far as I know, nobody including Dr. Palmer suspected that I was lesbian while I was working on the NIV; it was information I kept private at that time. Dr. Palmer always sent me the batches of translating to review, and I always returned them (with my comments) to him. I have not kept track of which of my suggestions made it into the final version; I am a busy person, and it was a labour love in the scriptures. I do not think anything concerning homosexuality was in any of the batches I reviewed. I do not consider the NIV more gay-friendly than most modern translations, so I do not understand why anybody would want to bash the NIV because a closeted lesbian worked on it. I was not a translator; if I were I would have argued that the word/concept "homosexual" is too anachronistic to be utilised in translating an ancient text. But I was a stylist and nobody asked me. I no longer have any contact with the NIV-CBT, but I am often amused to remember that I frequently refused my \$5 an hour stipend because I heard the project was running out of money. At the time I was naive about how many millions of dollars are made by a successful Bible translation! Please tell Kenneth Barker for me that although there is much controversy about homosexuality among Biblical scholars, to my knowledge nobody denies that the Bible condemns lying about other people. He should be ashamed of his attempt to rewrite history.

'''Somewhere in my files is the letter I got thanking me for my work on the NIV when the project was completed. I also have the slipcase version sent out to the whole NIV team in 1978 by Zondervan; and I have the tenth-anniversary edition sent out to the whole team in 1988 by the International Bible Society. Various other editions were also sent out gratis to the translation committee and stylists, but I have received nothing since 1988 that I can remember. Because I am idealistic and sincere, it never occurred to me that anyone would lie about my contributions, so I was not meticulous about keeping records. Thank you for anything you can do to set the record straight. You may utilise this letter to do so, and I'd appreciate you sending me a copy of anything you generate. Sincerely, Virginia Ramey Mollenkott.'

"Why could not Dr. Barker have told the truth in the first place? Taking Mollenkott's words at their face value, the NIV publicity machine has nothing to worry about. Does their anxiety to distance the NIV from homosexual associations reveal something more sinister?

"In the light of the following, I believe it does, as it has now come to light that **THE CHAIRMAN OF THE NIV'S OLD TESTAMENT TRANSLATION COMMITTEE, DR. MARTEN H. WOULDSTRA, WAS A HOMOSEXUAL**. This is much more serious than Mollenkott's involvement. Here we have one of the leading scholars on the NIV CBT who is a homosexual. Obviously this fact compromises the whole project, especially as this fact was well known by his colleagues for many years. However, only now is this fact coming to the notice of the general public through articles like the one you are reading.

"Dr. Woudstra, who died in the early 1990s, was a long-time friend of Evangelicals Concerned Inc. This organisation was founded in 1976 by New York psychologist, Dr. Ralph Blair, as a nation-wide task force and fellowship for gay and lesbian 'evangelical Christians' and their friends. ECI's address is 311 East 72nd Street, New York, NY 10021. They can be found on the internet at <http://www.korpi.com/ECWE/>

"It was during a series of research phone calls to Dr. Blair that I first confirmed the fact of Dr. Woudstra's homosexuality. Blair and Dr. Woudstra were friends. Dr. Woudstra had been on the mailing list of Evangelicals Concerned from its inception, and although he had no formal ties with ECI, on one of his many trips to New York he called in and had tea with Dr. Blair. Dr Blair told me that Dr. Woudstra shared the viewpoint of ECI that lifelong 'loving monogamous relationships' between gay men or women were acceptable to God. He believed that there was nothing in the Old Testament (his special area of technical expertise) that corresponded to 'homosexual orientation'. The 'sodomy' of the OT simply involved temple rites and gang rape (Gen 19). Notice the similarity between this view and that of Virginia Mollenkott. Dr. Blair clearly stated to me on the phone on 23rd September 1997 that Dr. Woudstra, a lifelong bachelor, was a homosexual. He intimated that other members of the NIV translation committee were also quietly supportive of ECI, but he was not able to tell me who they were (for obvious reasons). He later called them 'bigger' names than Dr. Woudstra.

"As to Dr. Marten Woudstra theologically, he was once the OT Professor at Calvin Seminary, the college of the Christian Reformed Church (Dutch Calvinistic). Over 70% of this denomination's churches now use the NIV. Dr. Woudstra was considered very 'conservative' within Calvin Seminary. He wrote the Joshua Commentary in the New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Eerdmans) which was also contributed to by such illustrious 'evangelical' names as F.F. Bruce.

"In 1973 the Christian Reformed Church published their official position relative to homosexuality. There is currently discussion, debate and disagreement over the issue of homosexuality within the CRC as in the wider Reformed denominations. For instance, the CRC's sister denomination, the Reformed Church of the Netherlands, took the position in 1979 of actually approving homosexual behaviour within certain bounds. This is a more liberal position than the CRC has ever yet taken. Is it not incredible to think how far the CRC has travelled over the years when one considers some of the former teachers, professors and presidents Calvin Seminary has had, such as Harry Bultema, Herman Hoeksema, H.J. Kuiper, Louis Berkof and William Hendrikson, to name a few.

"In 1970, the CRC Synod appointed a six man committee to study homosexuality. Its report was adopted by the same Synod in 1973. One of the six, Clarence Boomsma, was four times moderator of the CRC and pastor of two CRC churches. In fact Boomsma held the record for the longest pastorate in the CRC; 35 years in the CRC church in Grand Rapids, near the Calvin Seminary.

"I called Clarence Boomsma on the phone in October 1997, and had a long talk about Dr. Woudstra since he had know him for many years and had been his friend. HE TOLD ME THAT DR. WOULDSTRA ASSISTED THEM IN WRITING THE REPORT ON HOMOSEXUALITY. I have a copy of the complete report in my office. It takes a compromised 'middle line' between the Biblical anti-homosexuality absolute, and the Reformed Church of the Netherlands liberal acceptance of homosexual behaviour within certain bounds.

"Let me quote a few lines from the report (Report 42, Art. 53, 1973):

"‘In fact, its [homosexuality] origin is so unclear as to be finally a mystery’ (page 613)

"‘As the cause of homosexuality is uncertain, so is the possibility of correcting it’ (page 614)

"'Responsibility and the possibility of personal guilt for the homosexual arises at the point where he must decide what he will do with his sexuality. It is here that the Christian homosexual must ask what God's will is for him in the same way as the Christian heterosexual must ask what he must do in obedience to God with his sex drive' (page 616)

"[Note here the clever but wrong comparison being drawn. For a man to desire sexual relations with a woman is not wrong within the marriage relationship. However, for a man to desire sexual relations with another man is always wrong in all circumstances].

"'From this story [Genesis 19, Sodom & Gomorrah] read as an isolated incident we cannot conclude however that homosexuality is here condemned' (page 617).

"[Note that this report took the position that a person may be a homosexual by birth (homosexuality) due to the fallen and irregular nature of humanity, but should not practice homosexual acts (homosexuality)!]

"'In how far the prohibition of homosexuality [in Lev 18:21 & 20:13] is binding on us is therefore a question that remains' (page 619).

"'It has been suggested that the use of these words [malakoi and arsenokoitai in I Cor 6:9-10] stresses the activity rather than the condition of homosexuality' (page 619)

"[Note this vital belief of Dr. Woudstra. This is the reasoning behind the very clever translation in the NIV in I Cor 6 'homosexual offenders'. Thus the NIV here allows a person to be a homosexual, as long as they don't offend.]

"The report refers constantly to the 'Christian homosexual', and urges that he 'deserves the same acceptance, recognition, compassion and help that is given to any person (page 626). Since the report urges a fully functional place in the church for 'Christian homosexuals' is it any wonder that, according to the Boomsma, the CRC has currently (1997) one openly 'celibate' homosexual minister who has 'come out'. All through the report one is struck with the similarities it bears to the views of Virginia Mollenkott. Even the title of her book 'Is The Homosexual My Neighbour' finds an echo on page 631 of the CRC's Homosexuality Committee's 1973 report where paragraph 2 begins 'Love for the homosexual neighbour...'

"The 1973 report advised homosexual ministers to seek pastoral and psychological help to cope with their desires, but stopped short of condoning homosexual practice. Boomsma felt that although the CRC should understand and 'sympathise' (page 630) with the struggle homosexuals faced, for which they may bear minimal responsibility (page 631), it could not make an exception and allow such people to engage in 'homosexual activity' that is wrong. This is still the view of the CRC in general.

"Taking the scriptural principle of two witnesses, I will now add the comments of Clarence Boomsma regarding the sexuality of his friend Dr. Woudstra, the Chairman of the NIV Old Testament Committee. Boomsma made the following statement to me on the phone on 25th October 1997; I wrote it down verbatim: 'It is generally believed among us [Christian Reformed Church and Calvin Seminary] that Dr. Woudstra was a homosexual.'

"I asked Boomsma if Dr. Woudstra was an 'active' homosexual. Although he knew Dr. Woudstra's views on homosexuality very well and holds in his possession a written dissertation by Dr. Woudstra on the subject, he did not feel free to comment on its contents. However, he did tell me about a '[homosexual] incident' in Dr. Woudstra's career in which his professorship was at stake. Woudstra survived and was not fired by the Seminary.

"Boomsma also spoke of Dr. Woudstra's frequent trips to New York 'which like all large cities has a large homosexual population'. On his return Woudstra would tell Boomsma how much he enjoyed the 'plays' in New York. I asked were these 'gay plays'. Boomsma would only say that New York has a large gay culture and is dotted with gay bars, and it was his impression that his friend, Dr. Woudstra, took part in this side of New York's social scene.

"I submit this research as I feel it has a direct bearing on how the NIV treats homosexuality. By removing the word sodomy and sodomite from the Old Testament, the language is changed and new ideas are introduced. By speaking of homosexual 'offenders'

in I Corinthians ch. 6, the NIV allows for people to be homosexual as long as they don't 'offend' by being 'active'; and this is the position of the Christian Reformed Church, Calvin Seminary, Evangelicals Concerned, and who knows, quite a few other members of the NIV Translation Committee other than the late Dr. Woudstra. The fact that Leviticus denounces homosexuality in total does not worry them as such ethical condemnations do not apply today! "A corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit" (Matthew 7:17)."

Michael Penfold, November 1997
P.O.Box 26, Bicester, Oxon. OX6 8PB, England UK.
PenfoldBooks@characterlink.net"

SODOMY IN THE NIV COMPARED WITH THE VIEWS OF "EVANGELICAL" HOMOSEXUALS

THE FOLLOWING IS A COMPARISON OF HOW THE CONCEPT OF SODOMY AND HOMOSEXUALITY IS TREATED IN THE KING JAMES VERSION AND THE NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION. The NIV translation allows for the false view that homosexuality as a natural condition is not condemned in the Bible, that the Bible only condemns the misuse of homosexuality. It is much easier to support this strange view from the NIV than it is from the KJV.

The following study is expanded from one which was originally put together by Carl Graham entitled Sodomy and the NIV (first published 1991; revised 1996, Twogistates Publishers, 500 Wheeler Dr., Angier, NC 27501) after he researched the connection between the NIV's rendering of passages touching on homosexuality and the presence of a homosexual on the translation review team. It is amazing to see many direct parallels between Mollenkott's views about homosexuality and the translation of the New International Version. Graham's study has been enlarged by Michael Penfold with the addition of sections of the 1973 Christian Reformed Church report on homosexuality and by additional comments by me (David Cloud). As noted earlier, Dr. Woudstra, Chairman of the NIV Old Testament Committee, helped the six-man committee write this report. Thus the 1973 report can be taken as the views of at least one prominent member of the NIV CBT.

After Graham published his booklet, he was threatened with a lawsuit by the publishers of the NIV, the International Bible Society. He was accused of slandering the members of the NIV, and they insisted that he withdraw the booklet immediately or face a possible lawsuit. Graham hired an attorney, who assured him that he was on firm legal grounds. After receiving communication from Graham's lawyer, the IBC apologized to Graham for the threatening letter and dropped the matter.

Graham wrote his report without the knowledge that a homosexual man headed up the Old Testament New International Version translation team. Graham saw the amazing connection between Mollenkott's views and the rendering of various NIV passages, and he assumed this connection was caused by some direct input by Mollenkott. It appears now that this was not the case. Mollenkott probably had nothing to do with the translation of these various passages. At least that is what she has testified. There can be no doubt, though, that Dr. Woudstra had a direct role in the translation and that his views were precisely aligned with the views promoted by Mollenkott and other "Christian" homosexuals today.

Some people still believe two and two equals four. The connection between the NIV's rendering of passages touching on homosexuality and the views of modern "Christian" homosexuals is no accident. It is apparent that there must have been other members of the NIV committee who were like-minded with these modern "evangelical" sodomites. Michael Penfold's research has confirmed this, but the names of other NIV translators who were sympathetic with homosexual Christianity will possibly not be brought to light until the judgment seat of Christ.

THE SIN OF HOMOSEXUALITY CAN BE CONDEMNED OUT OF THE NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION, BUT IT IS NOT AS PLAIN AS IT IS IN THE AUTHORIZED VERSION.

We have seen repeatedly that this is one of the devil's tactics. He does not necessarily completely change or remove a doctrine; he merely tampers with it. In a fierce warfare, the difference between winning and losing often depends upon very small details. To clandestinely dull a warrior's sword is tantamount to open sedition.

The sad fact which must be faced is this: IN SCHOLARLY EVANGELICAL CIRCLES, THE IDEA THAT HOMOSEXUALITY IS SOMEHOW COMPATIBLE WITH CHRISTIANITY IS GAINING A WIDENING SYMPATHY. The book by Virginia Mollenkott and Letha Scanzoni, Is the Homosexual My Neighbor (Harper & Row, 1978), received favorable reviews in Christianity Today, The Christian Century, The Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, and The Christian Ministry. Joe Dallas, author of A Strong Delusion: Confronting the 'Gay Christian' Movement (Harvest House Publishers,

Eugene, Oregon, 1996), made the following conclusion: "ENDORSEMENTS FROM SUCH RESPECTED CHRISTIAN PUBLICATIONS WAS PROOF THAT THE GAY CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT WAS GAINING MOMENTUM AND CREDIBILITY."

We now list the verses relative to sodomy from the NIV and KJB, together with the comments, where pertinent, of Dr. Mollenkott and the CRC Committee, which was assisted by Dr. Woudstra. The comments of Dr. Mollenkott are from her book, *Is The Homosexual My Neighbor?* (abbreviated as ITHMN):]

GENESIS 19:5 - THE SIN OF SODOM

KJB - "And they called unto Lot, and said unto him, where are the men which came into thee this night? Bring them out unto us, that we may know them."

NIV - "They called to Lot, 'Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out so that we can have sex with them.'"

CRC REPORT: "From this story, read as an isolated incident, we cannot conclude however that homosexuality is here condemned. The evil that the men of Sodom were planning with Lot's guests was sexual assault and violence. ... From this account therefore it does not follow that homosexuality under other circumstances is wrong. ... We may not conclude from this account that it was only because of the sexual depravity in Sodom and Gomorrah that these cities were destroyed" (CRC 1973 Report on Homosexuality, No 42, Art. 53, assisted by Woudstra, p. 617).

MOLLENKOTT, ITHMN, page 57 ". . . the Sodom story seems to be focusing on two specific evils: (1) violent gang rape and (2) inhospitality to the stranger."

[NOTE FROM BRO. CLOUD: The Bible plainly states that the sin for which God judged Sodom was connected with gross and strange immorality. 2 Peter 2:7 refers to Sodom's "filthy conversation." The same Greek word is translated "wantonness" in Rom. 13:13 and 2 Pet. 2:18. Jude 7 refers to Sodom's fornication and "going after strange flesh." God did not send fire upon Sodom for its inhospitality. In Gen 18:20 God speaks of the great sin of Sodom before the angels had even visited the city.]

LEVITICUS 20:13 - SODOMY

KJB - "If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death: their blood shall be upon them."

NIV - "If a man lies with a man as one lies with a woman, both of them has done what is detestable. They must be put to death: their blood will be on their own heads."

CRC REPORT: "The difficulty that confronts us with these texts [Lev 18:22, 20:13] is the question in what distinguishable respects they are normative for us ... the problem ... is ... to determine what is binding for us ... it may be questioned whether homosexuality in non-cultic (e.g. moral) contexts is condemned by these passages ... we ... hold that 18:21 forbids homosexuality and the same is true of 20:13. On the other hand we must recognize the temporary character of much of Old Testament legislation ... IN HOW FAR THE PROHIBITION OF HOMOSEXUALISM IS BINDING ON US IS THEREFORE A QUESTION THAT REMAINS ... we cannot simply apply the Old Testament prohibition without considering whether our knowledge of homosexuality [modern 'scientific' research] may not modify to some degree our moral judgment about homosexual practices of such persons" (emphasis added) (CRC 1973 Report on Homosexuality, No 42, Art. 53, assisted by Woudstra, pp. 617-619).

MOLLENKOTT, ITHMN, pages 110 through 121 - "Dr. Mollenkott argues that this is part of the ceremonial laws, and as such, is to be disregarded by the Christian. She places this act on the same level as wearing clothes of two different materials."

DEUTERONOMY 23:17 - SODOMITE

KJB - "There shall be no whore of the daughters of Israel, nor a sodomite of the sons of Israel."

NIV - "No Israelite man or woman is to become a shrine prostitute."

CRC REPORT: "Deuteronomy 23:17...forbids male prostitution. All scholars agree that the Old Testament condemns homosexuality, although they are not all agreed on the rationale for such condemnation, and on what ethical force it has for all forms of homosexuality as we know it today" (CRC 1973 Report on

Homosexuality, No 42, Art. 53, assisted by Woudstra, p. 619).

JUDGES 19:22 - SODOMY

KJB - "Now as they were making their hearts merry, behold, the men of the city, certain sons of Belial, beset the house round about, and beat at the door, and spake to the master of the house, the old man, saying, Bring forth the man that came into thine house, that we may know him."

NIV - "While they were enjoying themselves, some of the wicked men of the city surrounded the house. Pounding on the door, they shouted to the old man who owned the house, 'Bring out the man who came to your house so we can have sex with him.'"

MOLLENKOTT, ITHMN, page 57 - "Violence--forcing sexual activity upon another--is the real point to this story."

I KINGS 14:24 - SODOMITES

KJB - "And there were sodomites in the land: and they did according to all the abominations of the nations which the Lord cast out before the children of Israel."

NIV - "There were even male shrine prostitutes in the land; the people engaged in all the detestable practices of the nations the Lord had driven out before the Israelites."

CRC REPORT: "There are other Old Testament passages that bear on the subject of homosexuality ... I Kings 24:24; 15:12; 22:40 ... which relates the attempts of the kings of Judah to abolish male cultic prostitution and the like" (CRC 1973 Report on Homosexuality, No 42, Art. 53, assisted by Woudstra, p. 619).

[NOTE FROM BRO. CLOUD: The rendering "male temple prostitutes" is an interpretation, as is the rendering "sodomite." According to Strong's, the Hebrew term is "qadesh, kaw-dashe'; from H6942; a (quasi) sacred person, i.e. (techn.) a (male) devotee (by prostitution) to licentious idolatry." In the Authorized Version this Hebrew word is translated "sodomite" and "unclean." The term "sodomite" was brought over from the Geneva Bible, because the translators understood the sin described in these passages is connected with the moral perversion of old Sodom. Many older Bible dictionaries connect sodomy with homosexuality in general. Eadie (1872) defines Sodomite as "not dwellers in Sodom, but practisers of unnatural lust--the sin of Sodom. This sin was consecrated in many Eastern kingdoms." The People's Bible Encyclopedia by Charles Randall Barnes (1903) says: "The sodomites were not inhabitants of Sodom, nor their descendants, but men consecrated to the unnatural vice of Sodom (Gen. 19:5; comp. Rom. 1:27) as a religious rite." Note that Barnes connects the sin of sodomy with the homosexuality described in Romans 1:27. Hastings (1898) says: "The term 'Sodomite' is used in Scripture to describe offences against the laws of nature which were FREQUENTLY connected with idolatrous practices" (emphasis ours). Note that Hastings did not claim that the offences against the laws of nature were restricted solely to idolatrous temple worship. The term "sodomy" in these passages doubtless did refer, at least in part, to homosexuality connected with immoral pagan religions. The problem with the NIV translation is that it LIMITS this sin to that particular connection rather than allowing the larger meaning of homosexuality in general. It also creates the confusion that the practice of sodomy in the Old Testament and the sin of Sodom itself was limited to male prostitution.]

I KINGS 15:12 - SODOMITES

KJB - "And he took away the sodomites out of the land and removed all the idols that his fathers had made."

NIV - "He expelled all the shrine prostitutes from the land and got rid of the idols his fathers had made."

I KINGS 22:46 - SODOMITES

KJB - "And the remnant of the sodomites, which remained in the days of his father Asa, he took out of the land."

NIV - "He rid the land of the rest of the shrine prostitutes who remained there even after the reign of his father Asa."

II KINGS 23:7 - SODOMITES

KJB - "And he brake down the houses of the sodomites, that were by the house of the Lord, where the women wove hangings for the grove."

NIV - "He also tore down the quarters of the male shrine prostitutes, which were in the temple of the Lord and where women did weaving for Asherah."

MOLLENKOTT, ITHMN, page 59 & 60 - "Most scholars agree that in the fertility religions of Israel's neighbors, male cult prostitutes were employed for homosexual acts. The people who loved and served the God of Israel were strictly forbidden to have anything to do with such idolatry, and the Jewish men were commanded to never serve as temple prostitutes."

LUKE 10:12 - JUDGMENT UPON SODOM

KJB - "But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom than for that city."

NIV - "I tell you, it will be more bearable on that day for Sodom than for you."

MOLLENKOTT, ITHMN, page 59. "Jesus refers to Sodom, not in the context of sexual acts, but in the context of inhospitality." And on page 71, she expands this thought with "the idea of a life long homosexual orientation or 'condition' is never mentioned in the Bible."

ROMANS 1:26 & 27 - HOMOSEXUALITY

KJB - "For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections; for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: And like wise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in lust one toward another; man with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet."

NIV - "Because of this, God gave him over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones. In the same way men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion."

CRC REPORT: "We conclude that the New Testament passages which make reference to homosexual behaviour are in harmony with the judgment of Old Testament: homosexual acts are sinful. But again, we need to ask whether the judgment of Paul applies to those who are homosexuals as we have defined them, i.e. those who are constitutionally homosexual [born that way] in their sexual orientation. Does the exchange from the natural to the unnatural which Paul deems dishonourable apply to such persons? ... The male homosexual does not exchange his passion for a woman for passion for a man, nor gives up the natural attraction for a woman, for he does not have such passions, such are not 'natural' to him" (CRC 1973 Report on Homosexuality, No 42, Art. 53, assisted by Woudstra, p. 621).

MOLLENKOTT, ITHMN, page 62 - "The key thought here seems to be lust, 'unnaturalness,' and, in verse 28, a desire to avoid the acknowledgment of God. But although the censure fits idolatrous people with whom Paul was concerned here, it does not seem to fit the case of a sincere homosexual Christian. Such a person loves Jesus Christ and wants above all to acknowledge God in all of life, yet for some unknown reason feels drawn to someone of the same sex, for the sake of love rather than lust. Is it fair to describe that person as lustful or desirous of forgetting God's existence?"

I CORINTHIANS 6:9 - REJECTION OF HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIOR

KJB - "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind..."

NIV - "Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders..."

CRC REPORT: "It has been suggested that the use of these words stresses the activity rather than the condition of homosexuality" (CRC 1973 Report on Homosexuality, No 42, Art. 53, assisted by Woudstra, p. 619).

MOLLENKOTT, ITHMN, page 67 - "Interpretation of these passages depends on two Greek words used in I Cor. 6:9 which have presented a problem for translators in the King James Version, they translated 'effeminate' and 'abusers of themselves with mankind.' In the Revised Standard Version of 1952, they were combined and rendered simply 'homosexuals,' which implied that all persons whose erotic interests were oriented to the same sex were by the very fact excluded from membership in the kingdom of God. But the original intent seems to have been to single out specific kinds of same-sex practices which were deplorable."

[NOTE FROM BRO. CLOUD: We see that the New International Version replaces the "effeminate" of the KJV with "male prostitutes." The word "effeminate" in the KJV is from the Greek word "malakos," which Strong defines as "soft, i.e. fine (clothing)." The Greek word appears three times in the New Testament, and in the Authorized Version it is translated "effeminate" one time (1 Cor. 6:9) and "soft" two times (Matt. 11:8; Lk. 7:25). The New International Version translators had no authority to translate this word as "male prostitutes." They have replaced the New Testament term "effeminate," which aptly describes male homosexuality in general, with the term "male prostitutes," thus diluting and perverting the meaning of the passage.]

JUDE 7 - STRANGE FLESH

KJB - "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire."

NIV - "In a similar way, Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding towns gave themselves up to sexual immorality and perversion. They serve as an example of those who suffer the punishment of eternal fire."

MOLLENKOTT, ITHMN, page 59 - "The 'unnatural lust' thus could, in the context, and in view of the apocryphal texts to which Jude made allusion, refer to a desire for sexual contact between human and heavenly beings."

IT WOULD NOT BE FAIR TO SAY THAT ALL THE PEOPLE INVOLVED IN PRODUCING THE NIV FAVORED HOMOSEXUALITY AS AN ALTERNATE LIFESTYLE, BUT IT IS FAIR TO SAY THAT THOSE WHO WERE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE FINAL WORDING WERE AT LEAST SYMPATHETIC TO DR. MOLLENKOTT'S and DR. WOULDSTRA'S CAUSE. One only has to look at the treatment of sodomy in the NIV to reach this conclusion.

BUT I THOUGHT EVANGELICALS WERE STRONG BIBLE BELIEVERS!

Those who do not understand the history and present condition of Evangelicalism, might be confused by these facts. The New International Version was translated by those who claimed to be "evangelical." Does that not guarantee that it is sound? By no means. At the mid-point of this century, Evangelicalism, which had previously described a zealous Protestantism (never more than that), took a different turn. Described as a "New Evangelicalism," many well-known Christian leaders such as Harold Ockenga, Carl Henry, Harold Lindsell, and Billy Graham, and many schools (Wheaton, Fuller, etc.) and publications (Christianity Today, etc.) denounced biblical separation and biblical absolutism and determined to practice infiltration and dialogue and inclusivism. They thought the old Fundamentalists were too negative, and they determined to approach theology and the ministry in a more positive manner. They also allowed for some rethinking or reexamination of certain points of the old Evangelical theology. They did not desire to be so boxed in. Ockenga described this new evangelicalism in an address he gave in 1948. "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" (emphasis added) (Ockenga, Foreword to The Battle for the Bible by Harold Lindsell, p. 11). The Bible warns that a little leaven leavens the whole lump, and since the 1950s, Evangelicalism has been on a downhill slide.

The result of this new thinking has been dramatic. It is God who has commanded that His people separate from error and from those who teach and practice it; it is God who has commanded that His people "earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints." And when these and other aspects of old-time Evangelicalism were rejected, the power and blessing of God was removed just as it was from Samson of old when he broke his Nazarite vow.

The following testimonies about the character of Evangelicalism today were not made by Fundamentalists; they were made by key Evangelical leaders, including some of the very founders of New Evangelicalism.

"A GROWING VANGUARD OF YOUNG GRADUATES OF EVANGELICAL COLLEGES WHO HOLD DOCTORATES FROM NON-EVANGELICAL DIVINITY CENTERS NOW QUESTION OR DISOWN INERRANCY and the doctrine is held less consistently by evangelical faculties. ... Some retain the term and reassure supportive constituencies but nonetheless stretch the term's meaning" (Carl F.H. Henry, first editor of Christianity Today, chairman for the 1966 World Congress on Evangelism, "Conflict Over Biblical Inerrancy," Christianity Today, May 7, 1976)

"MORE AND MORE ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS HISTORICALLY COMMITTED TO AN INFALLIBLE SCRIPTURE HAVE BEEN EMBRACING AND PROPAGATING THE VIEW THAT THE BIBLE HAS ERRORS IN IT. This movement away from the historic standpoint has been most noticeable among those often labeled neo-evangelicals. This change of position with respect to the infallibility of the Bible is widespread and has occurred in evangelical denominations, Christian colleges, theological seminaries, publishing houses, and learned societies" (Harold Lindsell, former vice-president and professor Fuller Theological Seminary and Editor Emeritus of Christianity Today, The Battle for the Bible, 1976, p. 20).

"Most people outside the evangelical community itself are totally unaware of the profound changes that have occurred within evangelicalism during the last several years--in the movement's understanding of the inspiration and authority of Scripture, in its social concerns, cultural attitudes and ecumenical posture, and in the nature of its emerging leadership. ... evangelical theologians have begun looking at the Bible with a scrutiny reflecting THEIR WIDESPREAD ACCEPTANCE OF THE PRINCIPLES OF HISTORICAL AND LITERARY CRITICISM ... The position--affirming that Scripture is inerrant or infallible in its teaching on matters of faith and conduct but not necessarily in all its assertions concerning history and the cosmos--IS GRADUALLY BECOMING ASCENDANT AMONG THE MOST HIGHLY RESPECTED EVANGELICAL THEOLOGIANS. ... these new trends ... indicate that evangelical theology is becoming more centrist, more open to biblical criticism and more accepting of science and broad cultural analysis. ONE MIGHT EVEN SUGGEST THAT THE NEW GENERATION OF EVANGELICALS IS CLOSER TO BONHOEFFER, BARTH AND BRUNNER THAN TO HODGE AND WARFIELD ON THE INSPIRATION AND AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE" (Richard Quebedeaux, author of The Young Evangelicals and The Worldly Evangelicals, "The Evangelicals: New Trends and Tensions," Christianity and Crisis, Sept. 20, 1976, pp. 197-202).

"A SURPRISING ARRAY OF EQUALLY DEDICATED EVANGELICALS IS FORMING TO INSIST THAT ACCEPTANCE OF HISTORIC CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES DOES NOT REQUIRE BELIEF IN AN INERRANT BOOK. ... What has made it a new ball game today is the emergence of a new type of evangelical. These persons accept the cardinal doctrines of Christianity in their full and literal meaning but agree that the higher critics have a point: there are errors in Scripture, and some of its precepts must be recognized as being culturally and historically conditioned" (G. Aiken Taylor, "Is God as Good as His Word?" Christianity Today, Feb. 4, 1977).

"I must regretfully conclude that the term evangelical has been so debased that it has lost its usefulness. ... Forty years ago the term evangelical represented those who were theologically orthodox and who held to biblical inerrancy as one of the distinctives. ... WITHIN A DECADE OR SO NEOEVANGELICALISM, THAT STARTED SO WELL AND PROMISED SO MUCH, WAS BEING ASSAULTED FROM WITHIN BY INCREASING SKEPTICISM WITH REGARD TO BIBLICAL INFALLIBILITY OR INERRANCY" (Harold Lindsell, The Bible in the Balance, 1979, p. 319)

"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. But is happening in very subtle ways. Like the snow lying side-by-side on the ridge, the new views on biblical authority often seem at first glance not to be very far from what evangelicals, until just recently, have always believed. But also, like the snow lying side-by-side on the ridge, the new views when followed consistently end up a thousand miles apart. What may seem like a minor difference at first, in the end makes all the difference in the world ... compromising the full authority of Scripture eventually affects what it means to be a Christian theologically and how we live in the full spectrum of human life" (Francis Schaeffer, The Great Evangelical Disaster, 1983, p. 44).

"Accommodation, accommodation. 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. More than this, the evangelical response itself has been a disaster. Where is the clear voice speaking to the crucial issues of the day with distinctively biblical, Christian answers? With tears we must say that largely it is not there and that A LARGE SEGMENT OF THE EVANGELICAL WORLD HAS BECOME SEDUCED BY THE WORLD SPIRIT OF THIS PRESENT AGE" (Francis Schaeffer, *The Great Evangelical Disaster*, 1983, p. 141).

"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*, 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, *Professor of Church History and New Testament, Protestant Reformed Seminary, The Battle for the Bible*, 1993, pp. 2,3).

"At one extreme are those who have recoiled into Anglo-Catholicism in reaction to pietistic subjectivism; at the other are those who have taken their stand on the verities of old-time Fundamentalism as a way of rejecting evangelical softness. BUT IN BETWEEN THESE FAR SHORES 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. ... Fundamentalism always had an air of embattlement about it, of being an island in a sea of unrelenting 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" (David F. Wells, *Professor of Historical and Systematic Theology at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, No Place for the Truth or Whatever Happened to Evangelical Theology?*, 1994, pp. 128,129).

"Although most of today's professing evangelicals would acknowledge that theology, in some sense of the word, does matter, a recent survey in *Christianity Today* revealed that this is more lip service than anything else. According to this survey ... theology, in any sense of the word, is really not all that important to the very people to whom it should matter most: those in the pew and in the pulpit. BOTH GROUPS LISTED THEOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE AS LAST IN TERMS OF PASTORAL PRIORITIES. ... WE ARE SADLY EXPERIENCING, ON A RATHER LARGE SCALE, A SUBJECTIVISM THAT BETRAYS ITS WEAKENED HOLD ON THE OBJECTIVE TRUTH and reality of Christianity by its neglect or even renunciation of its distinctive objective character. ... Men ... really wish to have a creedless Christianity. 'Creeds,' they shout, 'are divisive things; away with them!' ... Where does this leave us? An undogmatic Christianity is no Christianity at all" (Gary L.W. Johnson, "Does Theology Still Matter?" *The Coming Evangelical Crisis*, Moody Press, 1996, pp. 58,66,67).

"... evangelicalism in the 1990s is an amalgam of diverse and often theologically ill-defined groups, institutions, and traditions. ... THE THEOLOGICAL UNITY THAT ONCE MARKED THE MOVEMENT HAS GIVEN WAY TO A THEOLOGICAL PLURALISM THAT WAS PRECISELY WHAT MANY OF THE FOUNDERS OF MODERN EVANGELICALISM HAD REJECTED IN MAINLINE PROTESTANTISM. ... Evangelicalism is not healthy in conviction or spiritual discipline. Our theological defenses have been let down, and the infusion of revisionist theologies has affected large segments of evangelicalism. Much damage has already been done, but a greater crisis yet threatens" (R. Albert Mohler, Jr., "Evangelical What's in a Name?," *The Coming*

Evangelical Crisis, 1996, pp. 32,33,36).

These are sad testimonies. It is strange to note that these men (Hanko excepted), though they see the apostate confusion which has arisen in modern Evangelicalism, do not clearly see that this is the product of the rejection of biblical separation and absolutism. These leaders (Hanko excepted) continue to reject and misrepresent Bible-believing Fundamentalism. This present Evangelical generation is polluted with the Modernism and Ecumenism and Romanism and Humanism and Psychology and Worldliness from which it has refused to separate. God is not mocked. A "little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" and "evil communications corrupt good manners." A man, church, denomination, or movement cannot reject biblical separation and a zealous defense of the whole counsel of God without paying the consequence of apostasy.

Friends, "evangelical scholars" today cannot be trusted to be firm Bible believers.

SODOMY AND THE BIBLE

The following is from the Way of Life Encyclopedia of the Bible & Christianity, 2nd Edition, copyright 1997, David W. Cloud, 1701 Harns Rd., Oak Harbor, WA 98277. (360) 675-8311.

The sodomite of the Old Testament refers to male prostitution and homosexual moral perversion practiced in connection with idolatry (De. 23:17; 1 Ki. 14:24; 15:12; 22:46; 2 Ki. 23:7). The same Hebrew word is translated "unclean" (Job 36:14). The term is connected with the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah and has come to be identified with homosexuality and moral perversion in general. The 1828 Webster dictionary defined "sodomy" as "a crime against nature." The Webster's Deluxe Unabridged Dictionary of 1983 defines sodomy as "any sexual intercourse regarded as abnormal, as between persons of the same sex, especially males, or between a person and an animal." The term is descriptive of the moral perversion of the city of Sodom (Ge. 19; Jude 7).

THE NIV TRANSLATION OF SODOMY: Some modern translations, such as the New International Version, replace the word "sodomite" with "male temple prostitutes." This rendering is an interpretation as is the rendering "sodomite." According to Strong's, the Hebrew term is "qadesh, kaw-dashe'; from H6942; a (quasi) sacred person, i.e. (techn.) a (male) devotee (by prostitution) to licentious idolatry." In the Authorized Version this Hebrew word is translated "sodomite" and "unclean." The term "sodomite" was brought over from the Geneva Bible, because the translators understood the sin described in these passages as connected with the moral perversion of old Sodom. Many older Bible dictionaries connect sodomy with homosexuality in general. Eadie (1872) defines Sodomite as "not dwellers in Sodom, but practisers of unnatural lust--the sin of Sodom. This sin was consecrated in many Eastern kingdoms." The People's Bible Encyclopedia by Charles Randall Barnes (1903) says: "The sodomites were not inhabitants of Sodom, nor their descendants, but men consecrated to the unnatural vice of Sodom (Gen. 19:5; comp. Rom. 1:27) as a religious rite." Note that Barnes connects the sin of sodomy with the homosexuality described in Romans 1:27. Hastings (1898) says: "The term 'Sodomite' is used in Scripture to describe offences against the laws of nature which were FREQUENTLY connected with idolatrous practices" (emphasis ours). Note that Hastings did not claim that the offences against the laws of nature were restricted solely to idolatrous temple worship. The term "sodomy" in these passages doubtless did refer, at least in part, to homosexuality connected with immoral pagan religions. The problem with the NIV translation is that it LIMITS this sin to that particular connection rather than allowing the larger meaning of homosexuality in general. It also creates the confusion that the practice of sodomy in the Old Testament and the sin of Sodom itself was limited to male prostitution.

OTHER BIBLE TERMS FOR SODOMY. Some contend that the Bible only condemns prostitution and forced immorality, and that sodomy, or homosexuality, in general, is not addressed in the Word of God. That this is not true is evident by the terminology used in the following passages of Scripture. The language the Holy Spirit uses in the N.T. to describe same-sex relations proves that God considers this a great wickedness, whether or not it is done with consent--"uncleanness" (Ro. 1:24); "dishonour their own bodies between themselves" (Ro. 1:24); "vile affections" (Ro. 1:26); "that which is against nature" (Ro. 1:26); "that which is unseemly" (Ro. 1:27); "reprobate mind" (Ro. 1:28); "effeminate" (1 Co. 6:9); "abusers of themselves with mankind" (1 Co. 6:9); "inordinate affection" (Col. 3:5); "them that defile themselves with mankind" (1 Ti. 1:10); "filthy conversation" (2 Pe. 2:7); "going after strange flesh" (Jude 7). Under the Mosaic law homosexuality required the death penalty (Le. 18:22-29; 20:13). The terminology used in the passages in Leviticus describe and condemn homosexuality in general--man lying with man, and woman lying with woman.

WHAT DOES GOD THINK OF SODOMY? (1) It is an abomination (Le. 18:22). (2) It bore the death penalty in the O.T. dispensation (Le. 20:13; Ro. 1:32). (3) It defiles the land (Le. 18:25). (4) It is the product of a morally reprobate mind (Ro. 1:26-28). (5) It is worthy of the judgment of eternal fire (Jude 7). (6) It can be forgiven and cleansed in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of God (1 Co. 6:9-11).

IS SODOMY A GREATER SIN? While it is true that there are many sins other than homosexuality and all sin is wicked before God, and while it is true that any sin can be forgiven through the blood of Jesus Christ, the Bible does not say that all sin is the same in its effect in this world. God did not pour out fire and brimstone upon Sodom because of its jealousy or covetousness or lack of hospitality. It was judged specifically because of its homosexuality (Jude 7). Though all moral sins are evil in God's eye, homosexuality is especially corrupt because it is a sin against nature itself. It destroys the very fabric of society, which is the family as defined biblically--a man and a woman united in holy matrimony rearing children to fear God and to be productive citizens. Homosexuality is to "change the natural use into that which is against nature" (Ro. 1:26).