ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS TO OUR AUTHORIZED BIBLE.
By B. G. Wilkinson.
p. 2, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

A REPLY TO THE "REVIEW" OF MY BOOK "OUR AUTHORIZED BIBLE VINDICATED". BY B. G. Wilkinson.
p. 3, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

PREFACE. Back in 1930 B. G. Wilkinson published *OUR AUTHORIZED BIBLE VINDICATED.* Some of his colleagues took exception to his book and criticized it publicly. Since Wilkinson, who was a professor in one of our colleges, was having his scholarship questioned, it was mandatory that he reply. p. 4, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

This book is his reply to their "review" and criticism. It literally "downs" them on every argument. p. 4, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Since feelings and rivalry were running high, the General Conference of those days requested Wilkinson to *not* publish this work. He agreed. p. 4, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Since the individuals concerned are no longer on the scene, and since the issue of modern versions is now a very important topic, we feel that this work should be available to students. p. 4, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Many in our denomination are "pushing" the use of the New International Version and repressing the use of the King James Version from the pulpits. Since our doctrines, particularly the Investigative Judgment and 2300 Day Prophecy cannot be taught from the NIV, our people should be made aware of the dangers of this Romanized Bible being foisted upon them. p. 4, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

It is time our members studied for themselves the history of the English Bible, and its many modern versions. If we are to adopt the NIV as a standard for use in the pulpit and in our schools, then we might as well give up being Seventh-day Adventists and join the ecumenical movement back to Rome. This is not an idle statement. Just a real, honest bit of study will soon reveal how the enemy has crept within our ranks. p. 4, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

At the time *OUR AUTHORIZED BIBLE VINDICATED* was published,

the NIV had not come on the scene. Wilkinson's main concern was with the Revised Version and the American Revision, both springing from the works of Westcott and Hort (on the RV). All modern versions also have taken their basis from the Westcott-Hort Greek Text. It is time we re-examined their sources and reasoning. Our very denomination is at stake! p. 4, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

CONTENTS. p. 5, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

BLANK PAGE. p. 6, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

INTRODUCTION. I wish first of all to thank the committee for giving me more time than first was contemplated, in order that I should not have to work under too heavy pressure. I appreciate this very much and wish to take occasion to thank you. p. 7, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Perhaps a number of my hearers may think that this matter is receiving too much attention; to them it may appear like much ado about nothing. To all who may feel this way, I will say that if they will do me the honour to follow me

attentively, I shall attempt to show them that it is of great importance. p. 7, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

I trust that in all that I shall say on the subject, I shall avoid all unkindness, and if I say some things which have that appearance, I hope that you will forgive me and remember that it was my intention to be charitable and kind. p. 7, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

In the process of vindicating a matter, it is proper and obligatory, -- if you would vindicate successfully -- to not only state and quote those things that vindicate, but also it may be equally necessary to take away the foundations of opponents. Those who wrote this document -- my Reviewers -- took exception to my use of Dr. Hemphill, saying that I used only those statements from him which corroborated my viewpoint. As I was not reviewing Hemphill, but simply gathering from him such facts as I needed, I was under no obligation to quote also the opposite side. But those who wrote the document, to which I now reply, were under obligation, since they called it a *review,* to be impartial and to present the good and strong side of my arguments as well as those phrases which seemed to them to be weak. This they notably failed to do. p. 7, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Their document purports to be a review, not a reply. They should, therefore, have reviewed all my chapters and leading points; but they did not. Therefore, their document is not a review, it is a reply; yet not a fair, square reply; it is notably an attempt to refute such parts of my book as they consider weak; it is a defense of the Revisers, and an exaltation of the RV and a disparagement of the AV. (Authorized Version) p. 7, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

They completely ignored many of my main lines of argument, as follows: p. 7, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

1. They failed in this document to examine, much less to justify the apostate, Romanizing, and Unitarian character of Westcott and Hort, leading English Revisers. p. 7, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

2. They likewise failed even to notice, much less to answer, the grave charges my book brought against Dr. Philip Schaff, President of both American Revision Committees, and his great Romanizing influence over

American Theological colleges. p. 7, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

3. Their document, likewise, ignored and failed to meet the argument drawn from the Oxford movement which Jesuitized England, revised her Protestant prayer book and articles of faith, and created the men and measures which could produce the Revised Version. p. 8, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

4. They failed to notice or to meet the arguments drawn from the Council of Trent, which voted as its first four articles: (1) Establishing tradition; (2) Establishing the Apocryphal books; (3) Putting the Vulgate on its feet; (4) Taking the interpretation of the Bible out of the hands of the laity -- all of which split the world into Protestantism and Catholicism. p. 8, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

5. They failed to meet the indisputable testimony which I brought forth from Catholic scholars, that in the Revised Version were restored the Catholic readings denounced in Reformation and post-Reformation times. p. 8, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

6. They made no attempt to handle the argument drawn from the chapter, "The Reformers Reject the Bible of the Papacy". p. 8, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

7. They failed completely to meet, or even to notice, the tremendous argument drawn from the great struggle over the Jesuit Bible of 1582. p. 8, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

8. They paid absolutely no attention to my chapter, "Three Hundred Years of Attack on the King James Version", which showed the monumental work done by Jesuits, higher critics, and pantheistic German scholars in undermining the Inspired bases laid by the prophets of God for His divine Word, laid so that all men could see that the miracle of preservation was as great as the miracle of inspiration. Those higher critics substituted for these bases their subtle pantheistic, Romanizing, Unitarianistic, figments of imagination under the dignified title of "critical intuition". p. 8, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

With regard to the charge that my book "was published at disregard of General Conference counsel, and over the plea of the executive officers that agitation of this question should cease", I will say: Perhaps the brethren listening

to me know something that I do not know. But I can honestly state that the only thing in the nature of General Conference which came to me, was a copy of the letter written by Elder Spicer, then President of the General Conference, November 18, 1928, jointly to Elders Robbins, Hamilton, Martin, Prescott and myself. But if my Reviewers intended to be fair, frank, and impartial, why did they not call attention to others who published the other side of the question after the letter was written by Elder Spicer? p. 8, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Elder Spicer made it clear in his letter that there was no official action back of it, and that he was only writing it unofficially. In that letter he stated: "that this denomination, by years of usage, has taken on position on the comparative merits of the Bible translations". However, when proper protest was made from the field against publishing the articles in the "Signs of the Times", and reference was made to an article in the "Ministry" and one previously printed in the "Signs of the Times", at that time Elder Spicer, President of the General Conference, turned to Elder Robbins and said, p. 8, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Then let Elder Wilkinson write his side of the question." p. 8, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

The Reviewers refer to the "hidden identity of the printers". Perhaps they tried to convey to your minds that there was intent to cover or hide the real printer. If this has any bearing on the subject, I am glad to give the information that the printer, since he was not the publisher, did not want to be troubled with re-mailing to me orders sent to his address, and for that reason preferred not to print the name of the firm in the book. p. 9, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

With reference to using my official title in my book: I simply followed the custom of nearly 100 per cent of all writers; and the title page of millions of books will testify to this fact. But if you wish to be frank, fair, just and impartial, you must give me as much freedom as you did to the book entitled, "The World's Best Book" (W. P. Pearce), published by one of our large published by one of our large publishing houses, which in its ultimate, is a plea for the American Revised Version. This book would likewise, be regarded as setting forth the denominational

views on this subject; and much more than a book privately printed with the author's official position on the title page. That book went far astray in expressing denominational views. Then on what grounds of justice and equity do my Reviewers bring up this point? If that publishing house had the liberty to present their side of this question without censure, why should I not have the same liberty? p. 9, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Under the title of violating primal laws of evidence, my Reviewers produced three counts: p. 9, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

(1) That my first quotation is from a journal which has since been merged into another; (2) That I started out on my research for evidence with a bias (3) And that I took statements out of their settings. p. 9, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

1. I considered the charge that I was guilty because I quoted from a journal which has since been merged into another journal too unacceptable to be either made or to be answered. My first quotation in the book, "Our Authorized Bible Vindicated", was taken from a journal of first rate standing, which has since changed its name. Anyone who would trouble himself to go to the Congressional Library could obtain a bound copy of this journal. Here it is with my quotation in it. (At this point, Elder Wilkinson held up a large bound volume.) p. 9, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

2. I am further charged with being guilty of violating the primal laws of evidence because I sought available facts from reliable sources with a bias, I plead guilty to this charge. I did seek for available and reliable evidence with a Christian, a Protestant, and with even a Seventh-day Adventist bias. p. 9, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

I started out with a bias created in me by the statements of the Spirit of Prophecy. What may be the bias of my Reviewers we shall attempt to discover in the following pages. p. 10, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

3. I am further charged with violating the primal laws of evidence by taking statements out of their setting. This charge I will immediately attempt to answer in Section I. p. 10, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

To vindicate the Authorized Version it is not enough to

tell its wonderful history and great merits, but to make the vindication complete, one must also give the history and character of other versions which try to overthrow its authority. My book has covered these grounds and has thus lived up to its name, "Our Authorized Bible Vindicated." p. 10, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

SECTION I -- MISTAKES BY MY REVIEWERS IN IMPORTANT QUOTATIONS. p. 11, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers have accused me of "frequent misuse and misquotation of authorities"; and of me they say, he "includes only a part of a sentence or paragraph that suits his one-sided argument". (Section II, page 16). They further accuse me of "ignoring the context" and also of unfair deduction from the quotations". (I, page 17). And particularly they hold me up the public gaze as "even splitting paragraphs and often sentences so as to omit what would nullify 'my' purpose if left in". (Conclusion --2) p. 11, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

I now wish to submit to this body, who heard these charges against me read in your ears, how my Reviewers have handled *their* material. I will submit some facts drawn from their document which will speak for themselves. We will then see whether I am guilty of these charges, and we shall see how they stand. He who brings another into court of equity must himself have clean hands. p. 11, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Before giving example #1, notice the Reviewers partiality against Erasmus. They begin their discussion of MSS in general with four counts against Erasmus, which, of course, hits the Authorized and seven counts in favor of the Revisers, which, of course, exalts the Revised. Let me quote one sentence from Section II, page 3. "That is, was not textual work of *Catholic Erasmus,* working *single-handed* in the *sixteenth century,* with a *small number of MSS"* available, as *accurate and reliable* as that of "37" of the *best Protestant scholars* in England and America, working for *ten years* with *4000 MSS* available to check and compare?" p. 11, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Against Erasmus: (1) Catholic (2) single-handed (3) 16th century (4) small number of MSS. p. 11, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

For Revisers: (1) accurate and reliable (2) 37 (3) best

(4) Protestant (5) scholars (6) ten years (7) 4000 MSS available. p. 11, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO, I: On page 3, Section II of their document, my Reviewers read to you these words: p. 11, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"Again, the author has much to say in defense of the meager MSS used by Erasmus. He seriously overstates himself when, admitting that Erasmus 'used only a few,' he exclaims, 'What matters?... If the few Erasmus used were typical... did he not, with all the problems before him arrive at practically the same results which only could be arrived at today by fair and comprehensive investigation?' (page 54)." p. 11, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Now, brethren, notice that there are two sets of dots here to show that twice something was omitted in their quoting from my book. Why were those two portions omitted? The parts omitted would nullify their argument. if left in. Their opening quotation from my book in this connection consists of only four words, *used only a few.* In the sentence from which these four words are taken, there are 18 words in the whole sentence, and they quote only four, *"used only a few."* If they had quoted the other fourteen words of the sentence, the complete sentence would utterly have demolished the proposition they endeavor to make you believe, and would have shown that I said a very different thing from the impression given by the four words they quoted. p. 11, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Now listen to the complete sentence they should have quoted, the full 18 words. They read as follows: p. 12, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

***"There were hundreds of manuscripts for Erasmus to examine, and he did;* but he *used* only a few." p. 12, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].**

Also, I want you to notice what they left out in the place indicated by the first three dots, and what was left out in the place of the second three dots. Here is the complete quotation. p. 12, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"What matters? *The vast bulk of manuscripts in Greek are practically all the Received Text."* (This is the first sentence they left out). *"that is, after he had thoroughly*

balanced the evidence of many and used a few which displayed that balance, **did he not, with all the problems before him, arrive at practically the same result which only could be arrived at today by a fair and comprehensive investigation?" p. 12, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].**

They omit the first 14 words of a sentence, quote the last four; then quote 2 words; leave out 13; quote 7, omit 19, and quote 28. p. 12, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

In view of the full quotations they should have drawn from my book, now notice what they go on to make me say. They make me represent, p. 12, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"Catholic Erasmus working single-handed in the 16th century, with a *small number of MSS available."* p. 12, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

So whereas, I said that there were hundreds of MSS available, and I stated that Erasmus examined them and had balanced the evidence of many, they make me say that only a small number of manuscripts were available. I said the very opposite. p. 12, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

I respectfully submit that my Reviewers here have spilt sentences, so as to entirely contradict the thought of the writer; that is, they have done exactly what they accused me of doing. p. 12, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 2: I am accused of "untrustworthy manipulation". This is a serious charge. Who of you would like to stand up here and be accused of "untrustworthy manipulation". My Reviewers say that they will give "four" typical examples of this. We shall examine all four. p. 12, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Would you be surprised to learn that in the first example I bring before you, their argument (charge against me) was based upon their using a wrong footnote. Must I be pilloried because the eyes of my Reviewers, who are great sticklers for accuracy, wandered to a wrong footnote? p. 12, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

On page 22, Section I, of their document, my Reviewers bring to our attention footnote No. 36 of my book, (page 171) which was a reference to Dr. Salmon's book, "Some criticism, page 11, 12. Then on the next page of their

document, they represent me as quoting "from the same citation" that is, from Dr. Salmon, concerning Westcott and Hort's Greek N.T. being, "portion by portion secretly committed into the hands of the Revision Committee". Now, the truth is, that my footnote on "secretly committed into the hands of the Revision Committee" was not number 36, but was number 35, and refers not to Dr. Salmon at all, but to Dr. Ellicott's book, Addresses, etc." page 118. Therefore their gratuitous observation on my "untrustworthy manipulation" of Dr. Salmon falls to the ground; because I was not talking about Dr. Salmon, I was talking about Dr. Ellicott. It would be well the next time before they accuse a writer of "untrustworthy manipulation" on the basis of a footnote, to be sure they have the right footnote, and thus obviate a false accusation as well as a mistake on their own part. p. 12, Para. 12, [ANSWERS].

But as to the fact that Westcott and Hort's Greek Text was "secretly committed" and "in advance" I will now quote from three authorities. p. 13, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"Just five days before, -- under the editorship of Drs. Westcott and Hort, (Revisionists themselves,) -- had appeared the most extravagant Text which has seen the light since the invention of printing. No secret was made of the fact that *under pledges of strictest secrecy,* a copy of this wild performance (marked "confidential") had been intrusted to every member of the Revising Body." Burgon, "Revision revised", page 364. p. 13, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"But it is certain that the edition and the textual theories of Drs. Westcott and Hort, which were communicated to the Revisers in advance of the publication of their volumes, had a great influence on the text ultimately adopted, while very many of their readings which were not admitted into the text of the Revised Version, yet find a place in the margin." Kenyon, "Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts," page 239. p. 13, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"A fifth blunder was the secret sessions. There was no attempt to conciliate the public. No samples of the work were sent out for examination and criticism. The public was compelled to receive what the Revisers thought best to give them. Similar secrecy was maintained as to the Greek text which had been adopted. The Westcott and Hort text, which was confidentially laid before the Revisers, was not published until five days before the revision was issued."

Wm. Evarets. "Bibliotheca Sacra," January 1921. p. 13, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

What then becomes of the argument they tried to make against the fact that the Westcott and Hort Greek N.T. was secretly committed in advance to the Revisers? This argument against me they draw from a wrong footnote. I submit that the authority of a document based on the inexcusable mistakes of my Reviewers is a decidedly minus quantity. p. 13, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 3: We will now consider a worse case, Under this same first count of "untrustworthy manipulation" my Reviewers felt justified in pressing this charge against me because their eyes were holden and they did not see the point Dr. Salmon was making. p. 13, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

At the bottom of page 21, Section I, they quote, as they turn to page 22, what I said of Westcott and Hort's Greek Text, that it was strongly "radical and revolutionary". My footnote, number 36, refers this time not to Ellicott's book, but to Salmon. p. 13, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers turned to read Salmon, and at once issued forth with the statement that the expression "radical and revolutionary" had been wrongly applied. They claim that instead of Salmon indicating that Westcott and Hort were "radical and revolutionary" in an unrelated sense, Salmon really "states that their 'radical and revolutionary' attitude was in increased carefulness and conservatism as compared with Lachmann, who preceded them." Salmon did not say this. In fact he said precisely the opposite. In the first place he never used the expression "increased carefulness and conservatism". Neither did he express the thought, even if he did not use those words. My Reviewers state that Dr. Salmon "pays remarkable tribute to the trustworthy scholarship and conservatism" of Westcott and Hort. The tribute which Salmon pays to Westcott and Hort he clearly indicates as belonging to them BEFORE they brought out their Greek N.T. and so, since they had this previous reputation, Salmon exclaims: p. 14, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"It was all the more surprising, when these critics, who, with regard to the authority of the books, proved to be in respect to the criticism of the text, strongly radical and revolutionary." p. 14, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

In other words, the reputation of Westcott and Hort for conservatism previous to the publication of their Greek text was overthrown when they published their New Testament Greek text. I now quote the passage in full from Salmon's "Some Criticism", pp. 10, 11; p. 14, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"If the leaders of the Cambridge school deserved the gratitude of church men who knew them only by their published works, much more was due to them from those who came within range of their personal influence. By their honesty, sincerity, piety, zeal, and the absence of all self-seeking, they gained the love, as well as the admiration of successive generations of students; and it is hard to say whether they benefited the church more by their own works or by the learned scholars whom they trained, and who possibly may still outdo the performance of their masters. Surely these were men to whom the most timidly conservative of theologians might have trusted the work of textual revision in full confidence that its results would be such as they would gladly accept. *So it was all the more surprising when these* critics, who with *regard to the authority of the books,* belonging to the conservative school, *proved to be, in respect of the criticism of the Text, strongly radical and revolutionary.* Authorities which Lachmann had admitted into his scanty list were depressed to an inferior place; readings which Tischendorf had received into his text which bracketed or removed altogether. Possibly it may be found on investigation that the strict orthodoxy of the Reviewers had something to do with the stringency of their conditions for admission into their text." (Emphasis mine) p. 14, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Nevertheless, with regard to the authority of the books they were loose. The Revision Committee announced that they would translate the Apocrypha. p. 14, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"Another suspicious circumstance was the declaration that the Apocrypha would be included in the Revision. The exclusion of the Apocrypha from all issues of the British and Foreign Bible Society had been in force for nearly fifty years. This was a reactionary move, which was sure to arouse the opposition of all who were devoted to the circulation of an unadulterated Bible." "Bibliotheca Sacra" January 1921. p. 14, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

The only redeeming feature which Dr. Salmon can see, in this quotation, in Westcott and Hort, is this, -- namely,

that, being churchmen, they were limited. The whole tenor of Dr. Salmon's book is a condemnation of the theories of Westcott and Hort and of their Greek N.T. which was like the Greek Text of the Revisers from which the Revised Version was translated. If you do not believe it, read Salmon's book. I will quote to show how indignant Dr. Salmon was on the stringency or narrowness of Dr. Hort: p. 15, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"But if we desire to solve the literary problem determining what readings can claim to have belonged to the earliest form of the gospels, it does not seem that success is likely to be attained if we begin by setting aside half of the witnesses. Hort's method of casting aside Western readings as worthless has certainly the advantage of much simplifying the problem; but it reminds me too strongly of the Irish juryman who, after he had heard counsel on one side, decided that it only perplexed his judgment to listen to what the other side had to say. When we have rejected the 'Syrian witnesses, that is to say the overwhelming majority of all the less ancient MSS, and all the Western witnesses, that is to say, a majority of all ancient ones, we find criticism made very easy. We have follow B, (Vatican MS), and are only embarrassed when that MS fails us, or in the rare cases where its readings are clearly inadmissible." Salmon, "Some Criticism", pp. 130, 131. p. 15, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Anyone who knows anything about Dr. Salmon's opinion of Westcott and Hort's theories would never attempt to make him say what my Reviewers claim he meant. p. 15, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

To further substantiate the matter I will here bring up what Dr. Hemphill says of Salmon's "Criticism". You will then understand the expression of Dr. Salmon, whose meaning my Reviewers failed to grasp, and upon such failure peremptorily charged me with "untrustworthy manipulation". Note the high rating given Dr. Salmon, who held the Reviewers and their theory of MSS as unworthy of confidence: p. 15, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"Simultaneously with this republication of Westcott's defence of the Revised Version appeared a truly merciless dissection of his and Hort's textual theories, by Dr. George Salmon, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. This book caused quite a flutter of excitement amongst the

scholars who had too hastily and unthinkingly adopted the fascinating, but gossamer theories of the Cambridge Dons. The writer, having long been one of the foremost theologians of the world, and being perhaps superior in reasoning powers to any of the Revisers, touched weak points in those theories which he had long noticed, and the knowledge of which he did not wish to carry unspoken to his grave. He doubted the finality of Hort's work, and plead for 'a new trial by well-qualified judges'. He objected to the 'whole tone and method' of the two editors, as being, 'that of teachers instructing disciples,' who in too many cases seemed to adopt the motto 'Rest and be thankful! Speaking of the Horatian theory of a Syrian recension, he thinks it was hit upon by 'scientific divination', and was only 'a probably hypothesis' which Hort had been obliged to 'shore up' by a new hypothesis, that the Peshitto was a revised form of a Curetonian Syriac. On the 'voluntary poverty' of Dr. Hort, in his disregard of vast masses of documentary evidence, the Provost quaintly remarks: 'I had thought of comparing this successful elimination of untrustworthy witnesses to the process by which Gideon weeded out his army of the soldiers on whom he could not rely; but even Gideon's reduced army is too large to represent the forces on which WH depend. I ought rather to have thought of the victory won by Jonathan and his armour bearer;' with a sly glance at B (Vaticanus) and Aleph (Sinaiticus)! Then, alluding to Dr. Hort's opinion, that 'it is not safe to reject B' even where it stands alone, he remarks, 'At present I will only say I believe it to be far too extreme a rule to lay down that in the admission of a verse into the New Testament text a single black bean shall exclude.'" Hemphill, "History of Revised Version, pp. 130, 131. p. 15, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Surely this shows very plainly Dr. Salmon's opinion of Westcott and Hort and their revision, and that my Reviewers wholly misunderstand him, and that their charges against me are entirely without foundation. If they had carefully read the entire quotation they could not have made the bitter and unjust charges against me. p. 16, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 4: My Reviewers again produce a second example upon which to charge me with "untrustworthy manipulation". As in the three previous instances, again they failed. They fail here, not because they caught a wrong footnote as in the first instance, nor because they did not seize the idea of the writer, as in the second instance, but because they

failed to read on to the end of the paragraph they were quoting. If they had, they would never have made Bishop Westcott, the author, discuss a subject he was not discussing, and so would have been able to charge me with "untrustworthy manipulation". p. 16, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

I will now re-quote a portion of the quotation they used from Bishop Westcott's "Some Lessons", pages 184-185. I had pointed out in my book that Bishop Westcott was claiming that the Revised Version, by repeated changes, affected the articles of faith. These are my Reviewer's words; "Surely there is a fundamental difference between a deliberate attempt to alter articles of faith, as alleged, and the full effect of repetition that strengthens and supports faith." (Section I, page 24). Please listen now to what Bishop Westcott says: p. 16, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"The illustrations of the work of Revision, hitherto given, have been taken for the most part from isolated words and phrases. Such changes as have been noticed unquestionably increase the vividness and the force of the verse. They enable the English reader to weigh the significance of identity and differences in the parallel passages of the N.T. with a confidence which was before impossible. But the value of the Revision is most clearly seen when the student considers together a considerable group of passages, which bear upon *some article of Faith.* The accumulation of small details then produces the full effect. Points on which it might seemed pedantic to insist in a single passage become impressive by repetition, "Westcott's, "Some Lessons, pp. 184-5. p. 16, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

And now I will quote the rest of this paragraph which Reviewers left out, but before doing so, please notice even in what I have quoted, the Bishop said *"article of Faith",* and not *"faith in general";* for let me state here the Creed of the Church of England is contained in the Thirty-nine Articles of Faith. If that is not a change of doctrine, what is? I now quote the rest of the Bishop's words: p. 17, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"I wish, therefore, now to call attention to some places in which the close rendering in the original Greek in the Revised Version appears to suggest ideas of creation and life and providence, of the course and end of finite being, and of the Person of the Lord, who is the source of all

truth and hope, which are of the deepest interest at the present time." Westcott, "Some Lessons", page 185. p. 17, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Are (1) "creation," (2) "life", (3) "providence", (4) "course and end of finite being", (5) "the Person of the Lord" articles of faith, or faith in general? p. 17, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

What could be the Reviewers' purpose in charging me with "untrustworthy manipulation" by substituting a subject which Westcott did not use for one which he did use; by making him say that revision affected "faith" in general and not "Articles of Faith"? And, in passing, let me press home again the evidence as found in the words of this dominating Reviser, that the Revised Version of the Bible, by repetitive details, made changes affecting doctrines of great and serious import. Thus the three charges of "untrustworthy manipulation" made against my book are seen to be based wholly on the mistakes of the Reviewers. p. 17, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 5: The mistakes of my Reviewers in the next example I now cite, (Section I, page 24) was not because they seized a wrong footnote, but because they substituted another subject of the verb, in the sentence they criticized, for the subject I used. p. 17, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

They called attention to my statement (page 248 in my book) "The Spirit of the Revisionists on both sides of the ocean was an effort to find the Word of God by the study of comparative religions." p. 17, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

They take exception to my referring, on this occasion, to G. F. Nolloth's book, "The Person of Our Lord" because they say that Nolloth makes "absolutely no reference to the Revisionists and their work". In the first place, what I did say was, "The Spirit of the Revisionists". I made no claim that Nolloth mentions the Revisionists by name; and in the second place, to the work of whom could Nolloth be referring when he said, "The other is the critical study of the original Christian documents?" Was not *that* the work of the Revisionists on both sides of the ocean? Is this then an "untrustworthy manipulation" as they claim? p. 17, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Since these three examples of their charges against me of "untrustworthy manipulation" are based upon their mistaken appreciation of the facts I have used, I ask to be exonerated. What kind of verdict should be laid at 'their' door I leave my hearers to decide. p. 18, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

As to their fourth and last example of "untrustworthy manipulation", that concerns my quotation from the Catholic Encyclopedia on the relation of Origen and the Vatican MSS. I will leave this until I treat the larger problem they raised concerning Origen's Hexapla and the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. This also will give us some interesting yields. p. 18, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 6: In order to make me appear as having no real foundation to claim that Westcott and Hort were dominating mentalities on the Revision Committee, my Reviewers use a quotation from Scrivener. (Section I, 18, 19) They say that it is enlightening to note that Scrivener, who was recognized by the author as an outstanding scholar, and who in general opposed the textual criticism of Westcott and Hort, testifies that the influence of these men over the text adopted by the Revisionists was "by no means a preponderating one". p. 18, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

In replying I will call attention to the fact that my Reviewers have often used Hemphill, in fact they lead us to believe (in Section I, page 4) that they had read Hemphill's book thoroughly. If so, their mistake is all the greater. Hemphill takes up at length what Scrivener meant when he made the statement concerning the "preponderating influence" of Westcott and Hort. Hemphill shows that Scrivener was talking about the *text,* but when the *margin* of the Revised Version is taken into account, then Scrivener meant that Westcott and Hort did have a preponderating influence. Hemphill says: p. 18, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"The third edition of Scrivener's 'Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament' came out in the summer of 1883, and it takes full account of Westcott and Hort's theories. Scrivener, as has been already stated, dissents *intoto* from these, holding that they have their foundations 'laid on the sands ground of ingenious conjecture'; but, while he admits that the Cambridge Professors 'had a real

influence' in their deliberations of the Revision Company he thinks that 'a comparison of their text with that adopted by the Revisionists might easily have shown' that the influence was 'by no means a preponderating one'. It is noteworthy, however, that Scrivener, in thus writing about the *Text,* says nothing about the *Margin* of the Revised Version. The truth is that, mainly through his own vigilance, entrance into the *text* of the Revised Version was denied to many of Westcott and Hort's readings, and that these had as it were, to take a back seat in the margin. So that if we regard the margin as distinct and separable from the body of the work, as being in fact *an (?) for rejected readings* and contemplate its elimination from the Revised Version in the future, we can understand the drift of Dr. Scrivener's evidently carefully balanced words. p. 18, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"In his twelfth chapter he gives us a series of critical discussions on some controverted passages, and it is from the instances recorded in that chapter and in the Appendix and the tenth chapter that we can best learn *the manner in which the critical battle in the Jerusalem Chamber surged to and fro between Scrivener and his antagonist.* A full knowledge of Dr. Scrivener's third edition is therefore a necessary equipment for one who would rightly appreciate the true questions at issue." Samuel Hemphill, "History of the Revised Version", pp. 120, 121. p. 18, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers, as you see, simply do not understand Scrivener because they have not sufficiently studied his position and the work of the Revisionists. People who make such charges against me ought to be better informed and they will escape the embarrassment which the facts force upon them. p. 19, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

You will thus see that Scrivener is "talking about the text of the Revised Version", not about the margin or about the work as a whole. He indicates that he fought with all his powers, and with tremendous persistence to keep Westcott and Hort from mutilating the text. In this he held them down to some extent. But though he was able to keep them from doing all they wanted to the text, he was obliged to submit when it came to putting it in the margin. Therefore, Scrivener's idea was like that of most other writers, that the influence of Westcott and Hort on the Revised Version as a whole was a "preponderating

influence." Why did not my Reviewers in this instance tell the whole truth? p. 19, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Let me refer back to what I have already quoted (Section I, page 4) from Kenyon to this effect. p. 19, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Further, when my Reviewers took exceptions to my use of Salmon on the expression "radical and revolutionary" if they had turned the page they would have found this statement about Westcott and Hort's dominating influence: p. 19, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"Westcott and Hort were members of the Committee which prepared the Revised Version, and on the question of various readings they exercised a dominating influence." Dr. G. Salmon, "Some Criticism", page 12. (Emphasis mine) p. 19, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Dr. Frederick Field who became famous because of his life long work on the Greek O.T. wrote a letter to Dr. Philip Schaff to say that the Revised Version was a failure because the N.T. Revision Committee isolated itself and was dominated by three or four leading minds. (Schaff's Companion" page IX) p. 19, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

A word from Burgon on this: "I pointed out that 'the New Greek text', which, in defiance of their instructions, the Revisionists of 'the Authorized English Version' had been so ill-advised as to spend ten years in elaborating, was a wholly untrustworthy performance; was full of the gravest errors from beginning to end... I traced the mischief home to its true authors, Drs. Westcott and Hort; a copy of whose unpublished Text of the N.T. (the most vicious in existence) had been confidentially, *and under pledges of strictest secrecy,* placed in the hands of every member of the Revising Body. I called attention to the fact that, unacquainted with the difficult and delicate science of textual criticism, the Revisionists had, in an evil hour, surrendered themselves to Dr. Hort's guidance." Burgon, "Revision Revised", Preface, pp. XI, XII. (Emphasis mine). p. 19, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

I quote also Hemphill's testimony: "Yet here we find, on the Chairman's own admission, that in no fewer than sixty-four instances the Revisers outdistanced Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles in their revolt from the

traditional text" (This is what Salmon meant by "radical and revolutionary", B.G.W); "and that, in those identical sixty-four instances, Westcott and Hort, their fellow-workers, had previously done preciously the same on the proof sheets which they had communicated to the Company. *Surely this amounts to almost a demonstration that the Revisers were* following the guidance of the Cambridge editors, who were constantly at their elbow and whose edition, still in embryo, contained these sixty-four new departures." Hemphill, "History of the Revised Version", page 53 (Emphasis mine) p. 20, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Why did not my Reviewers in this instance tell you the whole truth? Why did they not cite Scrivener in this instance as referring to the text only? Why therefore, insist that my previous statement is correct that Drs. Westcott and Hort exercised upon the Revised Version, a deciding influence. Is any more needed to prove that my statement was entirely correct? p. 20, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 7: (Review Sec. I, pp. 18, 19) As in the preceding instance, so now we find that my Reviewers endeavor to make Scrivener testify to some extent before he died against the Received Text. The author they refer to does not say what they make him say. My Reviewers claim that he did not tell that the Received Text could not be supported unconditionally as he once taught." For their authority they refer to Caspar Rene Gregory, "Canon and Text", page 462. In referring to Gregory they left out the word "so" and if they had read a little further on, they would have seen what Gregory meant by "so". I will give the quotation from Gregory: p. 20, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"Scrivener came to see before he passed away that the Received Text could not be supported 'so' unconditionally as he once thought. But he expressed himself less distinctly in public, moved I think, largely by a kind consideration for his friend and staunch adherent, John William Burgon, whose devotion to that text scarcely knew any bounds. Burgon did a great deal of work in searching out manuscripts, and he published a very learned treatise upon the closing verses attached to the Gospel of Mark. It was a pity that he only published his notes about manuscripts in the "Guardian Newspaper". Would that more of the clergy could be induced to work as Scrivener and Burgon worked in furthering the text of the New Testament." Gregory, "Canon and Text", page 462. (Emphasis mine.) p.

20, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Of course I did not tell you what Gregory said of Scrivener, because it was simply a private opinion of Gregory's. He has given us no authority of any kind for this opinion. On the contrary he goes on to say very distinctly that Scrivener did not let it be known publicly. Gregory thinks this is because of Scrivener's great love for Burgon. But that there is no public evidence for this opinion advanced by Gregory, is proof enough that Scrivener did not express himself publicly. Why did not my Reviewers tell us just what Gregory said, and we would have seen that this statement rested on no foundation whatever. p. 20, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 8: *Scrivener misrepresented as to the value of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.* Since it is on the basis of a quotation from Hemphill which my Reviewers give (Section I, page 19) that they try to indict my stand on the two manuscripts, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus as "silly", let us see how large a foundation they have for their conclusion. Would you be surprised to learn that their seizing the chance to use the word "silly" was based on about six lines from Hemphill, whereas, if they had read on to the bottom of the page they would have seen that Hemphill was telling another story. p. 21, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

By not giving us all the quotation, the Reviewers made two mistakes. One, they tried to make out that my aspersions on the manuscripts were silly; whereas, the quotation shows that those who think Scrivener did not know that those two manuscripts had some value, were silly. A vast difference. Second, they present Hemphill as making Scrivener hold a greater value for these two manuscripts than Hemphill was trying to do. A man may be a very good witness on the stand, but he, himself, may not be a very good man. The Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are good witnesses to the state of the Greek New Testament in the early centuries; but that do not say that in themselves they are good manuscripts or represent the original text; they may be a witness to corruptions. I will give you the full quotation to show you that it was this very point -- not whether the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus had some value, but how much value -- caused the stormy battle for ten years around the Revision table: p. 21, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

***"Not* that Scrivener was prepared to give an unqualified**

support to the Traditional Text, or blind to the value of the great Vatican and Sinaitic Manuscripts. Indeed no one who has read his 'Introduction', much less his 'Collation of the Sinaitic Manuscript', can make so silly an assertion. But, while, he had been taught, by the actual work of collation, to use those MSS *as only two of many* helps to the reconstruction of the primitive text, Hort and Westcott had persuaded themselves to regard their consentient voice as the one virtually final and infallible authority. And, seeing that their consentient voice differed from the Traditional Text in thousands of places, it is easy to perceive that a pair of critics, holding that consensus to be decisive, would be in perpetual conflict with another who wished to *accord it a less exclusive supremacy.* Probably nine-tenths of the textual struggles and 'countless divisions' at the table in that old Jerusalem Chamber *were about that very question as to the proper amount of weight to be accorded to the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS., Hort and Westcott claiming pre-eminence for their consensus, while Scrivener pleaded caution."* Hemphill, "History of the Revised Version", pp. 55, 56. (Emphasis mine) p. 21, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Why did not my Reviewers read on to the end of the paragraph; then they would have understood what Hemphill said about Scrivener and would have saved themselves the trouble of making this mistake. Moreover, Scrivener himself says in his "Introduction" Vol. II, page 283; p. 22, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"We have no right to regard Codex B, as a second Infallible Voice proceeding from the Vatican, which, when it has once spoken, must put an end to all strife.' p. 22, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 9: Misstatements about Erasmus and his Vulgate (I have still another mishandling of Scrivener. But to rest your minds a few minutes on him, we will go back to Erasmus) p. 22, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

In order to make the Textus Receptus of Erasmus a Catholic Text, my Reviewers give among other evidence this statement about Erasmus, (Section II, page 1). p. 22, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"His own Bible was the Catholic Vulgate, both before and after he issued his Greek New Testament, and he printed the

Vulgate along with his Greek Testament in the second edition." p. 22, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Erasmus put out five editions. The fifth edition has no Vulgate, but the fourth edition showed what Erasmus was aiming at. It contained not two but three columns. The three columns contained (1) his Greek New Testament, (2) the Catholic Vulgate, and (3) the Catholic Vulgate revised by Erasmus. How then can my Reviewers claim that the Catholic Vulgate was Erasmus' own Bible "both before and after he issued his Greek Testament" which would take in all editions? p. 22, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

I could quote from many authors in support of the fact that I am presenting, but, to spare you, I will give only this one from Dr. Edward Miller: p. 22, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"A fourth edition exhibited the text in three parallel columns the Greek, the Latin Vulgate, and a recension of the Latter by Erasmus." Miller, "Textual Guide", page 9. (Read also Great Controversy, page 245) p. 22, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

In other words the Vulgate not only contained spurious books; not only contained spurious readings in the genuine books, but it also contained papal translations of the genuine readings. Erasmus brought out a revised Catholic Vulgate. I ask my hearers if the Vulgate, *revised* by Erasmus after he was overwhelming convinced that his Greek Textus Receptus was the original New Testament, was not really Erasmus' idea of a true Vulgate? Did the Reviewers know that the terrible storm which broke from all over Europe on the head of Erasmus came, not because he had published the Greek Textus Receptus, but because he had revised the Catholic Vulgate? This statement of my Reviewers is consequently misleading. Why did they not put the whole case and the true case before us? They would then have been without a case against me. p. 22, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 10: (Section II, pp. 11, 12) In this example we will present how my Reviewers have again misrepresented the thought of Scrivener by snatching only a part of what Scrivener said in quoting from him. They charge me with making an unsupported statement, when I indicated the corrupt nature of the Vatican Manuscript, its uncertain

history, and suspicious character. The part of the sentence which they pick out for emphasis and quote from reads: p. 22, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

"We accord to Codex B (the Vatican Manuscript) at least as much weight as to any single document in existence." (Sec. II, page 11). p. 23, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

This part of a sentence they used, endeavoring to make you see something in it which was not there. Notice that they omitted the introductory word, "while". Let me give you the sentence in full: p. 23, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

***"Without anticipating what must be discussed hereafter,* we may say at once, that, 'while' we accord to Codes B (Vaticanus MS) at least as much weight as to any single document in existence, we ought never to forget that it is but one out of many," etc., Scrivener, "Introduction", Vol. I, page 120. (Emphasis mine) p. 23, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].**

I will now proceed to continue the quotation from the point where they left off: p. 23, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"One marked feature, characteristic of this copy, is the great number of its omissions, which had induced Dr. Dobbin to speak of it as presenting 'an abbreviated text of the New Testament': and certainly the facts he states on this point are *startling enough.* He calculates that Codex B leaves out words or whole clauses no less than 330 times in Matt., 365 in Mark, 439 in Luke, and 357 in John, 384 in Acts, 681 in the surviving Epistles; or 2,556 times in all. That no small proportion of these are mere oversights of the scribes seems evident from the circumstance that this same scribe has repeatedly written words and clauses *twice over,* a class of mistakes which Mai and the collectors have seldom thought fit to notice, inasmuch as the false addition has not been retraced by the second hand, but *which by no means enhances an estimate* of the care employed in copying this venerable record of primitive Christianity." -- Scrivener, "Introduction", Vol. I, page 120. (Emphasis mine) p. 23, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers left off the preliminary statement -- "Without anticipating what must be discussed hereafter." What did he discuss afterwards? He showed that the Codex B (Vatican Manuscript) was punctured with 2,556 mistakes. Scrivener says these 2,556 mistakes are startling. Then he

concludes with "which by no means enhances our estimate of the care employed in copying this venerable record of primitive Christianity." So you see that Dr. Scrivener did not say at all what the Reviewers represented to you. p. 23, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 11: (Review Section II, page 15) We regret that it is necessary to call your attention to a serious misapplication of a quotation brought forth to make us believe that the Authorized Version was influenced by the Rheims of the Jesuit New Testament of 1582. My Reviewers cited a part of a quotation from Kenyon again, but they have given us only enough of the author's words, so that the idea of the author is not what they make it out to be. Kenyon, while admitting the valuelessness of the Douay Bible in interpreting Scripture, recognizes that through a systematic use of words and technical phrases, it has considerable influence in a literary way on our Authorized Version. I will now give the paragraph, on the same page, from Kenyon, which shows (1) that this influence was wholly literary, and not in any way of a doctrinal character, and (2) was transmitted not direct, but in the hands of the great defender of the Received Text, Dr. William Fulke, who exposed the corruptions of the Rheims and Douay Bible. I now quote from Kenyon: p. 23, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"The Romanist Bible had no general success, and its circulation was not large. The New Testament was reprinted thrice between 1582 and 1750; the Old Testament only once. Curiously enough, the greater part of its circulation was in the pages of a Protestant Controversialist, Fulke, who printed the Rheims and the Bishop's New Testament a *refutation by himself.* Fulke's work had a considerable popularity, and it is possibly to the wider knowledge of the Rheims Version thus produced that we owe the use made of it by the scholars who prepared the Authorized Version; to which Version, after our long and varied wanderings, we are now at last come." -- Kenyon, "Our Bible in the Ancient Manuscript", page 229. (Emphasis mine) p. 24, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers tried to make us believe in their review of my book that because of its natural goodness the Jesuit Bible of 1581 directly influences the Authorized. The quotation they use did not say this. They stopped too short. Had they gone on, the truth of the matter is, further quoting would have informed us that whatever

influence the Rheims had, was due to the familiarity with it, which had been gained through Fulke's masterly exposure of its corruptions. It is a matter of deep regret to me that my Reviewers so repeatedly have hidden from us the real unfavorable testimony which an author would present had they not stopped short with a favorable prelude. p. 24, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 12: It now becomes my duty to notice the repeated aspersions cast on me by my Reviewers on my use of the margin. I was informed by a leading brother that those who heard the review of my book went away with the impression that I had frequently quoted the margin as the text without any reference to it as the margin. This is not so. I challenge any one to find any place in my book where I used the margin in discussing texts without indicating in brackets that it was from the margin. We will now bring into relief a number of expressions found in the "review", touching this item: p. 24, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Section III, chapter 6, page 9. -- The Reviewers say of me -- "The author not very commendably substitutes in the text a reading from the marginal note, and then criticizes the result as if it were the original reading preferred by the Revisers." p. 24, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Section III, Chapter 11, page 5, -- "In this passage the author again injects the literal reading of the margin into the Scriptural text, and then criticizes it." p. 25, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Section III, chapter 11, page 8, -- "Here again the author brings the marginal reading 'maiden' into the text of the ARV and makes it read." p. 25, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Section III, chapter 12, page 4, -- "Once more the author places the marginal reading in the text, and criticizes the text as if there were no other reading." p. 25, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Review Conclusion, page 3, -- "When it serves his purpose, he disregards an alternative reading or an informative note in the margin. But when it serves his purpose, he incorporates into the text as if it were the translators' preferred reading." p. 25, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

The Revisionists themselves, place great emphasis upon the

marginal readings. In the preface of the New Testament of both Revised Versions, (Section III.) we read: p. 25, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"Many places still remain in which, for the present, it would not be safe to accept one reading to the absolute exclusion of others. In these cases we have given alternative readings in the margin, wherever they seem to be of sufficient importance or interest to deserve notice." p. 25, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

This officially published description of the margin proves its value in three different ways: First, these were to be alternative readings which could not be excluded absolutely for others; Second, there were of sufficient importance or interest to deserve notice; Third, they were put there simply "for the present"; the Revisers awaiting the day when perhaps in another revision their great importance would be seen sufficiently to have them supplant the alternative reading in the text. p. 25, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Two great differences stand out prominently between the marginal readings of the King James and the Revised. First, the marginal readings of the Authorized Version are few compared with the host of them in the margin of the Revised Version are few compared with the host of them in the margin of the Revised Version. Secondly, what few there are in the margin of the Authorized simply say in another way the same thing found in the text; while in the Revised there are hundreds of readings in the margin, many of which are opposite and contradictory to the readings in the text. p. 25, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Moreover, looking back upon the history of the selection of the Revision Committees and the instructions given to them, we see how important to this revision was the margin, both to Convocation, -- the authorizing body, -- and to the committees, -- the authorized body. p. 25, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Convocation of Canterbury, May 6, 1870, amongst others, took the following action with respect to their voting revision, Action 2. p. 25, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

"That the Revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings and such emendations as it may be found

necessary to insert in the text of the Authorized Version." p. 26, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Then a committee consisting of eight Bishops, and eight Presbyters, was appointed to take the necessary steps for carrying out the resolutions. At the first meeting of this Committee, the Bishop of Winchester, presiding, the following resolutions, among others were taken; p. 26, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

VIII-4. "That the text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating; and that when the text so adopted differs from that from which the Authorized Versions was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin." p. 26, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

IX-2. "To place all the corrections due to textual considerations on the left hand margin, and all other corrections on the right hand margin." Philip Schaff, "The Revisions of the English Version," Introduction, pp. IX, XI. p. 26, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

These resolutions, both that of Convocation, and those of the full Revising Committee, betray the fact that the margin was intended to play a big part in the Revision. However, with respect to the resolution that wherever the Greek text adopted differs from that from which the Authorized Version was made, the alteration should be indicated in the margin, it is certain that this was never carried out. In this vital matter the Revisers entirely set this provision at defiance from the very first. They never indicated in their margin the alterations that had been introduced into the Greek text. They entirely betrayed their pledge and compact, the very condition upon which they had been called into existence. Instead of that they encumbered their margin with doubts as to the *readings which after due deliberations* they had as a matter of fact retained. p. 26, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

A study of my Reviewers' document reveals the fact that the margin of the Revised Version was of great value to 'them'. While they arraigned me severely for making too much of the margin, as if in reality the margin was of little importance, behold how they fled repeatedly to the margin for refuge and clung to the horns of this alter! To illustrate: They are obliged (Sec. III, Chapter 6, page 7) to defend the mutilation of the secondary account of the

Lord's Prayer omitted here in the ARV are given in the margin." They claim the same protection elsewhere. Therefore, the Reviewers desperately defend a charge of a change of doctrine by what was done in the text by seizing the horns of the altar in the margin. p. 26, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Furthermore, God, through the 1260 years of tribulation gave to the Sacred Words of Holy Writ established usages. By the sufferings, the tortures, the death, the blood of the martyrs, God settled his Truth and gave confirmed meanings to the words of Inspiration. I protest against the margin of the Revised Version tearing down these meanings established by the Holy Ghost and by centuries of suffering. I reject the margin of Matt. 24:3 which says, "consummation of the ages" for "end of the world". Shall a fatal thrust at the established usages of words be any less a fatal thrust because it is in the margin and not in the text? Discuss these matters in commentaries, if you will, which do not pass as Inspiration; but do not give them to the people as the equivalent of Inspiration. Shall the margin be permitted to throw its unholy mantle around the ruin of words? *My Reviewers seem more interested in defending the Revisers than in defending the doctrines of our Message.* p. 26, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers did not say in so many words that I had quoted the margin as if it were the text, without indicating that it was the margin; they did say repeatedly that I used the margin as the text and criticized it as if I were criticizing the text. But they did use such strong expressions that to my knowledge certain hearers and readers got the impression that I was guilty of this deception. I deny the allegation. p. 27, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 13: (Review, Section I, page 6) False Accusation of thrusting odium upon the users of ARV. p. 27, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

I am branded as an impostor and of thrusting upon others an intolerable odium because my Reviewers failed to see they that had torn a sentence loose from its setting in my book, and out of this divorced sentence they lifted one word and substituted therefore another of entirely different meaning. Upon such procedures they base their argument. They said, "Our laity should be protected from

such imposition" and again they said, "Such a thrust places an intolerable odium upon any one who desires to quote publicly from the ARV." p. 27, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

What was the sentence which they tore loose? It is this: "Can we escape His (God's) condemnation, if we choose to exalt any version containing proved corruptions?", O.A.B.V., page 250. p. 27, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Now, brethren, of what was I talking? Read page 250 and you will see that I had just shown that the Douay Bible sanctioned both idolatry and Mariolatry. Can you sanction these things? Would you dare to exalt a version containing proved corruptions like this? Please tell me what is wrong with my position in this matter? p. 27, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Now notice how they handle this sentence. I said *"exalt"* any version containing proved corruptions. What did they say? p. 27, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

(1) "The implication of divine disapproval is placed upon all who *use* the ARV." (Section I, page 6) p. 27, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

(2) "This condemnation must logically include Sister White for she frequently *used* the Revised." (Section I, page 6) p. 27, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

(3) "A trustful laity.... is led to look askance at any one who might desire to *use* the Revised." (Section I, page 6) p. 27, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

(4) "Such a thrust places an intolerable odium on any one who desires to quote publicly from the ARV." (Section I, page 6) p. 27, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Thus four different times they have singled me out as condemning the users of the ARV when I raised the question concerning those who *exalt* any version containing proved corruptions. Is there not a great difference between "exalting" "using" and "quoting"? The Unitarian Bible was so translated as to support the Unitarian doctrine which denies the divinity of Christ. Could this denomination "exalt" this version to the level of the Authorized? p. 27, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

Nevertheless, in some passages the Unitarian Version might have a so much clearer translation, that it might be profitable for us to quote those passages. I emphatically say now that I said nothing against anyone using any version where he can find a clearer rendering of certain passages. But I do not approve of exalting those versions which contain proved corruptions. Do you? The danger is that such versions may contain grave errors which far outweigh the clearer renderings. I cast no odium whatever upon Sister White or any other person for using in this way any version they wish. p. 28, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

How can my Reviewers clear themselves when they handle this page with such a serious departure from the context, and when four times they substituted another word that was found in the quotation? Will you brethren stand for such procedure? p. 28, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Please read the Forward of my book where I recognized that all had full liberty to use or quote any passage from any version which would give a clearer rendering to *the original.* Moreover, in my little leaflet about the relationship of Sister White to Bible Versions, I agreed in her use of these. p. 28, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 14: (Section III, chapter 11, page 7) Again, by covering up marks of identification given in my book, they charge me with relying upon the quotation of a Unitarian minister to prove the damage wrought by the Revised Version in Col. 1:15, 16. This is what they say: p. 28, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"By quoting from a Unitarian minister, the author seeks to make it appear that by changing the little word 'by' in the Authorized Version to the little word 'in' in the ARV the Revisers have limited creation to 'a spiritual application to Christianity', instead of its including the material creation." p. 28, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Why did they hide the fact that this Unitarian Minister was a *Reviser?* Why have us believe that he was just an ordinary minister which sometime, somewhere delivered the testimony that I just used? If they were going to face fairly and squarely, the damaging weight of evidence of what went on in the English New Testament Committee, why did they not tell us that because of the presence of this Unitarian Minister on that Committee all England was

stirred to indignation. Why did they not tell us that the regular chairman, the silver-tongued Bishop Wilberforce, whose sympathy with the project of a remedial revision had led the public to have confidence in the attempt, was so indignant with the presence of this man, and with the practices and the pressure of liberalistic members toward a Unitarian type revision, that he never attended the meeting of the Committee? He absented himself in disgust, writing a friend, "What can be done in this most miserable business". p. 28, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Evidently disturbed by the strong evidence which this fact imposes, my Reviewers return to it again a little later, saying, "Some man's interpretation of the ARV rendering of Col. 1:15, 16 has no bearing upon its correct translation or true meaning, particularly if that interpreter is a Unitarian, who does not believe in the trinity at all." p. 28, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

But it does have very much bearing on the case; this Unitarian sat in that Committee, he exercised a strong influence; because Dr. Hort also ran all to readily in that direction, of which we have abundant testimony. When we seek to escape the damaging influence wrought upon God's sacred Word, why do they throw up a smoke screen and lead us away from the real perpetrator and from the mischievous theory which he used? The Bible did not hesitate to point out who it was that made God's Word prophecy 1260 years in sackcloth and ashes. If the damage wrought upon the Revision was nothing, as they claimed, why did the resort to concealing the facts in the case? Unless of course, they were of damaging nature? I quoted this man's testimony in my book to show the pantheistic change which had been made by the Revisers upon Col. 1:15, 16. I quoted him to show the interest and interpretation that this Reviser himself put upon this text. I said he was a Reviser; my Reviewers said he was "some man". p. 28, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Was it right for my Reviewers to cover up the marks which would identify the agents who wrought the evil upon the Revised Version, and leave you to infer that he was a stranger who had nothing to do with revision? p. 29, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 15: My Reviewers all through their document assume that they are fair and just, and that I am inaccurate and unfair. The next charge which I bring

against them is not [that] they cover damaging testimony, as in the previous case, but that they unjustly represent me as making claims [that the] Authorized Version is inerrant and perfect, and the Greek Text upon which it is built as "flawless". They say, (Section III, chapter 6, page 1): p. 29, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"To this end, attempt is made also to show that the King James Authorized Version is an inerrant, perfect translation of the only genuine, flawless Greek Text that has come down to us, the Textus Receptus". p. 29, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

They have proved that they cannot make this claim because of ignorance. They well know otherwise. In their Review (Section I, page 5) they say: p. 29, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"The comparison of the blemishes in the Authorized Version to the five scars on the resurrection body of Christ, (pages 180-181) is a travesty upon our divine Sacrifice for sin". p. 29, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

By turning to those pages indicated, one will read in my book: p. 29, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"But, they say, there are errors in the Received Text. Yes, 'plain and clear errors', as their instructions informed the Revisers. It is to the glory of the Textus Receptus that its errors are 'plain and clear'. When God showed us those errors were 'plain and clear' we recognized them as errors of copyists and therefore, like printers' errors, they can be promptly and certainly corrected. They are not errors of the Author. Man made them and man can correct them. Neither are they 'errors' which man made and only God can correct. They do not enter into the core of any question." O.A.B.V. page 180. p. 29, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

I say that my Reviewers have misrepresented me. They have represented me as standing for a theory for which I did not stand. How would any of you here like to have someone publishing that you stood for a teaching for which you did not stand, especially when you had made your position clear in print? This is not the first time that they have held me up to ridicule for presenting the Textus Receptus as the pure Greek Text of Erasmus. p. 29, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers say, (Section I, page 42): p. 30, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"Critical and cumulative evidence is presented completely, and we believe conclusively, covering the basically fallacious argument on the 'pure Greek Text of Erasmus'." p. 30, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

(Sec. II, page 4) "These facts are cited here to show the fallacy of the author's unreasonable contention that the New Testament of Erasmus was 'a pure Greek Text'." p. 30, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

(Sec. II, page 6) "The fundamental question in the matter of versions is whether the Textus Receptus... used by the translators of the AV is an absolutely correct text, as the author affirms." p. 30, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

I will show that I made it clear in my book that I did not make the contention which my Reviewers press home; and which they have brought up again and again as if they had some substantial thing to use as a weapon where I made my position clear with reference to the Received Text. I quote from page 161. p. 30, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"The friends and devotees of the King James Version Bible, naturally wished that certain retouches might be given the book which would replace words counted obsolete, bring about conformity to more modern rules of spelling and grammar and correct what they considered a few plain and clear blemishes in the Received Text, so that its bitter opponents, who made use of these minor disadvantages to discredit the whole might be answered." p. 30, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Again, on page 245, I indicate that it would be an excellent thing for certain changes to be made in the King James Version in order to bring it up to date, by my quotation from the "Herald and Presbyter" of July 16, 1924, page 10, which runs as follows: p. 30, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"The Revisers had a wonderful opportunity. They might have made a few changes and removed a few archaic expressions, and made the Authorized Version the most acceptable and beautiful and wonderful book of all time to come. But they wished ruthlessly to meddle. Some of them wanted to change the doctrine." p. 30, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Scrivener, Miller, Nolan, Burgon, Cook, Hoskier, and others, all eminent textual critics of the first rank, and outstanding defenders of the Textus Receptus, have indicated that there were plain and clear errors in the Received text which should be corrected, and that there were improvements which could be made in the English of the King James to bring it up to date. However, in my book, while I recognized this fact, I claimed that that which ought to be done was a far different thing from the ruthless work which was done by the Reviewers. Is it fair of my Reviewers to represent me as claiming that a building is perfect because I indict the men who wrecked it when they were authorized simply to repair it? p. 30, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

These questions from my book prove to you that I did not say what my Reviewers claim that I said. p. 30, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 16: I wish to take up what they call a "flagrant example". (Section I, page 28). We shall see who was guilty in this matter. In fact my Reviewers seem to be so greatly exercised over this case that they accuse me of a "deliberate perversion of fact". (Section I, page 29) I appeal to the brethren here for justice. Even suppose I had made a mistake, do you agree to have read in public, in your hearing and in my absence, a document which accuses me of a "deliberate perversion of fact"? And suppose you discover that what I said was the truth? Suppose further you learn that my Reviewers did not know what they were talking about? Then will you still stand for having me publicly charged with a "deliberate perversion of fact"? And suppose: p. 31, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

The topic under discussion is the quotation from Dr. Frederick Nolan, page 415 in his book "Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate". I made the statement in a note, page 42 of my book, that: p. 31, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"The two great families of Greek Bibles are well illustrated in the work of that outstanding scholar, Erasmus. Before he gave to the Reformation the New Testament in Greek, he divided all Greek Manuscript into two classes: those which agreed with the Received Text, and those which agreed with the Vatican manuscript." p. 31, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Now what is my "flagrant example"; what is my "deliberate perversion of fact"? Further what is my "gross carelessness" (as they say)? For in addition to the other charges, they also label me with "gross carelessness". p. 31, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

You will note that I did not quote Nolan. I referred to the page. My Reviewers, however, printed the quotation. I agree with them the quotation is correct. I will now quote it again: p. 31, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"With respect to manuscripts, it is indisputable that he (Erasmus) was acquainted with every variety which is known to us: having distributed them into two principal classes one which corresponds with the Complutensian edition, the other with the Vatican manuscript." Nolan, "inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate." page 413. p. 31, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

The deliberate perversion of fact with which they charge me is that I substituted the words "the Received Text" for the "Complutensian Edition". And then they give us the astonishing information that was never known before that the Complutensian Edition was a Roman Catholic text. Since they have recourse so often to Dr. Scrivener I will give you now a quotation from Dr. Scrivener to show you that Stunica, or the editor of the Complutensian Edition as well as Erasmus, molded the Textus Receptus. It is true that Cardinal Ximenes was the promoter of the Complutensian Bible, but the chief editor and brains of the Complutensian Edition was Stunica. Let me now quote from Dr. Scrivener: p. 31, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that the worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected, originated within one hundred years after it was composed: that Irenaeus and the African Fathers and the whole Western, with a portion of the Syrian Church, used far inferior manuscripts to those employed by 'Stunica', or Erasmus, or Stephen thirteen centuries later 'when molding the Textus Receptus." Scrivener, 'Introduction" Vol. 2, pp. 253-265. (Emphasis mine) p. 31, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

I will now quote from Dan Burgon: "And the genealogy of the written, no less than the genealogy of the Incarnate

Word, is traceable back by two distinct lines of descent, remember: for the 'Complutensian, which was printed in 1514, exhibits the Traditional Text' with the same general fidelity as the 'Erasmian,' which did not see the light till two years later." Burgon, "Revision Revised," pp. 390, 391. p. 32, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

This quotation proves that the Complutensian Text, as well as the Text of Erasmus exhibits in general lines the "traditional text", a term which Burgon uses interchangeably with the Received Text. I will give another quotation from Burgon which will bring all these points together: p. 32, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"The one great FACT which especially troubles him, (Dr. Hort), and his joint editor, (as well it may be), *is the traditional Greek* text of the New Testament Scriptures. Call this text Erasmian or Complutensian, the Text of Stephens, or Beza, or of the Elzevers, call it the 'Received' or the *Traditional Greek Text,* or whatever other name you please; the fact remains that a text has come down to us which is attested by the general consensus of ancient copies, ancient fathers, ancient versions. Our readers cannot have yet forgotten his (Dr. Hort's) virtual admission that, beyond all question the Textus Receptus is the dominant Greeco-Syrian Text of A.D. 350 to A.D. 400." Burgon, "Revision Revised," page 269. p. 32, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Where then was my "deliberate perversion of fact" in calling the Complutensian Edition the Received Text? I have quoted two outstanding text critics to prove that is 'was', but I could give you others. In face of these statements from textual critics agreeing with me that the Complutensian Edition was the Received Text, what right had those who wrote this document, to accuse me, in your hearing of a deliberate perversion of facts? Please note the word "deliberate". But I am not through with this yet. p. 32, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

They tried to make out that the Complutensian Edition was a Roman Catholic text; later that the text of Erasmus was. So then the Catholic Church gave us our Greek N.T. from which the AV was translated, did it? Do they then have the Catholic Church give us the Vaticanus, the Textus Receptus, and the Vulgate? Then the papists really were the preservers of the Bible after all? This is glorifying the

Roman Catholic Church. In my next example I will answer this charge that the Complutensian Edition was a Roman Catholic text and in my Section II, I will answer completely at length, their charge that the text of Erasmus was a Roman Catholic text. But notice that the text of Erasmus and that of the Complutensian are of the Textus Receptus type. p. 32, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Why is it that my Reviewers could copy this quotation from the learned Dr. Nolan, and never notice that he said that it was "indisputable" that Erasmus was acquainted with every variety of manuscript which is known to us? What does indisputable mean? It means it cannot be disputed. Then why do my Reviewers occupy page after page, and page after page of their document to try and make out that Erasmus knew only six or seven manuscripts. Secondly, why did they not also notice in this same quotation that Erasmus was acquainted with the Vatican Manuscript? Is it because they do not like to have the public know that when that gigantic mind of Erasmus laid the foundations of the Received Text, he knew the Vaticanus MS, and rejected it? p. 33, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Why did they not notice in this quotation that Erasmus had done exactly what I have done in my book, divided all manuscripts into two principal classes; one class with the Textus Receptus, and the other with the Vaticanus MS? They challenge my parallel streams of Bibles, I will notice that particularly later on, but for the present kindly mark it down that Erasmus had come to precisely the same conclusion. With the above incontestable evidence what becomes of the uncharitable, and unbrotherly charge of a deliberate perversion of fact, in other words, an, *intention to utter a falsehood?* p. 33, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 17: (Section I, page 29). I come back again, however, to another act of an outstanding nature in connection with their handling of a quotation from Dr. Nolan. In Dr. Nolan's quotation he said concerning Erasmus. p. 33, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"Having distributed them into two principle classes, one of which corresponds with the Complutensian Edition, the other with the Vatican manuscript." p. 33, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Did they handle this quotation fairly? I leave it to you

to judge. Listen now to what they say Erasmus did and see how it compares with what Dr. Nolan says he did. Dr. Nolan says he *"DISTRIBUTED".* My Reviewers say this: p. 33, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"It appears, then, according to the facts, as will be shown in Section II, that the *comparison* made by Erasmus was between one set of Vatican manuscripts and the great Vatican manuscript." (Section I, page 29) (Emphasis mine) p. 33, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

It looks as if the Reviewers did not know that the Complutensian New Testament was of the Textus Receptus type and thought it was a Vatican MS. p. 33, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Dr. Nolan presents "distribution"; my Reviewers present "comparison". Why did *not* my Reviewers use the word "distribute" of Dr. Nolan? Because they did not believe that the Complutensian Edition was the Received Text. That would have made perfect nonsense to say that Erasmus distributed all the varieties of manuscripts in the world into the Vatican Manuscripts on the left hand, and into the great Vatican Manuscript on the right hand. Therefore, my Reviewers substitute "comparison" for Dr. Nolan's "distribute". Was this fair? p. 33, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

I will now give another reason why my Reviewers were forced to this, what shall I call it? They claim that Stunica, in getting out the Complutensian Edition, used only manuscripts from the Vatican. You may be surprised to learn that Dr. Scrivener says that all Stunica received from the Vatican was probably only two manuscripts, and neither one of them had the New Testament: Dr. Scrivener says: p. 34, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"It has long been debated among critics, what manuscripts were used by the Complutensian editors, especially in the New Testament. Ximenes is reported to have spent four thousand ducats in the purchase of such manuscripts. Add to this that (Cardinal) Vercellone, whose services to sacred literature have been spoken of above, brought to light the fact that only two manuscripts are recorded as having been sent to the Cardinal Ximenes) from the Vatican in the first year of Leo, and neither of them (Vat. 330, 346) contained any part of the New Testament." Scrivener, "Introduction", Vol. 2, pp. 178, 179. p. 34, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

In view of the fact, then, that Cardinal Ximenes purchased most all of his manuscripts, and the two which he received from the Vatican did not contain the New Testament, why were my Reviewers so pressed in spirit to claim the Complutensian New Testament as a Catholic Edition? Why did they change the word "distribute" of Dr. Nolan into "comparison" and further why did they change "Complutensian Edition" into Vatican Manuscripts"? Simply because *they thought; they supposed; they actually did not know;* they did not comprehend what they found out, that the Complutensian Edition of the New Testament was not welded out of Vatican Manuscripts. I will now ask my hearers who have formed opinions on hearing these half dozen mistakes and misstatements on this point in this Review, to bring their conclusions and judgments back to the level of actual facts. p. 34, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 18: (Section I, page 32). I wish to present a short example of where my Reviewers made me say exactly the opposite of what you will find printed on the page they cite. On page 246 of my book, I said, p. 34, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"The new theology taught that Christianity was not "a system of truth divinely revealed, recorded in the Scriptures in a definite and a complete form for all ages," but Christianity is Christ." p. 34, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Notice what I said plainly in indicting this new pantheistic modernism which passes for Christianity on their claim that "Christianity is Christ". Mark the expression "Christianity is Christ". But in Section I, page 32 of my Reviewers' document they quote this very page (246) as an example of how perverters pour a wrong content into the words, "Christ is Christianity". The expression on page 246 of my book, and to which I object is "Christianity is Christ". They turn it completely around and say that the expression on this page is "Christ is Christianity". Is this fair? If I say "God is light", that is not saying "Light is God." How correct a conclusion could hearers of this document draw concerning my book, when the expression on the page is turned completely around? How would you like to have your fate depend upon such an example of accuracy as this? What treatment would this handling of material receive in a common court of justice of our land? p. 34, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 19: (Section III, chapter 6, page 12) Misrepresentation of Scrivener on 1 Tim. 3:16. Here again I indict my Reviewers for stopping short their quotation from Scrivener in their effort to find support for the damage which the Revised did to 1 Tim. 3:16. I here give the final words from their quotation from Dr. Scrivener upon which they reply: p. 35, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"... we must consider it probable (indeed, if we were sure of the testimony of the first-rate uncials, we might regard it as certain) that the second of our rules of Comparative Criticism must here be applied, and Theos of the more recent many yield place to (hos) of the ancient few." Scrivener "A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the N.T.", Vol. II, page 394. p. 35, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

I will now finish the quotation from Dr. Scrivener and you will see that he says the opposite from what they make him say. Wouldn't you brethren be surprised if I gave you the rest of the quotation from Dr. Scrivener and you found that Scrivener's final conclusion disagreed with my Reviewers and agree with me? Let me now finish the quotation from Dr. Scrivener: p. 35, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"Yet even then the force of the Patristic testimony remains untouched. Were we to concede to Dr. Hort's unproved hypothesis that Didymus, de Trinita abounds in what he calls Syrian readings, and that they are not rare with Gregory Myssen (Notes, page 133), the clear references of Ignatius and Hippolytus are not thus to be disposed of. I dare not pronounce *Theso* a corruption." Scrivener, "Introduction" Vol. II, pp. 394, 395. p. 35, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Following this, Dr. Miller, who edited Dr. Scrivener's work adds: p. 35, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"This decision of Dr. Scrivener would probably have been considerably strengthened in favour of 'Theos', if the above passage had been written after instead of before, the composition and appearance of Dean Burgon's elaborate and patient examination of all the evidence, which occupies seventy-seven pages in his 'Revision Revised'." Scrivener's "Introduction', page 394. p. 35, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

EXAMPLE NO. 20: (Section I, page 36) I have still another

example, in stating which, my Reviewers lay aside every weight and soar high. Two pages are devoted to revealing the uncompromising position of the author. They claim that I said that the King James Version was translated into over 800 languages. Deeply stirred on this, they write a letter to the British and Foreign Bible Society. The reply from this Society is given in full. The reply is heavily underlined. Many conclusions are drawn from it. And then as if to heap one mountain upon another, my Reviewers want to know whether I "would commission Seventh-day Adventists to bring forth their own translation in every current language and dialect in order to be in literal conformity to the 'Textus Receptus'". p. 35, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Well now, what is the cause of all this furor? Just four words in my book. After talking on the widespread translations of the King James Version, I use these four words, "One writer claims 886," (page 257). Would you like to know who this writer is? He is an outsider, not an Adventist, hired by the Pacific Press Publishing Company to write a book for the Pacific Press Publishing Company, which book the Pacific Press Publishing Company has widely advertised in certain of our publications, under the title, "The World's Best Book." Here is the quotation from the WORLD'S BEST BOOK, page 71: p. 36, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"Second, the Authorized Version has become a world book. It has the largest circulation of any modern book. It is now published in total or in part in 886 languages and dialects." p. 36, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

So I am reined up before this Committee of the General Conference because I, in my book, refer to a statement given in a book published and widely advertised by the Pacific Press Publishing Company. It is all right for the Pacific Press Publishing Company to use this fact; but for me it was all wrong. If I am pilloried for an uncompromising position because of this statement, what then shall we say of our publishing house which publishes it? If it is demanded of me whether I would commission Seventh-day Adventists to translate the Textus Receptus into all languages and dialects because I refer to this statement in the book published by the Pacific Press Publishing Company, will my Reviewers now turn around and lay the implication of this demand at the door of the originators -- the Pacific Press Publishing Company? All the weight of criticism that was hurled at me, must now be

transferred to "The World's Best Book" and its advocates. p. 36, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Before upbraiding me so severely, I suggest that it would have been well for my Reviewers to have become familiar with their own current literature. And I trust that before the next edition of "The World's Best Book" is published that the information so laboriously obtained will be forwarded to the Pacific Press so that this statement may be duly corrected. p. 36, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

After this recital of these twenty instances where the authors of this document have so seriously erred, I trust that I may humbly suggest that a more careful study of the real facts would have saved them much loss of time and effort and the expression of unjust and severe statements against a brother. p. 36, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

SECTION II -- ON THE BIBLE MANUSCRIPTS IN GENERAL. p. 36, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

I. *The Principles of the Last 100 Years in handling MSS.* p. 36, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

In reply to the Reviewer's document, Section II, entitled, "On the Bible Mss in general" we will note the following points: p. 36, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

1. *Overwhelming Testimony of MSS in Favor of Textus Receptus.* p. 36, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Nineteen out of every twenty Greek manuscripts, according to some authors, (Tregelles, Account page 138), ninety-five out of every one hundred, according to other authors, (Hastings Encyclopedia, 916) and according to still other authors, ninety-nine out of every one hundred (Burgon, Revision Revised, pp. 11, 12) Greek manuscripts are in favor of the Received Text. My Reviewers (Section 2, pp. 18, 19) give authorities to say that there are 3,000-4,000 manuscripts (MSS); and less than 160 of these are uncials. An uncial MSS is one whose every letter is a capital; while a cursive MSS is like our writing, running, all letters connected and made without lifting the hand. With the uncials the writer must lift the hand to make each letter. In other words, 50 or less Greek manuscripts out of every one thousand will favor the Greek New Testament from which the Revised Version was translated, while 950 or more out

of every 1000 Greek manuscripts will favor the Greek New Testament from which the King James Bible was translated. In the face of this significant fact we are led to ask how did it come about that with such a small quantity of evidence on its side the Greek text underlying the Revised Version secured as great a place as it did? Dr. Hort, who was an opponent of the Received Text and who dominated the English New Testament Revision Committee, says: p. 36, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

"An overwhelming proportion of the text in all known cursive manuscripts except a few is, as a matter of fact, identical." -- Hort's "Introduction". p. 37, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Thus strong testimonies can be given not only to the Received Text, but also to the phenomenal ability of the manuscript scribes, writing in different countries and in different ages, to preserve an identical Bible in the overwhelming mass of manuscripts. p. 37, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

That the large number of conflicting readings which higher critics have gathered must come from only a few manuscripts is evident. p. 37, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

2. *Comparatively only a few MSS survived in the period from the Fourth to the Ninth Century.* p. 37, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Since so much is said about the oldest manuscripts, or the most ancient manuscripts, and also about the uncials, it would be well here to quote from an author which my Reviewers have used a great deal, to show the relationship in style, in numbers, and in time, existing between the uncials and the cursives: p. 37, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"The oldest manuscripts of the Greek-New Testament now in existence were written in the fourth century. Two splendid volumes, one now in the Vatican Library at Rome, the other at St. Petersburg, are assigned by all competent critics to this period. Two more were probably written in the fifth century; one of these is the glory of our own British Museum, the other is in the National Library at Paris. In addition to these there are perhaps twelve very fragmentary manuscripts of the same century which contain only some small portions of the New Testament. From the sixth

century, twenty-seven documents have come down to us, but only five of these contain so much as a single book complete. From the seventh we have eight small fragments; from the eighth six manuscripts of some importance and eight fragments. So far the stream of tradition has run in a narrow bed. Time has, no doubt, caused the destruction of many copies; but it is also probable that during these centuries not so many copies were made as was the case subsequently. The style of writing then in use for works of literature was slow and laborious. Each letter was a capital, and had to be written separately; and the copying of a manuscript must have been long and toilsome task. In the ninth century, however, a change was made of great importance in the history of the Bible, and indeed of all ancient Greek literature. In place of the large capitals hitherto employed, a small style of letter came into use, modified in shape so as to admit of being written continuously, without lifting the pen after every letter. Writing became easier and quicker; and to this fact we may attribute the marked increase in the number of manuscripts of the Bible which have come down to us from the ninth and tenth centuries." F. D. Kenyon, "Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts," pp. 96, 97. p. 37, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

You will note from this quotation that there are only two manuscripts of the fourth century; two of the fifth century; twenty-seven from the sixth century, only five of which contain so much as a single book complete; eight from the seventh century only six, also small fragments. In other words, if we were to put together all the manuscripts from the fourth to the eighth century inclusive, looking at them from their broken and fragmentary condition, we probably would not have more than a few New Testaments complete. But when we reach the ninth century, what a great change takes place! Thousands of manuscripts come down to us from this period, 950 or more out of every 1,000 of them practically being the Textus Receptus. On the other hand the larger proportion of the uncials also witness to the Textus Receptus. p. 38, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

3. *Textus Receptus Traced Back to the Year 350 A.D.* p. 38, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Here again, however, another fact stands out silhouetted against the sky of Biblical history. In view of the strong criticism launched against the Received Text by the advocates of the other type, would it be surprising to

learn that the outstanding leader of the opponents to the Textus Receptus, Dr. Hort, testifies to the fact to which all authorities must agree, that the Greek New Testament of the Textus Receptus type, can be traced back very positively to the year 350 A.D. and is as old as any known manuscript. Hort says: p. 38, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"The fundamental text of the late extant Greek MSS generally is beyond all question identical with the dominant Antiochian or Graeco-Syrian text of the second half of the fourth century. The community of text implies on geneological grounds a community of parentage; the Antiochian Fathers and the bulk extant MSS written from about three or four to ten or eleven centuries later must have had, in the greater number extant variations, a common original either contemporary with or older than our oldest extant MSS, which thus lose at once whatever presumption of exceptional purity they might have derived from their exceptional antiquity alone." -- Hort's Introduction, page 92. p. 38, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

This gives a greater antiquity to the T.R. than to the Greek Text of the Revised Version. p. 38, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

4. *Terrific and Persistent Attack upon the King James Version.* p. 39, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Immediately following its birth, Protestantism sustained one hundred years of terrible conflict with Roman Catholicism. At the beginning of this 100 years, the Textus Receptus made its appearance in the lands dominated by the Papacy, brought forth by the hands of Erasmus. During the 1,000 years previous the Greek language and literature was practically unknown in this territory. Protestantism and the Textus Receptus were twins; they both saw the light practically the same year. After 100 years of anxious and dreadful conflict with cruel armies and corrupted literature, the King James Version was brought forth. It was destined to have splendid success and rise to a commanding position in the world. The King James Bible had hardly begun its career before armies commenced to fall upon it. Though it has held its place among us for three hundred years in splendid leadership, a striking phenomenon, nevertheless, as the years increase, the attacks become more furious. If the book were a dangerous document, a source of corrupting influence and a nuisance,

we would wonder why it has been necessary to assail it since it would naturally die of its own weakness. But when it is a divine blessing of great worth, a faultless power of transforming influence, who can they be who are so stirred up as to deliver against it one assault after another? Great theological seminaries participate. Point us out anywhere, any situation similar concerning the sacred books of any other religion, or even of Shakespeare, or of any other work of literature. Especially since 1814 when the Jesuits were restored by the order of the Pope, if they needed restoration have the attacks by Catholic scholars on the King James Bible and by others scholars who are Protestants in name, become bitter. I quote from William Palmer: p. 39, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"For it must be said that the Roman Catholic or Jesuitical system of argument, the work of the Jesuits from the sixteenth century to the present day evinces an amount of learning and dexterity, a subtilty of reasoning, a sophistry, a plausibility, combined, of which ordinary Christians have but little idea... Those who do so... (take the trouble to investigate) find that, if tried by the rules of right reasoning, the argument is defective, assuming the points which should be proved; that it is logically false, being grounded on sophisms; that it rests in many cases on quotations which are not genuine... on passages which, when collated with the original, are proved to be wholly inefficacious as proofs." Wm. Palmer, Narrative of Events on the Tracts." page 23. p. 39, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

5. *The Founders of Modern Biblical Criticism were Catholic Fathers.* p. 39, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Another quotation will show that the counter-reformation launched by the Jesuits, and having for its purpose the destruction of Protestantism, concentrated its most effective opposition against the Bible as the strongest bulwark of Protestantism. I quote from Von Dobschutz: p. 39, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"Wherever the so-called Counter-Reformation, started by the Jesuits, gained hold of the people, the vernacular was suppressed and the Bible kept from the laity. So eager were the Jesuits to destroy the authority of the Bible -- the paper Pope of the Protestants, as they contemptuously called it -- that they even did not refrain from

criticizing its genuineness and historical value." -- Von Dobschutz, "The Influence of the Bible," page 136. p. 39, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

A quotation from another source: "A French priest, Richard Simon (1638-1712), was the first who subjected the general questions concerning the Bible to a treatment which was at once comprehensive in scope and scientific in method. Simon is the forerunner of modern Biblical criticism." Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. 4, page 492. p. 40, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"In 1753 Jean Astruc, a French Catholic physician of considerable note, published a little book, 'Conjectures sur les memoires originaux dont il parait que Moise s'est servi pour compser le livre de la Genese,' in which he conjectured, from the alternative use of two names of God in the Hebrew Genesis, that Moses had incorporated therein two pre-existing documents, one of which employed Elohim and the other Jehovah. The idea attracted little attention till it was taken up by a German scholar, who however, claims to have made the discovery independently. This was Johann Gottfried Eichorn... Eichorn greatly developed Astruc's hypothesis." Idem, pp. 492, 493. p. 40, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"Yet it was a Catholic priest of Scottish origin, Alexander Geddes (1737-1802) who broached a theory of the origin of the Five Books (to which he attached Joseu) exceeding in boldness either Simon's or Eichorn's. This was the well-known 'Fragment' hypothesis, which reduced the Pentateuch to a collection of fragmentary sections partly of Mosaic origin, but put together in the reign of Solomon. Geddes' opinion was introduced into Germany in 1805 by Vater," -- Idem, page 493. p. 40, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"Some of the earliest critics in the field of collecting variant readings of the New Testament in Greek, were Mill and Benqel. We have Dr. Kenrick, Catholic Bishop of Philadelphia in 1849, as authority that they and others had examined these manuscripts recently exalted as superior such as the Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, Beza and Ephraem, and had pronounced in favor of the Vulgate, the Catholic Bible." -- quoted in Rheims and Douay by Dr. H. Cotton, page 155. p. 40, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

6. *Modern Textual Criticism Tended to Set aside the Received Text.* p. 40, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

It is a striking fact that the new science of textual criticism, first fashioned in the hands of the Jesuits made no progress until we reached the time of the end. As this was the hour when we also had reached perilous time and men have become lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, and have been turning away from truth unto fables, the soil of the Protestant world was fertile for receiving the seeds of the new so-called science of Biblical criticism. We quote now from Dr. Kenyon: p. 40, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"But with the nineteenth century a *new departure was made, and we reach the region of modern textual criticism, of which the principle is, setting aside the 'Received Text' to construct a new text* with the help of the best authorities now available. The author of this new departure was C. Lachmann (1793-1851), who published in 1842-50 a text constructed according to principles of his own devising. Out of all the mass of manuscripts collected by Mill, Wetstein, and their colleagues, he selected a few of the best (A, B, C, and sometimes D, with the fragments P, Q. T, Z, in the Gospels; D, E2 in the Acts; D2, G3, H3, in the Pauline Epistles; together with some of the best MSS of the Latin Vulgate, and a few of the Fathers), and from these he endeavored to recover the text of the New Testament as it was current in the Fourth Century (when the earliest of these authorities were written) by the simple method of counting the authorities in favor of each reading, and always following the majority. Lachmann's method was too mechanical in its rigidity, and the *list of his authorities was too small.*" -- Our Bible in the Ancient Authorities", pp. 117, 118. (Emphasis mine) p. 41, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

While Dr. Kenyon, who favors the modern criticism of the Bible criticized the list of authorities used by Lachmann as being too small, nevertheless he believes that it was productive of improvements on the Received Text. "Lachmann was followed by the two great critics of the last generation, Tischendorf and Tregelles." Tischendorf's (1815-1874) outstanding claim upon history is his discovery of the Sinaitic Manuscript in the convent at the foot of Mt. Sinai. Mankind is indebted to this prodigious worker for having published manuscripts not accessible to the average reader. Nevertheless, his discovery of Codex Aleph toppled his judgment. Previous to that time he had brought out seven different Greek New Testaments, declaring that

the seventh was perfect and could not be superseded. Then, to the scandal of textual criticism, after he had found the Sinaitic Manuscript, he brought out his eighth Greek New Testament, which was different from his seventh in 3572 places. (Burgon and Miller, Traditional Text, page 7). Moreover, he demonstrated how textual critics can artificially bring out Greek New Testaments when, at the request of a French Publishing House, Firmin Didot, he edited an edition of the Greek Testament for Catholics, conforming it to the Latin Vulgate. (Ezra Abbott, Unitarian Review, March 1875). p. 41, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

7. *The Destructive Principles Adopted by Several Leading Critics.* p. 41, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Tregelles (1813-1875) followed Lachmann's principles by going back to what he considered the ancient manuscripts, and like him, he ignored the Received Text and the great mass of cursive manuscripts. (Schaff, "Companion of Greek Testament" page 264). of him, Ellicott says: p. 41, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"His critical principles, especially his general principles of estimating and regarding modern manuscripts, are new, perhaps justly, called in question by many competent scholars;" and that his text is rigid and mechanical, and sometimes fails to disclose that critical instinct and peculiar scholarly sagacity which is so much needed in the great and responsible work of constructing a critical text of the Greek New Testament." Ellicott, "Considerations", pp. 47-48. p. 41, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

In his splendid work which convinced Gladstone that the Revised Version was a failure, Sir Edmund Beckett, speaking of the principles which controlled such men as Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort in their modern canons of criticism, says: p. 42, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"If two, or two-thirds of two dozen men steeped in Greek declare that they believe that he (John) ever wrote that he saw in a vision seven angels clothed in stone with golden girdles, which is the only honest translation of their Greek, and defend it with such arguments as these, I... distrust their judgment on the "preponderance of evidence" for new readings altogether, and all their modern canons of criticism, which profess to settle the relative value of manuscripts, with such results as this and many others."

Beckett, "The Revised N.T." page 181. p. 42, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

8. *The Real Method of Handling MSS.* p. 42, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

In regard to the other method of handling manuscripts which we believe is the right method and which prevailed until these subtle influences began to work which resulted in the strange and mysterious principles of some textual critics in the last one hundred years, I quote again from Dr. Kenyon: p. 42, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"Of Westcott and Hort we have spoken at length in the preceding chapter, showing how they revived, Griesbach's principles, and worked it out with greater elaboration and with a far fuller command of material. Their names close, for the present, the list of editors of the Greek New Testament whose attention has been directed especially to its text rather than (as Alford, Lightfoot, Weiss, and others) its interpretation. It is right, however, to mention the names of one or two scholars who have devoted their attention to textual studies without actually publishing revised texts of their own. Chief among those is F. H. A. Scrivener, who, besides editing the manuscripts D and F2 and collating a number of cursives, wrote, in his "Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament," the standard history of the New Testament text. J. W. Burgon, Dean of Chichester, was another scholar of immense industry, learning and zeal in textual matters, although his extreme distaste for innovations led him to oppose, rightly or wrongly, nearly every new departure in this field or in any other. To Scrivener and Burgon may especially be attributed the defense of the principle that *all the available authorities should, so far as possible be taken into consideration, and not only the most ancient.* They attached much weight to the evidence of the great mass of MSS. headed by A and C, while they opposed the tendency of Westcott and Hort, and their followers to defer almost invariably to the testimony of B (Vaticanus) and Aleph (Sinaiticus)." "Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts" pp. 119, 120. (Emphasis mine) p. 42, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

II. *Reviewers Illogical Arguments About Erasmus.* p. 43, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

For sometime past there has been an aggressive and wide-

spread effort to discredit the Waldenses, to discredit Erasmus and discredit Luther. This campaign has resulted in practically obscuring the real history and real character and the great work of the Waldenses. The first seven counts in Section II of my Reviewers' document claim: (1) Erasmus, himself was a Catholic. (2) His Bible was a Catholic Vulgate. (3) He dedicated his New Testament to Pope Leo X and printed the Pope's letter of approval. (4) The Greek New Testament of Erasmus was not the first one printed, though it was the first put into circulation. (5) The first Greek Testament was printed by Cardinal Ximenes' in 1514. (6) Erasmus knew of Cardinal Ximenes' Greek Testament and used it to make over 100 corrections in his own fourth edition. (7) Cardinal Ximenes had a number of scholars to work on his edition, while Erasmus worked alone on his text for publication for less than a year. p. 43, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

I will answer the seven points in order. p. 43, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

(1) Erasmus, himself, was a Catholic my Reviewers urge. Of course he was. At that moment the whole western civilized world was Catholic. There never would have been any Protestantism, except a divergence started somewhere. Erasmus started that divergence. Erasmus could not have appeared from thin air a full-fledged Protestant and having in his hand a finally perfected Textus Receptus. That being so, my Reviewers must admit that some man had to start somewhere to produce the divergence. Very naturally before he started he would have to be a Catholic, or as the famous proverb has it: "Erasmus laid the egg and Luther hatched it." Further, it might be claimed that Luther was a Catholic when he burned the Pope's Bull. In fact historians show that Protestantism was never finally and fully separated from Catholicism until the Council of Trent was broken up by the armies of Charles the Fifth in 1564. p. 43, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

(2) My Reviewers claim that Erasmus' own bible was the Catholic Vulgate which he printed in a second edition along with his Greek Testament. This they claim was a fact "both before and after he issued his Greek Testament". But why did they not tell all the facts? When Erasmus published the Bibles in parallel he did not confine himself, as my Reviewers state, to printing only two Bibles in parallel, the Greek Text and the Catholic Vulgate. He printed three

in parallel, the third parallel Bible being Erasmus' recension or revision of the Latin Vulgate. I quote again from Dr. Scrivener: p. 43, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"The fourth edition (dated March, 1527) contains the text in three parallel columns, The Greek, the Latin Vulgate and Erasmus' recension of it. Scrivener, "Introduction", Vol. 2, page 186. p. 43, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Also another quote from Dr. Miller: p. 44, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"A fourth edition exhibited the text in three parallel columns, the Greek, the Latin Vulgate, and a recension of the latter by Erasmus." Miller's Textual Guide, page 9. p. 44, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

See also Tregelles, "Account of the Printed Text", page 21. It was the third column, the revised Vulgate, that brought down the storm on Erasmus' head. I wonder how far my Reviewers have mislead you? My Reviewers ought to know that Erasmus' edition contained the Greek text of Erasmus, the old Catholic Vulgate and his own revised Vulgate. They left the impression that Erasmus was still clinging to the Catholic Vulgate. They gave no hint that he had revised it. I quote their statement now that you may see how far from fact their statement is. They say: "His own Bible was the Catholic Vulgate, both before and after he issued his Greek Testament in the second edition." (Section II, page 1) Why did they not tell you, if they knew, that in the fourth edition, he printed his revision of the Vulgate also. p. 44, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

(3) My Reviewers feel that they have given us a strong argument because Erasmus dedicated his Greek New testament to Pope Leo X and printed the latter's letter of approval in his second edition, but they forget that for 1,000 years Europe, with very small exception, had known nothing of Greek manuscripts and Greek literature, as Dr. Hort points out. (Hort's Introduction, page 142) Pope Leo was not a prophet. He could not foresee the colossal effects in the strength of the Greek New Testament of Erasmus. Pope Leo had no event from the past of a strong nature by which he could predict the coming greatness of the work of Erasmus. Neither could he foretell it. Why should not Erasmus have dedicated to the Pope his work? Why should not Leo X give it his papal smile? The Pope was hard pressed. He needed

friends and Erasmus was a great man. There was every reason in the world for him to beam graciously upon this product of the learned Erasmus. The Pope could not foresee the great Reformation which was about to dawn and that the Greek New Testament of Erasmus would be an opening wedge. My Reviewers have missed the whole point. The fact is of little moment that Erasmus dedicated his work to the Pope and received the Pope's approbation. What has been the attitude of the Catholic Church since the real meaning of Erasmus' work is known and understood, is the real question. p. 44, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

There are other reasons why the presence of the Pope's imprimatur upon the New Greek New Testament of Erasmus means nothing at all with respect to the problem under discussion. (1) If that fact has so important a bearing as my Reviewers claim, why did the Catholic Church for hundreds of years, oppose by fire, flame, and sword, and put on the index, the vernacular translation from the Greek Text of Erasmus, and also the German Bible of Luther, the English Bible of Tyndale, and that of the French? (2) In the second place why did the Papacy never make any use of the Greek New Testament brought forth by the Cardinal Ximenes? It was a Catholic possession and there was nothing to hinder the Roman pontiff from making splendid use of it in spreading the gospel throughout the world. (3) And this is a point particularly to be emphasized, why did the Papacy work so desperately at the Council of Trent (1545-1563) to proclaim the Vulgate as the official Bible of the Roman Catholic Church? We call attention to the fact that it was this famous Council which changed the Roman Catholic Church into a Jesuitical church. And it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the very first four resolutions of this dreadful Council were: (a) That the Vulgate was the official Bible of the Roman Catholic Church; (b) That the books of the Apocrypha were on a par with the other books of the Bible; (c) That tradition stood on an equal footing with the Bible and (d) That the interpretation of the Holy Scripture should be in the hands of the priests and not in the hands of the people. Why did not my Reviewers tell us that the Papacy put the Greek N.T. of Erasmus on the Index? Rome condemned all versions that departed from the Vulgate. (Putnam, "Censorship of Church," II, pp. 21, 22) p. 44, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

The second reason why the imprimatur of the Pope would at this time have no particular bearing upon the question, is,

that the New Testament of Erasmus was Greek. At that point in history this gesture meant nothing. The Pope could put his blessing on all the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin Bibles or other Bibles in any dead language, because without any successful hope of putting them into the vernacular, against the still unshaken and invincible power of the papal church, there was nothing to fear. p. 45, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers ask us to explain how Erasmus could bring forth in this atmosphere a pure Greek Text while the Revisers are suspicioned by me as bringing forth a Catholic product in the Protestant age? Please tell us what was the atmosphere which surrounded Erasmus? It was all the difference between 1516 and 1901. Erasmus was in the grip of a gigantic undertow, running with irresistible force away from Catholicism toward the reformation. And Erasmus was helping it on, because he was fighting for the reformation; the only difference between him and Luther was that Erasmus, before he died, brought reform as far forward as he could in the Catholic Church, while Luther finally was driven to create it outside the church. p. 45, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

But the Revisers, on the other hand, were in the grip of a gigantic undertow, running away from Protestantism towards Catholicism. And they were helping it on. In my book I brought ample proof of this gigantic undertow running from Protestantism to Catholicism in the chapter entitled "How the Jesuits captured Oxford University." My Reviewers have entirely ignored this chapter and its unanswerable proof and this explains why they ask this inconsistent question in endeavoring to explain Erasmus and the Revisers. p. 45, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

As for the Revisers working ten years -- Yes! They worked ten years, but in dead secrecy. As to the statement made by my Reviewers that there was no Catholic on the Committee, -- that was not true, because it was the fault of the committee. Let the world know that Cardinal Newman, who had done more to damage Protestantism and popularize Romanism than any other man that ever lived, was invited to sit on this revision committee. Dr. Hort and Dr. Schaff drank their inspiration from the same fountain, -- from the higher critical theology of Germany, -- at the same time both pagan and papal. As to the results of Newman's life and the Oxford Movement, let a quarterly "Review" testify:

p. 45, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"He (Newman) had left the leprosy of Popery cleaving to the very walls of Oxford, to infect the youth of England, through an unknown future." -- New Brunswick Review, Aug. 1854, page 322. p. 46, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Do not forget, also, that Oxford University, with Cambridge, paid the bill of the Revisers. p. 46, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

As to the effect of Dr. Schaff, the Mercersburg theology, and his doctrines, let the same witness testify again: p. 46, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"Our examination has extended only to a little beyond the middle of Dr. Schaff's work (i.e. his History of the Apostolic Church). But the positions he has already advanced, are such as to lay the whole truth and grace of God, and the whole liberty, hope and salvation of the human race, at the feet of the Roman Papacy." -- New Brunswick Review, Aug. 1854, page 325. p. 46, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

(4-5) My Reviewers state: "Erasmus' Greek Text was not the first one printed though it was the first one to go into circulation. The first Greek text was printed by Cardinal Ximenes in 1514," etc., etc. p. 46, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

What of it? The Greek New Testament of Cardinal Ximenes went into cold storage and has been there every since, but the Greek Testament of Erasmus was used by Luther in the circulation and publication of his German Bible which made the German Reformation. The same Greek Text of Erasmus was used by Tyndale in the publication of his English Bible which made the English Reformation. This is further proof that the tide was running away from Catholicism to Protestantism. I quote from Sister White: p. 46, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"While Luther was opening a closed Bible to the people of Germany, Tyndale was impelled by the Spirit of God to do the same for England. Wycliffe's had been translated from the Latin text, which contained many errors... In 1516, a year before the appearance of Luther's theses, Erasmus had published his Greek and Latin version of the New Testament. Now for the first time the word of God was printed in the original tongue. In this work many errors of former

versions were corrected, and the sense was more clearly rendered. It led many among the educated classes to a better knowledge of the truth, and gave a new impetus to the work of reform. But the common people were still, to a great extent, debarred from God's word. Tyndale was to complete the work of Wycliffe in giving the Bible to his countrymen. p. 46, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"A diligent student and an earnest seeker for truth, he had received the gospel from the Greek Testament of Erasmus." Great Controversy, page 245. p. 46, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

It would seem that these statements from Sister White would furnish all the answer any Seventh-day Adventist would ask for the first ten pages of the Reviewer's Section II. All of their own assertions and quotations from their critical authorities disparaging Erasmus and his Greek Text; all of the scorn and doubt cast upon his work in these pages, is here contradicted by Sister White. If she is right, about the work of Erasmus, the Reviewers are wrong. You must choose between the two. p. 46, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

(6) The Reviewers use the fact that Erasmus made over one hundred corrections from the Complutensian. p. 47, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

[NOTE -- LOA, the publishers are here adding this paragraph to clarify for our readers what the Complutensian Text was:-- p. 47, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"The New Testament was first printed in Greek in 1514 at Alcala in Spain, under the direction of Cardinal Ximenes. This printing formed part of the *Complutensian Polyglot* (so called from Complutum, the Latin name for Alcala). In this the New Testament appeared with the Greek text and the Latin Vulgate in parallel columns; in the Old Testament section of the work the Latin Vulgate was flanked by the Hebrew and the Septuagint Greek (like our Lord on the cross between the two thieves, commented one contemporary who had no great enthusiasm for the new learning). But while the New Testament part of the enterprise was printed in 1514, it was not published until some years later, when the whole work, running to six volumes, was complete. The first Greek Testament to be *published,* therefore, was the first edition prepared by the Dutch humanist Desiderius Erasmus, printed

at Basel and published in March 1516. THE ENGLISH BIBLE by F. F. Bruce, pp. 24, 25.] p. 47, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Apparently they failed to discern that Cardinal Ximenes' text was the Complutensian and it was also the Textus Receptus. If Erasmus used it in his fourth edition to make 100 corrections, would he not go forward "moulding the Textus Receptus" as Scrivener says? Who of you knew as much in the first year of your college course as in the fourth? Give a man a chance to get his second breath. Shall we be like Herod who slaughtered the children of Bethlehem before they had a chance to get on their feet? Erasmus blazed the trail. No one had done anything like his work in Western Europe for one thousand years before. After him, Stephens and Elzevir continued to mould the Textus Receptus which reached a splendid condition about 1611 and there are few touches which this Textus Receptus could undergo even yet. But to say that since Erasmus (1535) made one hundred corrections in his fourth edition of the Greek N.T., the Revision Committee was entitled to 5,337 corrections of the same in 1881, is a vastly different proposition. Did God keep His church waiting to do in 1881 what Great Controversy (page 245) says was done by Erasmus in 1516? Moreover, Erasmus and his followers were moulding the Textus Receptus forward. The Revisers of 1881 moulded the Greek New Testament backwards toward the Vulgate from which Erasmus and his Protestant successors delivered us. Why did not Luther and Tyndale translate their New Testament from the Vulgate? They clearly saw that the Vulgate was a Catholic Bible and would justify and protect the doctrines of the base of the Roman Catholic Church. Let us rejoice that Erasmus did as well as he did. Sister White praises Erasmus' text. p. 47, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

(7) We are now treated to the information that (a) Erasmus worked alone on his text, while Cardinal Ximenes had a number of scholars at the task; and (b) that Erasmus worked less than a year. In reply I will say that the Reviewers have entirely ignored the learning and the knowledge acquired by Erasmus in years of study and investigations, previous to bringing out his Greek Text. They entirely mislead you regarding the actual facts. Do you suppose that Erasmus alone, could in so brief a time, bring forth such a prodigious work, if he had not had years of preparation for his Greek text? I had only three or four weeks in which to reply to my Reviewers document. Where would I have come out if I had not had my material in hand before I was given

this limited time to work. In other words, I intend to show you when I take up my Reviewers next seven points that to bring into relief the statement that Erasmus thus worked alone for less than a year, has absolutely no bearing whatever on the case. What work did he do in previous preparation is the vital question. p. 47, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

We will now address ourselves to the next seven points brought forward by the Reviewers (Section II, pp. 3, etc.), to place Erasmus and the Textus Receptus in a position of inferiority. With regard to the Revisers and their new Greek text changed in 5,337 places they say; (1) Erasmus actually used only six or possibly seven manuscripts; (2) These are still at Basle except for Revelation which was a mutilated copy -- they took particular pains to tell us that the Book of Revelation was a mutilated copy that he was obliged to borrow, etc. (3) That none of these manuscripts went back further than the 12th century, and some other remarks I will notice later. (4) That in the book of Revelation Erasmus supplied all of the last six verses and some other words either by translation from the Catholic Vulgate or by his own words, -- either one or the other, the Reviewers apparently do not know which and we are left to take our choice; (5) That Erasmus says that his first editions he made interpolations in one verse in Acts and one in First John, and (7) the same as point six in the former enumeration, he made over 100 corrections from the Catholic Complutensian edition which he did not see when his earlier editions were brought out. p. 48, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

In reply I would say in reference to point (1) that though it may be Erasmus used only six or possibly seven manuscripts, he consulted many. I will quote my words in my book (page 54) which the Reviewers mutilated. (Section II, page 3). By quoting two words, omitting a sentence of thirteen words, quoting seven, omitting nineteen words, then quoting some more, they distorted my meaning by this piece-meal method of quoting, and failed entirely to convey the thought in my statements. I said, "There were hundreds of manuscripts for Erasmus to examine, and he did; but he used only a few." Now what are the facts of the case? We are told by Scrivener that Erasmus had a long time of preparation in this field of manuscripts; and secondly, that he had many manuscripts for his work. p. 48, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"He was in England when John Froben, a celebrated publisher at Basle... made application to Erasmus, through a common friend, to undertake immediately an edition of the N.T..... This proposal was sent on April 17, 1515, *years before which time Erasmus had prepared numerous annotations to illustrate a revised Latin version he had long projected."* -- Scrivener, "Introduction", Vol. II, page 182. (Emphasis mine) p. 48, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Dr. Tregelles points out the same fact, -- p. 48, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"This was on April 17, 1515. It seems as if Erasmus had before this made some preparation for such a work." -- "Account", page 19. p. 48, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Scrivener says:-- "Besides this scanty roll, however, he *not rarely,* refers in his annotations to other manuscripts he had seen in the course of his travels... yet too indistinctly for his allusions to be of much use to critics." -- "Introductions." Vol. II, page 184. p. 49, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

To illustrate further the enormous work that Erasmus did in traveling examining manuscripts, etc., I quote from Froude: p. 49, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"Trouble enough and anxiety enough! Yet in the midst of bad health and *furious monks* -- (Note: Reviewers would stamp Erasmus as Catholic, then why monks furious?) -- it is the noblest feature in him -- his industry never slackened, and he drew out of his difficulties the materials which made his name immortal. He was forever on the wing, searching libraries visiting learned men, consulting with politicians or princes. His correspondence was enormous. His letters on literary subjects are often treatises in themselves, and go where he would his eyes were open to all things and persons. His writings were passing through edition on edition. He was always adding and correcting; while new tracts, new editions of the Fathers show an acuteness of attention and an extent of reading which to a modern student seems beyond the reach of any single intellect. Yet he was no stationary scholar confined to desk or closet. He was out in the world, traveling from city to city, gathering materials among all places and all persons, from palace to village alehouse,

and missing nothing which had meaning or amusement in it." -- "Life of Erasmus" pp. 206, 207. p. 49, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

How does this statement square up with the manner in which the Reviewers belittle Erasmus and his work? p. 49, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Burgon and Miller say: "Erasmus followed his few manuscripts because he knew them to be good representatives of the mind of the Church which had been informed under the ceaseless and loving care of the medieval transcribers: and the text of the Complutensian editors published in Spain, for which Cardinal Ximenes procured MSS at whatever cost he could. No one doubts the coincidence in all essential points of the printed text with the text of the cursives." -- "Traditional Text", page 236. p. 49, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

And finally on the same subject I will quote from Nolan quoted on page 29 of my Reviewers' document: p. 49, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"With reference to manuscripts, it is indisputable that he (Erasmus) was acquainted with every variety which is known to us; having distributed them into two principal classes, one of which corresponds with the Complutensian edition, the other with the Vatican manuscript." -- Frederick Nolan, "Integrity of the Greek Vulgate", page 413. p. 49, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Here I give the testimony of two Revisers to the goodness of Erasmus' MSS. They show also that his MSS were not Catholic: p. 50, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"The manuscripts which Erasmus used, differ, for the most part, only in small and insignificant details from the bulk of the cursive manuscripts, -- that is to say, the manuscripts which are written in running hand and not in capital or (as they are technically called) uncial letters. The general Received Text is carried up beyond the individual manuscripts used by Erasmus to a great body of manuscripts of which the earliest are assigned to the ninth century." p. 50, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Then after quoting Dr. Hort, they draw this conclusion on his statement: p. 50, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"This remarkable statement completes the pedigree of the Received Text. That pedigree stretches back to a remote antiquity. The first ancestor of the Received Text was, as Dr. Hort is careful to remind us, at least contemporary with the oldest of our extant manuscripts, if not older than any one of them." -- Two Members of the N.T. Company on the Revisers and Greek Text., pp. 11, 12. p. 50, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Notice that the above quotations are not from my authorities; they are not even from my Reviewers' authorities. They are from the REVISERS themselves. They settle once and forever that the MSS of Erasmus were representative, almost perfectly so of the over 3,000 MSS which agree with the Received Text, and which run back into antiquity as far, if not father than any known MSS. Erasmus did not do badly after all. p. 50, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Why did not my Reviewers tell this? Thus we see that the Reviewers have entirely ignored the many MSS that Erasmus knew and compared, and his prodigious investigation and preparation for his Greek Text, when using Greek MSS and hosts of Latin and Greek Fathers in preparation for his revision of the Catholic Vulgate. It was not so hasty after all, as the Reviewers would have you believe. p. 50, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

III -- MONKS CORRUPT MSS OF WALDENSES AND ERASMUS. p. 50, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

We have just learned from Scrivener that Erasmus had other manuscripts than those which are generally talked about, but traces of them are too vague and indistinct to be of value to critics. We saw also from Nolan that it is "indisputable" that Erasmus was acquainted with every variety of manuscript which is known to us. In other words, this is a fact which cannot be disputed. He may not have known all the manuscripts which can be listed under the different varieties, but he certainly knew all of the different varieties and classified them into two classes, namely: Those which agree with the Textus Receptus, and those which agree with the Vaticanus. Nolan used the word "Complutensian" as the representative of one of these classes; but of course the Complutensian was the Textus Receptus. This man, who as Froude says, could do ten hours work in one, and as many authors say was the intellectual

dictator of Europe while he lived, had read more widely in the ancient fathers than probably any other man who has ever lived. He had within the vast storehouses of his scholarly learning more lines of evidence by which to weigh manuscripts than any of his successors. One writer speaks of Tischendorf as having the intellect of a giant, but the judgment of a child. He did not know how to weigh evidence. Erasmus knew how to weigh evidence. Sister White endorses his work. p. 50, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

It is interesting at this point to recall the number of manuscripts used by the much heralded men named Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles. Dr. Ellicott says, "Lachmann's text is really one based on little more than four manuscripts." ("Considerations", page 46). While of Tischendorf let it be remembered he brought out seven different Greek New Testaments declaring that the seventh was perfect and could not be superseded. Then, to the scandal of textual criticism, after he found the Sinaitic manuscript he brought out his eighth Greek Testament which was different from his seventh in 3,572 places. (Burgon and Miller, "Traditional Text," page 7). I call this going wild. If Erasmus had made one-twentieth as wild a job as this we would never heard the last of it. Let us hear from Tregelles, himself, how few manuscripts also 'he' used: p. 51, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"We are able to take the *few* documents whose evidence is *proved* to be trustworthy, and safely discard from present consideration the eighty-nine ninetieths, or whatever else their numerical proportion may be." -- "Account of the Printed Text," page 138. p. 51, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Thus Tregelles preferred one-ninetieth to eighty-nine ninetieths of the witnesses. He was a member of the Revision Committee. Dr. Schaff points out that, though Dr. Tregelles was prevented by feeble health from participating in the work of revision, yet he was present in spirit by his critical edition of the Greek New Testament. (Introduction to "Revision" by Lightfoot, Trench and Ellicott, page III) What weight would you give to his judgment? But it was just this principle which prevailed with the Revisers. p. 51, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Erasmus suffered in his day like the Waldenses did in their day, by having his writing corrupted by the monks. I quote from Froude: p. 51, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"Erasmus could be calm for others. It was very hard for him to be calm for himself. The Louvainers (a class of monks) got hold of more of his letters and published them with alterations in the text. He had written 'Lutherus': they changed it into 'Luther-Noster' to make him out Luther's friend. They reprinted his 'Colloquies,' imitated his style, and made him say the contradictory of what he had really said. He had denounced extorted confessions, and laughed at pilgrimages and ridiculed indulgences. His new editors reproduced his real language, but they attached paragraphs in his name where he was represented as declaring that he had once thought all that, but had perceived his error. He had written that 'the best confession was confession to God'; his editor changed it into 'the best confession is confession to a priest.' p. 51, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

'Wonderful Atlasses of a tottering faith' he might well call such people. 'Once,' he says, 'it was held a crime to publish anything in another man's name; now it special game of divines and they are proud of it.'" -- Life of Erasmus, pp. 271, 272. p. 52, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

To show how the Jesuits worked to corrupt or destroy manuscripts, I give the following quotation from Gilly: p. 52, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"It is a singular thing that the destruction or rapine, which has been so fatal to Waldensian documents, should have pursued then even to the place of security, to which all, that remained, were consigned by Morland, in 1658, the library of the University of Cambridge. The most ancient of these relics were ticketed in seven packets, distinguished by letters of the alphabet, from A To G. The whole of these were missing when I made enquiry for them in 1823. What these precious records were, may be seen by a reference to the catalog given in 'Morland's History of the Evangelical Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont.' pp. 95-98." -- "Waldensian Researches" pp. 80, 81. p. 52, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

I have answered the argument sufficiently, I think, urged against Erasmus that he used but a few manuscripts. It ought to be said that Tregelles denies that Erasmus worked alone. He distinctly says that Ecolampadius assisted him. ("Printed Text", page 20). With regard to correcting the

mistakes of one edition in the second, let it be known that so hard and difficult is the field of textual criticism to work in, that almost every scholar, even the greatest, is constrained to correct in the second edition mistakes of the first. I call your attention to the words of Dr. Scrivener in the preface to the second edition of his "Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus". He says, "The first edition of this little volume (1864) being exhausted, care has taken to correct in the second issue whatever errors have been detected in the interval." p. 52, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

IV. WHY DISCARD THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS FOR WESTCOTT AND HORT'S TEXT? p. 52, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers give a page full of quotations (Section II, page 5) taken from the New Testament in original Greek by Westcott and Hort. The sum total of this page of single space lines is to say that the change from the Textus Receptus to the Greek Text of Westcott and Hort is practically nothing. Here is one statement: p. 52, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"If comparative trivialities, such as changes of order, the insertion or omission of the article with proper names, and the like are set aside, the words in our opinion still subject to doubt can hardly amount to more than a thousandth part of the whole New Testament." p. 52, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers would give us to understand them that the amount of differences which would stand above trivialities between the Textus Receptus and the Greek Text of the Revisers, or of Westcott and Hort, is only a 1/1000 part of the whole New Testament. Since there are approximately 8,000 verses in the whole New Testament, a 1/1000 part, of course, would be 8 verses. How can such a claim as this be advanced when we know that in the Revised Version, in the last chapter of Mark alone, 12 verses are branded with suspicion? This is a fair example of the sooth-saying with which modernists as Westcott and Hort would allay our alarm at what has been done in the 5,337 changes of the Greek of the Revised New Testament. If my Reviewers really believed that the differences were so little between the versions, it would seem that they have gone to a lot of trouble over this subject. p. 52, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Nevertheless a little further on the Reviewers devote four and one-half pages of single space typewritten matter with quotations from Souter, Smith, Gregory, Kenyon, and Ellicott, with one from Dr. Scrivener, all to show us that the Greek text of Erasmus was built upon manuscripts "neither ancient nor valuable". The way these quotations are thrown together is very misleading. The severest of them evidently apply to the first edition of Erasmus; nevertheless, the ordinary reader would get the idea that when Erasmus died, and in fact even till now, the Textus Receptus was built on very questionable manuscripts. p. 53, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

If that is so, then why has it persisted for 300 years in its splendid leadership? Is it not a fact that in Cambridge University, the very university in which Westcott and Hort taught, the Textus Receptus is the standard Greek text? I wish to use, however, one of these quotations, which I feel certain my Reviewers did not discern when they used it, that it really overthrows their severe arraignment of the Textus Receptus. It reads: p. 53, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"The Complutensian Edition of the Greek New Testament of Cardinal Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros was printed in 1514, though not circulated until 1522. Erasmus produced his edition in 1516 and so won in the race with Cisneros... and thus laid the foundation for the Textus Receptus which held the field till the critical text of Westcott and Hort, in 1881." -- A. T. Robertson, "Biblical Review", Jan. 1931. p. 53, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

If the Textus Receptus is so badly built on poor MSS, why did not scholars reject it before 300 years passed by. "It had the field", says this author. p. 53, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

A severe indictment, it is thought, is found when we are repeatedly told that all the manuscripts which Erasmus used were seven. But how many manuscripts did Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles use? We are treated to the names of Lachmann, Tischendorf and Tregelles continually. We have them for breakfast, for dinner, and for supper. Lachmann brought forth a Greek New Testament much different from the Textus Receptus. And how many manuscripts did he use? -- Just four! Tischendorf brought forth an edition of the Greek New Testament and on how many manuscripts did he rely? -- He informed us that he threw away eighty-nine

ninetieths of the manuscripts. Westcott and Hort brought forth a Greek New Testament and how many did they rely on? -- principally the Vaticanus and one other of the same family, the Sinaiticus. Then why belittle Erasmus who used three times as many? p. 53, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Much has been said about the great wealth of material which was at the disposal of the Revisers. Would in not be astounding to you if I read from Dr. Ellicott, Chairman of the Revision Committee, that their Greek Text was brought out before the great wealth of Papyri was found. p. 53, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

I quote from Dr. Ellicott, Chairman of the English New Testament Revision Committee: p. 54, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"What I shall now do will be to show that the principals on which the version of the New Testament was based have been in no degree affected by *the copious literature connected with the language of the Greek Testament and its historical position which has appeared since the Revision' was completed.* It is only quite lately that the *Revisers have been represented as being insufficiently acquainted,* in several particulars with the Greek of the New Testament, and in a word, being twenty years behind what is now known on the subject. Such charges are easily made, and may at first sight seem very plausible, as the last fifteen or twenty years have brought with them an amount of research in the language of the Greek Testament which might be thought to antiquate some results of the Revision." -- "Revised Version of the Holy Scriptures", pp. 96, 97. (Emphasis mine) p. 54, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Another great authority, Dr. Adolf Deissmann, tells us, in his famous book, "Light from the Ancient East", (page 67), how this wealth of material came since the Revision. You will remember that Dr. Deissmann was an outstanding figure in the researches among the papyri, ostraca, and other materials unearthed the last thirty years by the spade. He says: p. 54, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"Memorials of the popular colloquial language, on the other hand, memorials of the spoken Greek of the people, were scarcely known to the general run of scholars at a period distant only some score or so of years from the present day." (1922) p. 54, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

It will thus be seen from the words of this great scholar that the great wealth of material unearthed by the spade in the field of which we speak began about the year 1902, or twenty years after the copies of the English and American Revisions were finished. He further says: p. 54, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"The work to be accomplished by the linguistic historian on the New Testament includes great problems yet unsolved, but one thing is clear already. The New Testament has been proved to be, as a whole, a monument of late colloquial Greek, and in the great majority of its component parts the monument of a more of less popular colloquial language." -- "Light From the Ancient East", page 69. p. 54, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

From the above quotation it is evident that Dr. Ellicott, Chairman of the English New Testament Revision Committee, felt obliged to answer the strong indictments brought against their work by outstanding scholars in the field of textual criticism in the twenty years following the appearance of the Revision. My Reviewers use Kenyon, 1901, Price, 1907, Gregory, 1907, Souter, 1910, and Robertson, 1925, in support of their contention about the manuscripts in general. Of these authorities it may be said, (1) They are all followers of the Westcott and Hort theory; (2) Kindly inquire will you, and find out how many of them are not textual critics, but simply secondary writers in the field. (3) From the dates you will see that Robertson only, wrote late enough to speak from having a grasp of the new theories which arose from the new findings indicated by Dr. Deissmann. A testimony, therefore, of these witnesses would not rank in general, very much above the use of good common sense of the men who are now listening to me. A little bit later I shall present a whole array of authorities on the other side of the question, giving their denunciation of Westcott and Hort's paper theory, and of the corruptions of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus MSS. p. 54, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

The work of the Revisers of 1871-1881 ended in the complete spoliation of the Textus Receptus in the New Testament. Yet my Reviewers would have you believe that the difference between the RV Greek text and the Textus Receptus is not much. On the other hand, listen to Dr. Schaff: p. 55, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"On this line the great battle of the purest text of the New Testament must be fought out. The question is between the oldest MSS and the latest, between the uncial text and the Stephanic or Elzevir text." -- "Companion to Greek N.T.", page 120. p. 55, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Why did not the Revisers accomplish the same results in the way of spoliation for the Hebrew Textus Receptus in the Old Testament? My Reviewers have taken me to task as to why most of my book concerns the New Testament of the Revised Version and not the Old. Very plainly did I tell in my book that it would mostly concern the New Testament and why. But now I will say this: First of all the Revisers of the Old Testament were obliged to proceed on directly opposite theories from the Revisers of the New Testament. It is a well-known fact that the skilled copyists of the Hebrew period always preferred the latest manuscripts copied, above the older manuscripts. In other words, the schools engaged in copying and translation of the Hebrew manuscripts, as soon as a Hebrew manuscript became old and worn relegated it to the discarded collection. In their eyes, the newer manuscript, the better it was. It is upon this theory that the Textus Receptus of the Old Testament is built as we have it today for both AV and ARV. p. 55, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

How differently has been the treatment of the manuscript of the New Testament since the unwarranted principles of textual criticism came into vogue the last one hundred years. Starting with Griesbach about one hundred years ago the campaign against the Greek Textus Receptus of the New Testament has grown in volume and intensity. The only way, however, it could hope to succeed was upon the principle that the more ancient a manuscript, the more valuable it is. Dr. Scrivener points out that the worst corruptions which befell MSS occurred in the period before the Council of Nicea (Introduction, II, page 264). From then on two streams of MSS come down -- the uncorrupted and the corrupted. Since the ancient MSS we have are few and some of them differ widely from the later MSS of which we have three or four thousand, it is evident, suspicion naturally being directed more toward the ancient than the later MSS, that the few which differ are of the corrupted type. I have before proved, the great mass of Greek New Testament manuscripts -- Tregelles says 89/90, Burgon says 99/100 of them -- (1) Date from the 9th century, (2) are witnesses to the Textus Receptus, (3) are practically identical, and (4)

Fort says their Greek New Testament or the text written on the MS, can be traced back to about 300 A.D. Just as Roman Catholic Theology steadily advanced during the last 100 years, successfully capturing Germany, England, Scandinavia, Scotland, etc., so step by step, kept growing, the numbers of textual critics, and of secondary writers in this field, who denounced the more recent manuscripts (thousands of them) of the Greek New Testament as practically valueless and staked all their claims on some five, some three, some two, and in some cases, even one old Greek manuscript. The facts above given constitute one reason why claim can be justly made that the damage done to the Old Testament by the Revisers was comparatively small to what was done to the Greek New Testament. p. 55, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

The second reason for this is found in the fact that the Old Testament Revision Committee in England finished its work several years *after* the New Testament Revision Committee did. What does this mean? It means this, that as soon as the new Revised New Testament appeared in 1881 a storm broke over all England. So intense was this storm and so terrible, that it dealt a death blow to the Revised Version in England. Works of a masterly nature appeared at once, which pointed out the unjustifiable principles that had been adopted by that Revision Committee and their apparent effect upon the English New Testament which they printed. During the time of this storm the English Old Testament Revision Committee was still sitting. They saw the point, they ran to cover, and seeking to avoid the terrible storm, this time against the Old Testament Revision we find that the Hebrew Textus Receptus was spared the terrible handling that was given to the Greek Textus Receptus. p. 56, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

My brethren, explain to me why we will accept the Hebrew Textus Receptus on certain principles and have it still with us as it has been practically since the days of the Apostles; yet confused or misled by the theories of Westcott and Hort and their ardent followers, we refuse to establish the Greek New Testament upon the same principles upon which we established the Hebrew Textus Receptus. On what ground of reason or justice can my Reviewers explain why, in respect to the Old Testament, they adopt one principle, while in respect to the New, they adopt the very opposite. p. 56, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

One or two quotations to support my contention that the English Revision is dead in England. First I will quote from an author who is popular with my Reviewers, Dr. Robinson: p. 56, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"Of the thirty-six thousand changes in the New Testament alone many appear to be changes for the sake of change; in fact, purely arbitrary. Hence, their work was not appreciated. Nearly fifty years have now passed and still this new English version is valued chiefly by scholars, and is anything but popular with the common people. Yet, it was intended to be a translation especially adapted to ordinary readers. Time has shown that its improved grammatical accuracy is not a sufficient compensation for the music of the old cadences, which is so many cases has been sacrificed for some trifling point in syntax! 'Two thirds' majorities decided many of the changes that were made by the Committee, but today the reading public are deciding that the English Version can never displace the Authorized. From time to time, scholars are demonstrating that in certain instances it is even less true to the originals than the old version, and less exact in its exegesis." -- Where Did We Get Our Bible", pp. 174, 175. p. 56, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

I wish now to present to you another quotation from Dr. Ellicott, Chairman of the New Testament Revision Committee, where as Bishop of his diocese he bewails the fact that 25 years have passed and the English Revised Version is not making its way in his own parish: p. 57, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"My fixed opinion therefore is this, that though, after a long and careful consideration of the subject, I do sincerely desire that the Revised Version should be introduced into the churches of this diocese, I do also sincerely desire that it should not be introduced without a due preparation of the congregation for the change, and some manifestation of their desire for the change. There will probably be a few churches in our diocese in which the Revised Version is used already, and in regard of them nothing more will be necessary than, from time to time, in occasional addresses, to allude to any important changes that may have appeared in the lessons and recent reading of Holy Scripture, and thus to keep alive the thoughtful study of that which will be more and more felt to be, in the truest sense of the words, the Book of Life. But, in the

great majority of our churches -- though in many cases there may have been passing desires to read and to hear God's Word in its most truthful form -- no forward steps will have been taken. It is in reference then to this great majority of cases that I have broken my long silence..." -- "The Revised Version", pp. 125, 126. p. 57, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

So you see that the Chairman of the Revision Committee was not able to have the Revised Version adopted in his own diocese. p. 57, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Just a further word from a well-known modernist writer concerning the failure of the Revised Version: p. 57, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"But we have not yet produced our best. This Revised Version of 1880 is not our last word. It ought to have been a great success. It had more in its favor than any previous version. And yet we have to say, after thirty years, that the Old Authorized Version with all its defects, is still holding the ground, going out every year in quantities a *hundred times greater* than those of the Revised Version. p. 57, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"The Old Version holds the ground not only by the familiarity of its language but by its wonderful charm. It is universally accepted as a literature masterpiece, as the noblest and most beautiful book in the world. The New Version is more accurate, more scholarly, more valuable. But it avails not. It lacks the literary charm. The verdict is, 'The Old is better.' p. 57, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"On the whole we may assume that far into the twentieth century the Authorized Version will still remain the popular Bible. The Version that is to supercede it will come some day, but when it does it will have more than accurate scholarship. It will have in some degree at least the literary charm and beauty which for 300 years has brought the whole English world under the spell of the old Bible." -- Smythe, "How We Got Our Bible", pp. 152, 153, (Emphasis mine) p. 57, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Finally note that Putnam (Vol. II, page 344) says that the Geneva library in Calvin's day contained so many Greek MSS that it ranked second to the Vatican; that Swete said, ("Introduction", page 181) the Catholic scholars appointed

by the Council of Trent to visit all the libraries of Italy, and find Greek MSS on which to base their officially voted Bible, the Vulgate, came back to the Vatican and the big Vatican MSS, just where Westcott and Hort came in 1881; and that Fulke told the Queen of England in 1583 that the Greek Textus Receptus was in everybody's hand; and again, that Dr. Jacobus declared the textual critics of 1600 were at least as good, if not superior to those of our day. All this evidence shows that the men of 1611 had material ample enough to vouchsafe to us the dependability of our great Protestant Bible. p. 58, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

I will now answer my Reviewers disparaging estimate of Dean Burgon. Dean Burgon is discounted only by those who are looking for people who believe as they do, and who discount all who disagree with them. Burgon's knowledge and scholarship and integrity will stand. An estimate of this godly and scholarly man is given as follows, by the Bishop of Chichester: p. 58, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"No part of his character was more remarkable than his intense reverence for the Word of God. He might take to himself the words of David, when he said, 'Lord, what love have I to Thy Word; all the day long is my study in it.' Every jot and tittle of the scriptures was inestimably precious to him; he treasured them in his heart and mind as coming from God by the inspiration of prophets, evangelists, and apostles, each in their own good time. He delighted in searching out from the commentators on the Scriptures, but he did not disdain such assistance from the old Fathers of the Church, and I do not believer that there is any man who had so large and perfect acquaintance with them; the old divines of our own Church he held also in special regard; but he was no slave to commentators and always said what he thought. He used his own unbiased judgment, and his interpretations of Holy Writ always came fresh from his hands. The years of this careful study to the Scriptures he gave to the world in the so-called "Plain Commentary on the Gospels", a work which later commentaries have in no way superseded. The late Dean has made this work not only useful as a work of reference, but a treasury of Christian counsel. In our sister church of America, I have reason to know, Dean Burgon's commentary holds a high place. This was expressed to me by several of the Bishops whom I met lately at the great Lambeth Conference. The Bishops with one accord expressed their sense of his services to our common Church, and their anxiety on his

behalf. Now, this reverence for the letter as well as the spirit of Holy Writ -- and he held that the spirit was inseparably bound up with the letter, and that both were divine -- I say this reverence led him to vindicate with great learning, and as was confessed with great ability, the authority of the last verses of the Gospel of St. Mark. *This vindication was directed against a certain school of thought which the Dean very justly suspected of subverting the authority of the Word of God, and that they were thereby undermining the faith of many half-learned persons 'wise in their own conceit,' and also the faith of many simple souls. For this reason he set himself the task of criticizing the revised version of the Bible.* I believe, it and therefore will speak of it, that it was his burning zeal for the Word of God which supported him in coming forward as the champion of the cause of which he then was the prophet, and this, I think, cannot be denied that his arguments and critical judgment upon the basis upon which the revised version was constructed, and in a few cases to the errors which he pointed out in the translation, *have retarded, if not completely stopped, the reception of this revised version into our Church, and of thereby supplanting that old version, the inheritance of the English people the world over.* It would be a great injustice to consider Dean Burgon only as a vigorous controversialist, with his thoughts wholly centered in defending the truth of that faith in which he lived." -- The Bishop of Chichester in "The Guardian" Aug. 8, 1888. (Emphasis mine) p. 58, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

V. *Why Discard the King James for the Revised Version?* p. 59, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

I will now introduce a quotation from Canon Cook, found in the Bibliothec Sacra: p. 59, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"He recalled... 'The strong impression made by the weight of authority with which the Revised Version was supported, that the question seemed to be regarded as a last settled. Then came the tremendous onslaught by Dean Burgon, when the popular verdict was pronounced unmistakably. *It is already admitted on all hands that the Revised Version is a great blunder."* -- page 28. p. 59, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

The Reviewers (Section II, page 18) in order to show the superior sources of manuscripts available in 1881 over that of 1611 use three quotations from different authors.

Unfortunately for them these quotations are like the inhabitants of the land of Canaan that ate up one another. A short examination of these quotations will serve to call to remembrance -- or to instruct, if not already known -- points of interest concerning manuscripts which we must always hold in mind if we would have a clear understanding of the problem involved. p. 59, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

In the first place the Reviewers quote from the preface to the Parallel New Testament, to the effect that the manuscripts upon which the Greek Text of the King James Version is founded were of a comparatively late date and few in number. In the light of the facts of the case neither of these points have any great bearing; because a manuscript is of a late date is no evidence that the text is of an inferior nature. In fact this is a very strange piece of information to be held in much esteem by those who seek to impress upon us the idea that there is not much difference among Bibles in general anyway. The manuscripts, as I have previously pointed out, are few in number from the fourth century to the ninth; then we begin to have thousands of them. Why should a manuscript of the ninth century, if it has been faithfully copied and is a legitimate descendant of the Apostles' Bible be held up to considerations of inferiority above a manuscript that was executed in the fourth century? I have previously pointed out that the Jews -- and their copyists cannot be surpassed in skill -- always considered a manuscript of a later date better than one of an older date. p. 59, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

With regard to Manuscripts in 1611 being few in number, let it first be inquired what is meant by "few in number". I have already brought before you the fact that Erasmus had access to many manuscripts in his day. Among the great body of cursives and uncial manuscripts which the Reformers had possessed, the majority agreed with the Received Text. The Reformers had access to many MSS. I quote from Putnam: p. 60, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"Casaubon secured in 1600, at the instance (?) of his friend, Do Vic, appointment as Keeper of the Royal Library (at Geneva)... the collection of Greek manuscripts was said to be second only to that of the Vatican." -- Censorship of the Church of Rome, Vol. II, page 354. p. 60, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

We are indebted for the following information to Dr. F. C. Cook, editor of the "Speaker's Commentary," chaplain to the Queen of England, who was invited to sit on the Revision Committee, but refused: p. 60, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"That Textus Receptus was taken in the first instance from late cursive manuscripts; but its readings are maintained only so far as they agree with the best ancient Versions, with the earliest and best Greek and Latin Fathers, and with the vast majority of uncial and cursive manuscripts." -- F. C. Cook -- "R.V. of the First Three Gospels", page 226. p. 60, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

The above quotation will also answer the quotation (Sec. II, page 19) which says that the MSS of 1611 were "not selected on any estimate of merit." p. 60, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

I wish to present testimony on the value of these manuscripts from other authorities: p. 60, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"The popular notion seems to be, that we are indebted for our knowledge of the true texts of Scripture to the existing uncials entirely; and that the essence of the secret dwells exclusively with the four or five oldest of these uncials. By consequence, it is popularly supposed that since we are possessed of such uncial copies, we could afford to dispense with the testimony of the cursives altogether. A more complete misconception of the facts of the case can hardly be imagined. For the plain truth is THAT ALL THE PHENOMENA EXHIBITED BY THE UNCIAL MANUSCRIPTS ARE reproduced by the cursive copies." (Caps. mine). -- Burgon and Miller, "The Traditional Text", page 202. p. 60, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

The admirers of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus belong to this class who have completely misconceived the whole subject. p. 61, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

We give a further testimony from another eminent authority: p. 61, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"Our experience among the Greek cursives proves to us that transmission has not been careless, and they do represent a wholesome traditional text in the passages involving doctrine and so forth." -- Dr. H. C. Hoskier, "Concerning

the Genesis of the Versions." page 416. p. 61, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

As to the large number of manuscripts in existence, we have every reason to believe that the Reformers were far better acquainted with MSS than later scholars. Dr. Jacobus in speaking of textual critics of 1582, says: p. 61, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"The present writer has been struck with the critical acumen shown at that date (1582), and the grasp of the relative value of the common Greek manuscripts and the Latin version." -- Dr. Jacobus, "Catholic and Protestant Bible", page 212. p. 61, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

On the other hand, if more manuscripts has been made accessible since 1611, little use has been made of what we had before and of the majority of those made available since. The Revisers systematically ignored the whole world of manuscripts and relied practically on only three or four. As Dean Burgon says, "But nineteen-twentieths of these documents, for any use which had been made of them, might just as well be still lying in the monastic libraries from which they were obtained." We feel, therefore, that a mistaken picture of the case has been presented with reference to the material at the disposition of the translators of 1611, and concerning their ability to use that material. p. 61, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

I want my hearers to get this point for it sweeps away the whole theory of the late critics and the supporters of the method used by the Revisers and consequently the position taken by my Reviewers. The point is this; The Revisers, it is claimed, had so many more MSS to compare and consult than Erasmus and the King James translators had. But of what value were they? The Revisers like my Reviewers based the whole fabric of their vision on the Sinaiticus, the Vaticanus, and two or three more MSS. All others are relegated to the rear if they do not agree with B (Vaticanus) and Aleph (Sinaiticanus). Hence, if they had a million MSS the poverty of the Revisers would have been just as great, for they confined themselves to the narrow limits of just their four or five manuscripts after all. All this talk about the large number of manuscripts accessible to the Revisers is of no consequence since they ignored them in their great zeal for the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus. Dr. Scrivener protests in these words: p. 61,

Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"A judge is not impartial if he rejects the testimony of eighty-nine out of a hundred witnesses. It is a law of evidence that the very few are to be suspected rather than the very many." -- "Bibliotheca Sacra", page 35. p. 61, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Returning now to Section II, (page 18) my Reviewers quote again from the "Dictionary of the Bible, edited by James Hastings, to tell us that in 1611 there were about 25 manuscripts while now there are 7,000, but this is not what Dr. Hastings says. The quotation reads: p. 61, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

"The TR (Textus Receptus) is consequently derived from (at most) some 20 or 25 MSS, dating from the last few centuries before the invention of printing..." page 916. p. 62, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

You will note that Dr. Hastings did not say that there were only 25 MSS in existence in 1611; his contention is that the TR was derived from about that many. There is a difference between "derived" and "existing". Dr. Hastings goes on to say of these 20 to 25: p. 62, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"They may be taken as fairly *representative of the great mass of Greek Testament MSS* of the late Middle Ages, but no more." -- page 916. (Emphasis mine) p. 62, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

These 20 or 25 are representative of the great mass, and the fact that they are splendidly representative is backed by the history of the four hundred years of unrivalled leadership. p. 62, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

When did this hunt for ancient Greek MSS begin? It began at the Council of Trent, in order to find a Greek MSS which would dethrone the Textus Receptus and vindicate the Vulgate. And they found it -- the Vaticanus. Charles V stood with drawn sword over the Council of Trent, ordering it to become reconciled to the Protestants. His great Protestant general, Maurice, at the head of his armies, stood with drawn sword over Luther and Melanchthon ordering the Protestants to go to Trent and be reconciled to the Catholics. Neither he, nor Charles V, however, knew the

Jesuits who had seized control of the Council and were determined to rule the world. The first four resolutions of the Council broke with the Protestants on the Bible and enthroned the Vulgate. p. 62, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

To show how misleading was the Reviewers' handling of this same quotation I will go on with the next sentence in the quotation we have been handling. Dr. Hastings says: p. 62, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"At the present time we have over 3,000 MSS of the N.T. or of parts of it, and they range back in age to the 4th century." (page 916) p. 62, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

But we must not believe that any large number of these 3,000 Greek MSS date back to the early centuries. If so, then the next quotation used by the Reviewers (Section II, pp. 18, 19) will completely demolish any such idea; for in the following quotation from the "National Standard Bible Encyclopedia" we are informed that all the MSS that we have of the fourth century are 2; of the fifth century 10; and of the sixth century 25. Authorities know that the great bulk of MSS date from the ninth century on. That the Textus Receptus was built from the material available in 1611 in an almost perfect condition, can be seen from a very interesting report from which I will now read. A committee of 34 Hebrew and Greek scholars were selected to prepare the Tercentenary Edition of the Authorized Bible. Because 1911 made a convenient opportunity to celebrate the work of the King James Version for 300 years, a great exposition over this matter was held in London, England that year. This committee reported, as a result of a careful scrutiny of the entire text, that they repudiated over 98 per cent of the changes introduced by the Revisers of 1881. (See Mauro, "Which Version", page 94). From the Preface to the Tercentenary Edition of the Bible we quote the following: p. 62, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

"The continued confidence of the Church Universal throughout English speaking lands in the Authorized Version is seasoned and mature. Despite a limited number of passages in which the Revisers of 1611 seem to have missed the true meaning, and a number of other passages which have, through changed usage, become obscure, the AV is still *the English Bible."* -- Mauro, "Which Version", page 94. p. 63, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

The above quotation shows very clearly that the Authorized Version has not changed materially since 1611. And most certainly this report shows that if there should have been some "plain and clear errors" in the AV, to remedy these would be a very long way from changing it into the RV; for these 34 Greek and Hebrew scholars on this committee of 1911 point out that after thorough examination they were obliged to reject *98 per cent* of the changes made in the Revised Version. Let us not forget, moreover, that this took place in the year 1911, *thirty years after the R.V. appeared.* And note further that the conclusion of the Committee of 34 refutes the oft-repeated claims that it was the later accumulation of MSS which showed revision necessary. Is not this, therefore, a repudiation of the Greek New Testament underlying the RV, and also of the Revised Version itself, as the ENGLISH BIBLE? p. 63, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

VI. WOULD THE CHANGES OF THE REVISERS AFFECT DOCTRINE? p. 63, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

In two different statements my Reviewers claim that in the changes made by the Revisers they "do not find the fundamentals of our faith altered." (Section II-11) (Quoting Kenyon, "Our Bible and the Ancient MSS", pp. 99, 100). And that further, the truth of God "is found abundantly in any of the great outstanding versions of the Holy Scriptures." (Section II, page 4). p. 63, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

What do my Reviewers mean by the great outstanding versions of the Holy Scriptures? How many of them are there? Which are they? Name them. What great outstanding versions do we have in English besides the Authorized, the Revised, and the Douay? Will the Reviewers put along side of these, the Unitarian Version with its manifest efforts to deny the divinity of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, or the Shorter Bible? p. 63, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

I do not believe they will agree to that. Let us go a little further. By the "great outstanding versions" do they mean Moffat, Weymouth, Rotherham, Goodspeed, and other versions gotten out by individuals? Evidently not, because they quote (Section I, page 3) with approval a letter from Dr. Grant Stroh, writing officially for the Moody Bible Institute under date of Jan. 23, 1931: p. 63, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"Here at the Institute we recommend the American Revision. We use both it and the Authorized. In most instances when changes are made the American Revision is more accurate. *We do not endorse the various irresponsible individual versions, such as the Moffat translation."* (Emphasis mine) p. 64, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Also in the *Sign of the Times,* December 10, 1929, we read: p. 64, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"Within the last two or three years two English translations of the Old Testament have appeared and been rather widely advertised -- one made by James Moffatt, an English scholar, and the other by several professors of the Chicago University. Those who wish to be informed as to the freedom with which Biblical scholars of the modern school, handle the original Hebrew text, amending and transposing it, to make it conform to their own ideas, can secure this information." Then the writer calls those "these modernistic translations." p. 64, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Apparently then, in English the field of the "great outstanding versions" is narrowed down to the Authorized, the Revised, and the Douay (Catholic). Will the Reviewers claim that the truth of God can be found abundantly in the Douay Version? Do they not know that this Version sanctions image worship and also Mariolatry, and also endorses the Apocryphal books and the spurious additions to the Book of Daniel and other books? Perhaps the Reviewers will claim that outside of these spurious readings and spurious books in the Catholic Versions the truth of God can still be found abundantly. p. 64, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

The Reformation was compelled to rule out the Vulgate and the Douay translation of it, before the pure gospel could go to the world. To prove it I will now quote from Dr. Edgar: p. 64, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"It is certainly a remarkable circumstance that so many of the Catholic readings in the New Testament, *which in reformation and early post-reformation times were denounced by Protestants as corruptions of the pure text of God's word,* should now, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, be adopted by the Revisers of our time-honoured English Bibles." "Bibles of England," page 347. (Emphasis mine) p. 64, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

If you wish to see what kind of a version the Douay is, read the 14th chapter of Daniel. p. 64, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

The above quotation from this worker in the field of Bibles and their history reveals two things: (1) That the Protestants in Reformation and post-Reformation times eliminated from their New Testament many of the Catholic readings; and (2) that the Revisers put them back in again. If there were no difference between the Vulgate and the Textus Receptus, why did not the Reformers and Protestants take the Vulgate as the basis of their translations? Not only Luther, but since Luther, outstanding German Versions, as those of Dr. Leander Van Ess (1889), Dr. R. Brockhus, (1871, Dr. Franz E. Schlacter (1902), and Dr. L. Reichard (1878) are translated from the Textus Receptus. p. 64, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Therefore in English the great outstanding versions are not reduced to two... the King James and the Revised... they are reduced to simply one, the Authorized. And I would be very glad to have my Reviewers explain what they mean by saying that the truth of God can be found abundantly in any of the outstanding versions. p. 65, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Now with reference to the field outside of the English versions, note how difficult it is to consider this apart from our Authorized Version. The 'Washington Star' says there are two hundred million English speaking people in the world. The nearest approach to this number speaking a single tongue is the Russian speaking people, one hundred million, and the German speaking people, one hundred million. Historians tell us that the two hundred million English speaking people have been bound together by one great common bond, and that bond is our Authorized English Bible. Moreover, it is now quite generally recognized that the British Empire and United States hold the balance of power in the world, that in fact without them, civilization would go to ruin. How then can we consider the great outstanding Versions outside the English as having any very important bearing upon the whole problem of the world situation? If my line of argument then be true, we are brought down to the fact that the great outstanding dominating Version which contains abundantly the truth of the Living God, and which must be guarded preciously, is the Authorized Version. It must be guarded against the

changes made in it by the Revisers of 1881, 98 per cent of which were rejected by the Committee of 34 Greek and Hebrew scholars of 1911. p. 65, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Referring again to the statement from Bishop Westcott, which was represented wrongly by my Reviewers, (Section I, page 23), that Bishop Westcott claimed that articles of faith were changed by the repetition of changes in the Revised, I will say that when I come to discuss the closing sections of this Reply, we will see that my Reviewers, themselves, admit that on certain passages my contention is correct that the theology of the Revisers influence in changes which very disastrously affected great doctrines, and I shall show others of the same kind, which my Reviewers would not admit. Furthermore the quotation from the Presbyterian Magazine at the beginning of the Chapter XV of my book claims that the Revisers wished to change doctrine. p. 65, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

The examination of the claim that the Rheims New Testament (Jesuit New Testament of 1582) had any influence on the AV, I have answered very positively in the negative in Example No. II in the first section of this reply. I believe now that I have answered in this section, and perhaps in one or two instances, in other sections, most all that my Reviewers have offered for my consideration in their Section II, on the Bible MSS in General. p. 65, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

With regard to the value of the Vaticanus, just a word before taking up Section III, from one who as late as 1921 summed up the findings of later critics: p. 65, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"Another scheme devised by Dr. Hort to justify his abbreviated text was to put forward the Vatican Codex B as the purest text and nearest to the original autographs. This preference has been condemned by later critics." "Bibliotheca Sacra", 1921, page 33. p. 65, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

SECTION III -- 'THE ITALA AND THE BIBLE OF THE WALDENSES.' p. 66, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

I have reserved a special chapter for the Itala, and the Bible of the Waldenses. I do it particularly because my Reviewers announce (Section I, page 15) that "the decisive

consideration is whether the Itala was translated direct from Palestine, or whether it originated in North Africa." This fact they make is *so* decisive that they say: p. 66, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"When this claim is overthrown, the very foundation of the book under review is removed, and the conclusions which are based upon it are rendered untenable," (Section I, page 17.) p. 66, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

I accept the challenge. I ask them if they will abide by the results. Here again we meet with the repeated mistake in the leading quotation, the unfortunate choosing of proof, and presentation of witnesses whose testimonies eat up one another. p. 66, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Concerning the opening quotation from Dr. Nolan, (Section I, page 13) they say,... p. 66, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"The uncertainty in his own contention is clearly recognized even by Mr. Nolan." p. 66, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

***I reply.* The thing which we clearly recognize is that the Reviewers certainly took Mr. Nolan's testimony out of its setting entirely. Why did they not go on and finish the paragraph? Mr. Nolan shows that he had not the slightest trouble to find the name of the Itala, its location, and the reason for that name, Dr. Nolan does not question the propriety of the name of the Itala he refers to others who have questioned it. I will go on and quote from the point where they left off, Dr. Nolan says: p. 66, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].**

"In considering the strange error into which Dr. Bently has led Archbishop Potter, Dr. Mosheim, and Professor Michaelis, on this subject, the *author perceived, without any labor of inquiry,* that it derived its name from that diocese, which has been *termed the Italick,* as contradistinguished from the Roman... p. 66, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

"In the search to which these considerations have led the author, *his fondest expectations have been fully realized."* "Inquiry into Integrity of the GREEK VULGATE," preface pp. XVII, XVIII. (Emphasis mine) p. 66, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

In the face of these words, I wish to know why my

Reviewers quoted only part of this passage, left the hearers under a wrong impression, and drew from those words precisely the opposite conclusion from that which you see the author goes on to state. Why did they present before you Dr. Nolan as in uncertainty concerning the Itala, when his *whole book* was written to show that he arrived at the most positive kind of certainty? A considerable part of his book is written to show that the Latin Bible of the Waldenses was of the family of the Itala and was the Received Text. p. 66, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers next claim that my whole contention stands or falls on the fact, which they set out of prove, that the original Latin version came from Africa. In support of their contention they first give us two quotations from Dr. Westcott. (Section I, page 14). p. 66, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

It can naturally be seen that Dr. Westcott would be a prejudiced witness, because Dr. Westcott is one of the two men, under heavy indictment in my book. We suggest it would have been more logical to have grounded their argument upon better bases. Nevertheless, let us examine Bishop Westcott and see what his testimony to Westcott says: p. 67, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"There is not the slightest trace of the existence of independent Latin Versions." "General Survey of the History of the Canon." page 278. p. 67, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Over against the testimony of Westcott I will put the testimony of three different authorities, whom my Reviewers usually seem very glad to use. Why they failed to use them in this place, I do not know. The first is from Dr. Kenyon. Speaking of the Old Latin version, he says: p. 67, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"What is certain is that the version exists in two different forms, probably representing *two independent translations,* known, from the regions in which they were circulated, as the 'African' and the 'European': and that a revised form of the latter was current in Italy towards the end of the fourth century and was known as the *Italic,"* Kenyon, "Our Bible and Ancient MSS" page 78. (Emphasis mine) p. 67, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Another from Dr. Kenyon: p. 67, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"But the Old Latin was made long before any of our manuscripts were written, and takes us back almost to within a generation of the time at which the sacred books were themselves composed. The Old Latin Version is consequently one of the most valuable and interesting evidences which we possess for the condition of the New Testament Text in the earliest times. It has already been said (page 78) that it was originally made in the second century perhaps not very far from A.D. 150, and probably, though not certainly, in Africa. *Another version, apparently independent, subsequently appeared in Europe."* Idem, page 166. (Emphasis mine) p. 67, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"Codex Brixianus (f), sixth century, with an Italian Text." Idem, page 168. p. 67, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"The Italian Text being evidently due to a revision of those with the help of Greek copies of a Syrian type." Idem, page 169. p. 67, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

The first two quotations from Dr. Kenyon disprove the contention of my Reviewers. They present an independent line of Old Latin Versions whose origin is Europe. They further represent that a certain revision of the European type is known as the Italian or the Italic. Now note Dr. Kenyon's remarkable statement to the effect that the Italian text was the revision with the help of Greek copies of a Syrian type. Since Dr. Kenyon had adopted Hort's word "Syrian" to mean the Textus Receptus, here we have positive evidence that the Itala or the Italic type of Latin manuscript was of the Textus Receptus type. It is this Itala which Dr. Nolan proves was the Bible of the Waldenses. Moreover, Dr. Kenyon specifically names the Codex Brixianus, as does Dr. Nolan. Thus we have the testimony of Dr. Nolan, Dr. Kenyon, also Burgon and Miller, the effect that the Codes Brixianus is of the type of the Textus Receptus. We now add a special testimony from Hastings: p. 67, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

"Of the Italian group, (f) (Codex Brixianus) is the most pronounced, and has been taken by Wordsworth and White as the best representative of the Old Latin text which Jerome had before him when he undertook his revision of the Latin New Testament." Hastings, "Dictionary of the Bible," page 921. p. 68, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers have claimed that there is no hope of having the Italic transmitted in a pure form direct from Palestine to the Waldenses. (Section I, page 13). The testimony of Hastings on this point is enlightening: p. 68, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"The kinship which the text of the Old Latin has with the Old Syriac has caused Antioch to be suggested (by Sandy) as the original home of the version, that being a metropolis where Syrian and Latin elements met, and where versions of the scriptures in either tongue might radiate from a common center." page 921. p. 68, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Again from Gregory: p. 68, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"From one translation, then or *if any one insists upon it, from two or three independent Latin translations,* the manuscripts passed through the Provinces to Gaul, to Great Britain, to Ireland," "Canon and Text," page 409. (Emphasis mine) p. 68, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

The African theory invented by Cardinal Wiseman has since been disproved. I wish, however, to call the attention of my hearers to the fact that my Reviewers have stepped forward and advocated the theory invented by Cardinal Wiseman, when he helped Cardinal Newman to Romanize Oxford University and subsequently all England. Would you believe it if I tell that this theory of the African origin of the Old Latin was invented by Cardinal Wiseman. I have given evidence in my book which can be obtained from the life of this prelate that he was furnished with considerable of his material by the Jesuits. "Without this training," he said later, "I should not have thrown myself into the Pusoyite Controversy at a later date." (Ward, "Life and Times of Wiseman," Wiseman Vol. I,' page 65) The Cardinal shows us that it was his familiarity with higher criticism which nerved his arm to help Cardinal Newman Jesuitize Oxford University. I will give you now a quotation from Burgon and Miller, to show how Cardinal Wiseman invented the theory, and that the theory has now been disproved. Then I will take one of the authorities used by my Reviewers, which also give you testimony opposed to the African theory: p. 68, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"It is instructive to trace how the error arose. It came chiefly, if I mistake not, from two ingenious letters of Cardinal Wiseman, then a young man, and from the

familiarity which they displayed with early African literature. So Lachmann, Tischendorf, Davidson, Tregelles, Scrivener, and Westcott and Hort followed him. Yet an error lies at the root of Wiseman's argument which, if the thing had appeared now, scholars would not have let pass unchallenged and uncorrected." Burgon and Miller, "The Traditional Text," page 142. p. 68, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers used a quotation from the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia in their effort to prove that the Itala was the Vulgate, (Sec. I, page 16). They overlooked a paragraph preceding, which demolishes their theory or rather Cardinal Wiseman's theory... when they say that the Old Latin manuscripts were of African origin. I will now quote the paragraph which my Reviewers overlooked: p. 69, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"Although the evidence has, up to the present time, been regarded as favoring the African origin of the first Latin translation of the Bible, recent investigation into what is called the Western Text of the N.T. has yielded results pointing elsewhere. It is clear from a comparison that the Western type of text has *close affinity with the Syrian witnesses originating in the Eastern provinces of the Empire.* The close textual relation disclosed between the Latin and the Syrian versions has led some authorities to believe that, after all, the earliest Latin version may have been made in the East, and possibly at Antioch." "International S. B. Encyclopedia." Vol. III, page 1842. (Emphasis mine) p. 69, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

It is interesting to note that the quotation which they did use from this same Encyclopedia, and which *followed* (the former paragraph *preceded)* the above quotation, was an effort on their part to prove that the Itala was the Vulgate. (This was on page 16, Section I.) However, on page 15, Section I, they used another quotation (from Scrivener) to prove that the Itala was a stepping stone to the Vulgate. Now will my Reviewers please tell us which of the two they meant it to be, the Vulgate, or a stepping stone to the Vulgate. It can't be both. They have delivered to us here contradictory testimony. p. 69, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

In their endeavor to disprove the Itala as a text of the Textus Receptus type they bring quotations to show that it was a stepping stone to the Vulgate. I cannot see what bearing this has on the situation. Suppose Jerome did use

the Old Latin getting out his Vulgate, In fact we know he did use it. But the Old Latin still persisted after the Vulgate was made even until the 12th and 13th centuries. So all quotations about the Old Latin being a stepping stone to the Vulgate are beside the point. p. 69, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Why did my Reviewers say (Section I, page 16): "Waldenses had only Vulgate." I take issue with this statement, when the Spirit of Prophecy shows that the Vulgate contained many errors (Great Controversy, page 245), and also declared that the Waldensian Bible was preserved uncorrupted. (Great Controversy, page 65) The evidence is clear that the true Waldensian Bible was not the Vulgate. Of course they had access to the Vulgate as we Protestants today also have, but it was not their own proper Bible. Dr. Schaff says: "This high place the Vulgate holds even to this day in the Roman Church, where it is unwarrantably and perniciously placed on an equality with the original." Do not accuse the Waldenses of this "unwarranted" and "Pernicious" doing. (Mcclintock and Strong, Art. Jerome.) p. 69, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

In section I, page 15, they bring forth a quotation from Gregory which says: p. 69, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"Rome and Southern Italy in Christian circles were too thoroughly Greek at first to need a Latin Text." "Canon and Text," page 156. p. 70, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

In other words, my Reviewers to sustain their African theory try to secure evidence to prove that the early Christians of Italy were Greek speaking. Let us hear the Bible on this point, I read in Phil. 4:22, "All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Caesar's household." p. 70, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

From the quotation of my Reviewers, it would seem, then, that Paul's converts from Caesar's household, from the immediate circles of the ruler of the Roman Empire, could not talk Latin, but were talking Greek. This cannot be true, because it is unbelievable that the members of the household of the head of the great Latin Empire, could not speak Latin. Furthermore, I read in Romans 16:1-16 that Paul in his letter to the Church at Rome sent salutation to the following brethren and sisters: Phebe, Priscilla and Aquila, Epaenetus, Mary, Andronicus, and Junia, Amplias,

Urbano, Stachys, Apellos, Aristobulus (household), Herodion, household of Narcissus, Tryphena and Tryphosa, Persis, Rufus, Asyncritus, Phlegen, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, Philologus, and Julia, Nereus and his sister Olympas. p. 70, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

What a grand array of Latin Christians at Rome! Do you suppose that these poor brethren (according to the argument of my Reviewers) had to sit around ninety years waiting for an African Latin Bible to come to Caesar's household before they had the Scriptures in Latin; and that they were using a Greek Bible? At this point let me quote from Burgon and Miller, page 145: p. 70, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"How could he (Paul) have known intimately so many of the leading Roman Christians, unless they had carried his teaching along the road of commerce from Antioch to Rome? Such travellers, and they would by no means be confined to the days of St. Paul, would understand Syriac as well as Latin. The stories and books, told or written in Aramaic must have gone through all Syria, recounting the thrilling history of redemption before the authorized accounts were given in Greek. *Accordingly, in the earliest times translations must have been made from Aramaic or Syriac into Latin, as afterwards from Greek. Then a connection between the Italian and Syrian Churches, and also between the teaching given in the two countries, must have lain embedded in the foundations of their common Christianity,* and must have exercised an influence during very many years after." Burgon and Miller, "The traditional Text.", page 145. (Emphasis mine) p. 70, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

All the foregoing argument may be found in my book summed up in one paragraph which my Reviewers did not notice, much less attempt to answer. This paragraph reads, (O. S. B. V., page 37) p. 70, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"It is recognized that the Itala was translated from the Received Text (Syrian Hort calls it); that the Vulgate is the Itala with the readings of the Received Text removed." p. 70, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Of course this means the variant readings removed. Why did Jerome remove the Textus Receptus variant readings from the Itala, if the Itala and the Vulgate were the same? See also article on Jerome in Mcclintock and Strong's Encyclopedia which shows that Jerome in getting out the Vulgate,

departed widely from the "traditional text" (i.e. Textus Receptus). "the only text which was known" to those who resisted Jerome's innovations. If Holvidius, Jovinian and Vigilantus (reputed founder of the Waldenses) were fighting Jerome, it was not likely they would accept his Bible, edited under the flatteries of the Pope. p. 71, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

But we have some more splendid testimony concerning the Waldensians and their Bible. Other than is left entirely to the speculation of higher critics. I read from the earlier edition of "Great Controversy:" p. 71, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"The Waldenses were the first of all the people of Europe to obtain a translation of the Scriptures. Hundreds of years before the Reformation, they possessed the entire Bible in manuscript in their native tongue. They had the truth unadulterated, and this rendered them the special objects of hatred and persecution.... Here the lamp of truth was kept burning during the long night that descended upon Christendom. Here for a thousand years they maintained their ancient faith." "Great Controversy," pp. 70, 71, (1884 edition). p. 71, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

The Spirit of Prophecy emphasis the fact that the Waldenses were the first people to have the Scriptures translated from the original into their native tongue. She said they had the entire Bible, and whatever Bible they had, it was pure and unadulterated. I wish to make note that this evangelical Bible stretched back to Apostolic days, I quote from Dr. Alexis Muston: p. 71, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"Thus was the *primitive* church preserved in the Alps at the very period of the Reformation. The Vaudois are the chain which united the Reformed church with the first disciples of our Saviour. It is in vain that Popery, renegade from evangelical verities, has a thousand times sought to break this chain, it resists all her efforts. Empires have crumbled, dynasties have fallen, but this chain of scriptural testimony has not been broken, because its strength is not from men, but from God." Muston, "The Israel of the Alps", Vol. I, page 29. p. 71, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Let us recognize that Jerome brought the Vulgate into existence 390 A.D. By the influence of the Pope the

Apocryphal books were inserted. The Waldenses on the other hand, made a distinction between the Canonical and the Apocryphal books, My Reviewers intimate that they did not by the quotation (Section I, page 16) and further that they did not have the whole Bible. But I read from Allix: p. 71, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"The Church of Italy made a more accurate distinction of the Canonical Books from the Apocryphal, than the Church of Rome at that time did." Allix, "Ancient Churches of Piedmont", page 23. p. 71, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

He is speaking of the ancestors of Waldenses had certain of the Apocryphal books, but they did not look upon them as authoritative for doctrine, any more than certain English Bibles having hymns printed in them. Their confession of faith 1120 says so about Apocryphal books. (See Perrie, "History of Ancient Christians", page 212. p. 71, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Furthermore, the Spirit of Prophecy says that the Scriptures of the Waldenses were pure and unadulterated. To us speaks again "Great Controversy"; p. 72, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"Some manuscripts contained the whole Bible..." "By patient, untiring labor, sometimes in the deep, dark caverns of the earth, by the light of torches, the Sacred Scriptures were written out, verse by verse, chapter by chapter... Angels of heaven surrounded these faithful workers. p. 72, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"Satan had urged on the papal priests and prelates to bury the Word of truth beneath the rubbish of error, heresy, and superstition; but in a most wonderful manner it was preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness. "Great Controversy", pp. 68, 69. p. 72, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Does Sister White say here that angels held back the hand of the papists from corrupting their own Bible? No, she does not. She says that Satan urged them on to bury it in error, later she says that Wycliffe's Bible was translated from the Latin (Vulgate) which contained many errors. (See "Great Controversy", page 245, edition 1911). An interesting point I will here mention is that the "Celts used a Latin Bible unlike the Vulgate." R. C. Flick "Rise

of the Mediaeval Church." Sister White says, p. 72, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"In Great Britain, primitive Christianity had very early taken root. The gospel received by the Britons in the first centuries, was then uncorrupted by Romish apostasy." Great Controversy", page 62. p. 72, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

For further testimony that the Vulgate was corrupted, I read from D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation": p. 72, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"But to the popular attack of sarcasm Erasmus united science and learning... He showed that they must not even rest contented with the Vulgate, *which swarmed with errors;* and he rendered an incalculable service to truth by publishing his critical edition of the Greek text of the New Testament a text as little known in the West as if it had never existed." Book one, Chapter 8, page 42. (Emphasis mine) p. 72, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

We can readily see that the Vulgate was not the Bible of the Waldenses. By further search we discover that step by step, as the Waldenses refused to bow the knee to Rome, so likewise, the Bible of the Waldenses refused to bow the knee to the Vulgate. We will speak of the people first. I quote from Muston: p. 72, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

"Thus we see that the Apostolic Church of Italy, disowned and proscribed by papal pride, gradually retired from Rome, withdrew into Upper Italy, and sought a retreat in the wilderness to preserve her purity. We see her first sheltered in the diocese of Milan, where Popery still pursues her. p. 72, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

She then retires into the diocese of Verceil, and thither also the hostile pretensions of Popery are extended. She takes refuge in the diocese of Turin, but Popery still gains upon her, and at last she seeks an asylum in the mountains. We find her in the Vaudois valleys!" Muston, "Israel of the Alps", Vol. 1, page 10. p. 73, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

I quote also Mccabe, "Cross and Crown": p. 73, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"Soon after the introduction of Christianity into Italy by

the Apostles, the people of these valleys became converts to the faith preached by St. Paul. They accepted and taught the doctrines of the Apostles, and practiced the simple rites or usages as described by Justin or Tertullian. They acknowledged the Holy Scriptures as their sole rule of faith, and rejected all that was not taught in the books of the New Testament. From the days of Constantine to the present time, they have never changed their faith, and have never altered in any important particular their religious observances." Pages 22, 23. p. 73, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"The Vaudois, therefore, are not schismatics, but continued inheritors of the Church founded by the Apostles. This Church then bore the name of Catholic, and was persecuted by the Pagans. Afterwards, becoming powerful and persecuting in its turn, it underwent a vitiation of its very nature in Catholicism, whilst it was preserved in the Vaudois Valleys simple, free, and pure, as in the time of persecution." Idem, page 25. p. 73, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

We have the history of the people, we will now have the history of the Bible. Dr. Jacobus says: p. 73, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"The Old Latin versions were used longest by the Western Christians who would not bow to the authority of Rome." **"Bible Versions Compared." Appendix, Note 15. p. 73, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].**

This quotation proves that several bodies of Western Christians for 900 years refused the Vulgate and clung to the Old Latin Bible. The Reformers also recognized the thousands of errors in the Vulgate. It was impossible therefore for the Waldenses as one of those Christian bodies opposed to Rome to do otherwise than refuse to accept the Vulgate. p. 73, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

The High Antiquity of the Waldenses was attested to by the Catholic authorities as well as by others. p. 73, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

"Dungal, an ecclesiastic, who was the bitter enemy of Claude... makes constant reference to Vigilantius. Vigilantius, he said, was the neighbor and spiritual ancestor of Claude... both being natives of Spain, and the author of 'his madness'." Bompiana, "Hist. of Waldenses", pages 12, 13. p. 73, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Vigilantius lived in the days of Jerome and was famous for his great learning and opposition to Jerome. On the other hand, Claude, Bishop of Turin, lived nearly five hundred years later than Vigilantus, or about 820 A.D. It is from Vigilantus that the Waldenses are sometimes called Leonists. This same Catholic author, Dungal, proves that after the lapse of centuries, the memory and influence of Vigilantus remained among the men of the valleys, and that although the example, preaching, and work of Claude about 820 A.D. encouraged them and strengthened them in the noble ways of Vigilantus they never attribute their origin to Claude. p. 74, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

As we adduce testimony from Sir Samuel Moreland, and also from Leger, concerning this ancient people, it may be well here to refer to the testimony of Samuel Miller, Professor of Eccl. History, Princeton, 1845, to the effect that the accounts given by these two authors are attested by "many unimpeachable witnesses"! ("History of the Ancient Christians", by Perrin, page 6.) This statement of Perrin who refers to Moreland for his authority: p. 74, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"Thus you see the constant and uninterrupted succession of the doctrine of these churches from the times of the Apostles, to that of Claudius, and so through the 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries until some of Waldo's disciples came into these valleys which was in the 12th century, where they have professed and taught ever since. I need not prove the continued succession of this doctrine in those churches, from the 12th century until now, because all popish writers do unanimously confess it." Perrin, "History of the Vaudois," page 278. p. 74, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Vigilantus, Helvidius and Jovinian are three of the outstanding names which come down to us as great scholars, living in the regions of Northern Italy, or right across the Alps in France, who stood out strongly against the rule and corruption of Rome. All three lived in the time of Jerome, that is, from or about 350 to 425 A.D. All three strongly opposed Jerome. Helvidius actually accused Jerome to his face of using corrupt Greek manuscripts. While so great was the influence and learning of Jovinian that the combined scholarship of the church of Rome was unable to answer him. p. 74, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

We have authoritative testimony that the followers, teachings, and influence of both Jovinian and Vigilantus continued down to the days of the Reformers. And we have reliable testimony that Vigilantus was the spiritual father of the people of the valley, whose continuing name generally was Vaudois but who passed under many other names. These people we are assured, both by the Spirit of Prophecy, and by history, kept the seventh day as the Sabbath, if not all, yet enough to stand out prominently upon the pages of history. p. 74, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

We have the testimony of the historian, Neander, (Volume 8): p. 74, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"But it was not without some foundation of truth that the Waldenses of this period asserted the high antiquity of their sect, and maintained that from the time of the secularization of the church, that is, as they believe, from the time of Constantine's gift to the Romanish Bishop Sylvester, such opposition as broke forth in them had existed all along." "History of the Christian Religion", 5th Period, Sec. IV. page 605. p. 74, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

It is true, as both history and the Spirit of Prophecy testify, that at times a certain number of the Waldenses would grow loose, go to mass, etc., and some even apostatized. p. 75, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

I submit to my hearers if I have not established the chain from the Apostles down to Vigilantus, 400 A.D. I have already given a testimony to show that these same followers stretch from Vigilantus to Claude of 820 A.D. My Reviewers accuse me of not bridging the gaps. How much more testimony is necessary to bridge the gaps? Add to this the statement of Sister White, that they had the Bible entire and uncorrupted; then place alongside of this the facts already given, that their Bible could not have been the Vulgate, but was the Old Latin, which never bowed the knee to the Vulgate, then the chain respecting the Bible is also complete. Now let this chain stretch clear on to the Reformation. The Vaudois are the chain which unites the Reformed churches with the disciples of our Saviour. Hear again what Muston says: p. 75, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"It is in vain that Popery, renegade from evangelical verities has a thousand times sought to break this chain. It resists all her efforts. Empires have crumbled,

dynasties have fallen, but this chain of scriptural testimony has not been broken, because its strength is not from men, but from God." Muston, "Israel of the Alps", Vol. I, page 29. p. 75, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Is it not strange, brethren, that I must stand before Seventh-day Adventists to defend the Waldenses and the Waldensian Bible? Is it not strange that I must stand before Seventh-day Adventists to prove that the Waldensian Bible was not the corrupt Scriptures of Rome? But let us go on, for I have stronger proof coming. p. 75, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

I wish here to scatter to the winds an opinion which can be found not a thousand miles away from here, that the Waldenses were not particularly a learned people, but only a missionary people. I quote from Muston: p. 75, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"Gilles says, 'This Vaudois people have had pastors of great learning.... versed in the languages of Holy Scripture... and very laborious... especially in transcribing to the utmost of their ability, the books of Holy Scripture, for the use of their disciples.' (Chapter 2, page 15, par. 2.) This explains the circumstance that copies of the books of the Bible, translated in the Romance Tongue, are of far more frequent occurrence than copies of any other work preserved in our Vaudois MSS." Muston, "Israel of the Alps." Vol. 2, page 448. p. 75, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

The great antiquity of the Waldensian vernacular preserved through the centuries witnesses to their line of descent independent from Rome and to the purity of their original Latin. Muston, speaking of the Italian work of Bert, says: p. 75, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"An incidental remark leads me to make an observation here on the subject of language, that the patois of the Vaudois valleys has a radical structure far more regular than the Piedmontese idiom. The origin of this patois was anterior to the growth of Italian and French, antecedent even to the Romance language, whose earliest documents exhibit still more analog with the present language of the Vaudois mountaineers, than with that of the troubadours of the 13th and 14th centuries. The existence of this patois is of itself proof of the high antiquity of these mountaineers,

and of their constant preservation from foreign intermixture and changes. Their popular idiom is a precious monument," Muston, "Israel of the Alps", Vol. 2, page 406. p. 75, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

I will recall here again the quotation I gave in my book, (page 34) to the effect that about 600 A.D., Pope Gregory I burned in the city of Rome two great libraries in which were collected the precious Greek and Latin manuscripts of the Waldenses. At the same time, Pope Gregory I was persecuting the large number of Sabbath keepers who lived in the City of Rome. And if any one wishes to regard this fact lightly, let him answer the facts on pages 526-530 of Andrews and Conradi's "History of the Sabbath" that this same Pope Gregory I issued a remarkable document to stamp out the large body of Sabbath keepers in the City of Rome itself. Moreover this same Pope sent missionaries to England and to Northern Europe to stamp out Sabbath-keeping Christianity. Still another quotation along this line: p. 76, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"Unfortunately many of these books were lost during the persecutions of the 17th century, and only those books and ancient documents sent to the libraries of Cambridge and Geneva by Pastor Leger were preserved. The papists took care after every persecution to destroy as much of the Waldensian literature as possible. Many of the barbes were learned men and well versed in the languages and science of the Scriptures. A knowledge of the Bible was the distinctive feature of the ancient, and is now of the modern Vaudois." Bompiani, "History of the Waldenses," pages 56, 57. p. 76, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"Deprived for centuries of a visible, church, and forced to worship in the caves and dens, this intimate knowledge of God's Word was their only light. Their school was in the almost inaccessible solitude of a deep mountain gorge, called Pral del Tor, and their studies were severe and long continued, embracing the Latin, Romaunt, and Italian languages." Idem, pages 57. p. 76, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

This idea which prevails, engendered and fostered by Rome, that the Waldenses were few in number, without much organization or learning, and dependent upon Rome for their Bible and culture, is dispelled by this picture. Without adding more quotations, I will state that we have abundant reliable testimony that in some places the nobility were

members of their churches, that they were the greatest scholars and theologians of their day; that they were the leaders in language, literature, music, and oratory. There are authors who say that the language of the Waldenses was the language which contributed to the revival of learning. Of course most of the writings of the Waldenses were destroyed in the great persecutions which raged in the 16th and 17th centuries. p. 76, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

I wish here also to emphasis the difference between the older Romaunt language and the later. Confusion may arise unless we emphasize the splendid tongue of the early Waldenses stretching from the year 400 on in comparison with that used by Waldo about the year 1200, when he and his followers added themselves to the ancient Waldenses. p. 76, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Just here I give a quotation to show the great influence the Waldenses had upon the Reformation: p. 77, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"Seemingly they took no share in the great struggle which was going on around them in all parts of Europe, but in reality they were exercising a powerful influence upon the world. Their missionaries were everywhere, proclaiming the simple truths of Christianity, and stirring the hearts of men to their very depths. In Hungary, in Bohemia, in France, in England, in Scotland, as well as Italy, they were working with tremendous, though silent power. Lollard, who paved the way for Wycliffe in England, was a missionary from these Valleys. The Albigenses, whose struggle with Rome forms one of the most touching episodes of history, owed their knowledge of the truth to the Vaudois missions. In Germany and Bohemia the Vaudois teachings heralded, if they did not hasten, the Reformation. And Huss and Jerome, Luther and Calvin did little more than carry on the work begun by the Vaudois missionaries." Mccabe, "Cross and Crown, page 32. p. 77, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

We have proved before that the Old Latin Bible for 900 years resisted the Vulgate and persisted in the hands of those who never bowed the knee to Rome. We will now bring you up to the time of the Reformation, or the 13th century. Did the Waldenses then accept the Vulgate? No indeed. p. 77, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

When the early leaders of the Reformation came, by

invitation, into the valleys of the Waldenses, to meet their assembled delegates from all over Europe, they saw in the hands of their learned pastors, what, -- the Vulgate? No! They saw manuscripts going back to "time out of mind" in the ancient and not the modern, Romaunt language. By agreement between the Waldenses and the Reformers, these manuscripts were translated into French, compared with the original Hebrew and Greek, and became the Olivetan Bible, the first Protestant Bible in the French language, Olivetan came with Farel, the leading Reformer to this council of the Waldensian churches. The second edition of the Olivetan Bible produced by Calvin, became the basis of the Geneva Bible in English. The Geneva Bible was a foundation and forerunner of the King James. Is not the chain now complete, and is it not now clear that our Authorized Version is the Bible of the Apostles coming down through the noble Waldenses? Let me give you an authoritative quotation on these facts: p. 77, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"'The Reformers,' says one who was present at the meeting, 'were greatly rejoiced to see that people, who had ever proved faithful, the Israel of the Alps, to whose charge God had committed for so many centuries the Ark of the New Covenant -- thus eager in His service. And examining with interest, 'says he,' the manuscript copies of the Old and New Testaments in the vulgar tongue which were amongst us'... It will be perceived that it is a Vaudois who speaks... 'correctly copied with the hand at a *date beyond all* memory,' they marveled at the favour of Heaven which a people so small in numbers had enjoyed, and rendered thanks to the Lord that the Bible *had never been taken from them.* Then, also, in their great desire that the reading of it might be made profitable to a greater number of persons, they adjured all the other brethren, for the glory of God and the good of Christians, to take measures for circulating it, showing how necessary it was that a general translation should be made of it into French, carefully compared with the original texts and of which large numbers would be printed.'" ... Muston, "Israel of the Alps," Vol. I, page 97. p. 77, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

I quote another account of this event from Mccabe, "Cross and Crown." p. 78, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"Thus the time passed on until the Reformation dawned upon the world. The Vaudois were well pleased at this general awakening of the human mind. They entered into

correspondence with the Reformers in various parts of Europe, and sent several of their Barbes to them to instruct them. The Reformers on their part, admitted the antiquity of the Vaudois rites and the purity of their faith, and treated the mountain Church with the greatest respect. On the 12th of September, 1532, a Synodal Assembly was held at Angrogna. It was attended by a number of deputies from the Reformed Churches in France and Switzerland. Among them was William Farel, of France, to whom we shall refer again in another part of this work. He manifested the greatest interest in the manuscript copies of the Bible which the Vaudois had preserved from *the earliest times,* and at his instance the entire Bible was translated into French, and sent as a free gift from the Vaudois to the French." page 37. p. 78, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

I have given all this particularly in my book. To be sure, I do not use the same authors and the same quotations, but I give the same history and results. In the quotation I give in my book (page 32) from Leger he contrasted this Olivetan French Bible of 1535 (or 1537) with the manuscripts formerly found among the papists, which he said "were full of falsifications." p. 78, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Recall that about forty years after this, the learned fathers of the Council of Trent, upon the recommendation of Gregory XIII in 1578, made a study of all the Greek MSS in the libraries of Italy for one MS with which to defend the Vulgate and they chose the Vaticanus MS. Nevertheless, forty years previous the Waldenses declared that the MSS found among the papists were full of falsifications. p. 78, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

It will be interesting to listen to another account of this meeting of the Reformers with the Waldenses, as taken from the life of William Farel by Bevan, (written in French): p. 78, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"During the remainder of his visit in the valley of Angrogna, Farel had interesting interviews with the pastors and the villagers. They showed him their old manuscripts; some of these they said dated back 400 years in the past. The Vaudois preserved them as precious treasures from father to son; these books were very rare, were all which they possessed in the nature of religious readings. There were among those manuscripts, ancient Bibles, copied with

care in the old French. While, in the so-called Christian countries, the Word of God had become an unknown book, these mountaineers possessed it and read it from generation to generation." ... Bevan, Life of Wm. Farel," page 207. (Translated by B. G. Wilkinson.) p. 78, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Gilly, Leger, and Muston were put in the Index. (Muston II:400). p. 79, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

If then, as Muston said, this Bible had never been taken from the Waldenses, and they claim in the preface to this Olivetan Bible that they had always enjoyed the free use of the Holy Scriptures since the days of the Apostles, it follows that our Authorized Version passed straight in a clear line back through the Waldenses to the days of the Apostles. p. 79, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

THE COMPLETED CHAIN. **p. 79, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].**

A short review of authorities here: p. 79, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Pleas note again the quotation I have already given that "In the very earliest times translations must have been made from Aramaic or Syriac into Latin, as afterwards from Greek. Thus a connection between the Italian and Syriac churches, and also between the teaching given in the two countries, must have lain embedded in the foundations of their common Christianity, and must have exercised an influence during very many years after." Burgon and Miller, "Traditional Text" page 145. p. 79, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Now add to this Sister White's testimony that the Waldenses had "not a faith newly received. Their religious belief was their inheritance from their fathers," ... Great Controversy," page 64. p. 79, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"The Waldenses were the first of all the peoples of Europe to obtain a translation of the Holy Scriptures." (Old Edition, 1884, page 65). "Some MSS contained the whole Bible." Idem, page 68. p. 79, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"In a most wonderful manner it (the Word of Truth) was preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness."... Idem, page 69. p. 79, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Add to this the testimony of many Protestant authorities and the writings of the Waldenses themselves that they never belonged to the Church of Rome, they always remained separate, and had received their religion through father and son since the days of the Apostles. Add to this the beautiful testimony of Muston that the "Vaudois are the chain which united the Reformed Churches with the first disciples of our Saviour." (Muston, Vol. I, page 29.) p. 79, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Then, finally, add to this the statement of the Vaudois themselves in the preface of their Bible translated by Olivetan which they gave to the French people that they had "always fully enjoyed that heavenly truth contained in the Holy Scriptures ever since they were enriched by them by the Apostles themselves." p. 79, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Is not the chain complete? The Spirit of Prophecy and the plain statements of history unite to tell us that we do have as represented in the Received Text the same Bible that the Waldensian Church possessed in "MSS directly descended from the Apostolic originals." p. 79, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

Here I take a stand with Nolan, with the Waldensian historians themselves, and with Sister White, any textual critics" to the contrary not withstanding. p. 79, Para. 12, [ANSWERS].

Of course we must not forget, as I presented in my book, that the Authorized Version is the legitimate descendant of another great stream, which did not pass through the Waldenses. I refer to the thousands of Greek manuscripts which carry the Received Text. In the Authorized Version, then, the two pure streams meet; that of the Greek Received Text, and that of the Old Latin, preserved in its Waldensian descendant. p. 80, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Thus, through those valleys, in which dwelt those people through the centuries, miraculously preserved by God, we are connected with the primitive churches. They handed over to us, not the Bible of Rome, but the Bible of the primitive churches, which found at last a resting place in our noble Authorized Version, under whose name and beauty, it was, like the waters of the sea, to touch all shores and refresh all nations. p. 80, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

SECTION IV -- THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY. p. 81, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers have made no greater mistake in all the long list of severe indictments in their lengthy document than that I have cast "aspersion" and "intolerable odium" upon Sister White or her use of the Revised Version; or anyone who uses it as she did. The preface of my book substantially states that some texts may be clearer in the Revised than in the Authorized; for the Authorized is 320 years old. The English language has somewhat changed in that time. The RV is only 50 years old; the ARV but 30. I, myself, prefer the Revised on such texts as John 7:17, "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from myself." Also "Righteousness and justice are the foundation of his throne." (Ps. 97:2). I often quote Daniel 7:25 from the Revised or Douay Versions, but I never quote them as authority; only as books of reference in which an occasional text may be clearer than in the Authorized. There are many verses or part of verses that are omitted in the Revised Version that the Spirit of Prophecy quotes from the AV as the inspired, indestructible word of the eternal God. (AV... Authorized Version) p. 81, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers say, (Section I, page 5) "That our standard publications in English, since 1901, use the two versions with impartiality, and as equally authoritative." I must say to you brethren, that this is *not* well-known, neither is it the *truth.* Many of our ministers do not regard the Revised Version as of equal authority with the King James. I have read our standard publications very thoroughly since 1901 and can safely say that the number of scripture quotations from the Revised Version in our books, and in our church paper, "The Review and Herald," are *many* from the AV, to 1 from the Revised Version. (Leaves of Autumn Note: In the 1980s we are seeing almost everything but KJV quotes in our Periodicals and books. The NIV seems to be leading the pack for number of times used. but we also see quotes from many other perversions.) Note that the author uses "AV" for "KJV" in his text. Both mean Authorized or King James Version. p. 81, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

In my book, I have occasion to present in a particular way the death of Christ. Here my Reviewers think that they have found an example of my conflict with the Spirit of Prophecy. I will show emphatically that it is not the truth

(as stated in Section I, page 31), that I am in conflict with the Spirit of Prophecy by statements made on pages 158, 217, 218, and 219, of my book relating to Christ's death. I show that in the theology of Romanism and of Westcott and of other leading Revisers, that the death of Christ is not considered as the complete payment for our debt of sin. But that the incarnation, that is, the re-birth of Christ in the flesh as transmitted in the sacraments, is regarded as the all-potent means of salvation. p. 81, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

It is unreasonable for my Reviewers to tell you that I am in conflict with Sister White as that would place her in agreement with this Catholic theology. I have proof in my book that Westcott was at heart a Spiritualist, and thus taught that the real Christ must have never died, but that while his body was dead his soul lived on; and he thus, while dead preached to the spirits of the departed. p. 81, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

The Reviewers (Sec. I, page 31) quote from an unpublished statement of Sister White thus: p. 82, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"When Christ was crucified, it was his human nature that died. Deity did not sink and die; that would have been impossible." p. 82, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

I would reply that I have never said in my book or anywhere else or thought at any time, that Deity died, or that Divinity died. The scripture tells us that men, when converted, become partakers of the divine nature. Does this divine nature of Christians survive death and live as an independent personality after death? Do my Reviewers believe that any part of Christ was conscious in death? I have the word of Sister White in one of her standard publications on this point: p. 82, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"When he closed his eyes in death upon the cross, the soul of Christ did not go to heaven as many believe, or how could His words be true,...' I am not yet ascended to my Father'? The Spirit of Jesus slept in the tomb with his body, and did not wing its way to Heaven, there to maintain in a separate existence, and to look down upon the mourning disciples embalming the body of which it had taken flight. *All that comprised the life and intelligence of Jesus remained with his body in the sepulchre* (Emphasis mine); and when he came forth it was as a whole being; he did not

have to summon his spirit from Heaven." Spirit of Prophecy, Vol. 3, page 203. (Old Edition). p. 82, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Christ died for us, all that comprised his life and intelligence along with his body. Thus His divine sacrifice paid the debt for the sin of our soul. This was what I meant and there is not the slightest conflict between my views and the statements of Sister White. I will guarantee that 999 out of every 1,000 of Seventh-day Adventist ministers, in teaching from the fifty third chapter of Isaiah, would say, with me that Christ poured out his soul unto death. All who believe the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy believe this and teach it. With them, on this question, I am in perfect harmony. p. 82, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Whatever I wrote in my book about Christ's death, I intended to refer to His divine sacrifice. I tried to convey the idea that His sacrifice was more than a human sacrifice, it was a divine sacrifice. p. 82, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White says: "In consequence of limited ideas of the sufferings of Christ, many place a low estimate upon the great work of the atonement." Vol. 11, page 200. p. 82, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Next the Reviewers, (Sec. I, page 31), criticize my statement on page 246 of my book: "The new theology taught that Christianity was not 'A system of truth divinely revealed, recorded in the Scriptures in a definite and complete form for all ages,' but that CHRISTIANITY IS CHRIST." p. 82, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Then the Reviewers quote from "Gospel Workers," pages 282, 283, "CHRIST IS CHRISTIANITY". It is surprising to me that they did not see at once that the two statements are not the same but reversed. One says, "Christianity is Christ", and the other that "Christ is Christianity" but I deny the false theology of modernism that Christianity is Christ." p. 83, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Christian science teaches that "God is all", and then reverses the statement and says that therefore "All is God". The first statement is a great truth, the second is a pantheistic error. They ring the changes also on "God is

life" and therefore "Life is God." The first is true, the second is not. The Scriptures teach that God is love but never that love is God. If that were so then God would be a mere sentiment, a principle, but not a person. p. 83, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

God is light, but light is not God. This is pantheism again. p. 83, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Most emphatically, "Christ is Christianity" as taught by Sister White, but is Christianity therefore Christ? Is Christianity, the righteous living of men, *all* there is of Christ? This is a subtle error. Christ is a *person* from whose mighty influence Christianity flows; but Christianity is not Christ. On this the Princeton Review says: "Making Christianity a life -- the divine-human life of Christ -- has far reaching consequences. It confounds and contradicts the scripture and church doctrines as to the Person of Christ" (Jan. 1854). In section I, page 32 my Reviewers accuse me of using the expression in my book (page 246) that Christ is Christianity." No such statement is found on page 246 of the book under review. How could my Reviewers so misrepresent me? All I did say on page 246 was that the new theology taught the untruth that *Christianity is Christ.* This is different from the divine truth as stated by Sister White that Christ is Christianity. My critics should be accurate and avoid such misrepresentation. p. 83, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

The following statement is quoted by the Reviewers from Sister White (page 33, of Section I): p. 83, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"I saw that God had especially guarded the Bible, yet when copies of it were few, learned men had in some instances changed the words, thinking that they were making it more plain, when in reality they were mystifying that which was plain, by causing it to lean to their established views, which were governed by tradition. But I saw that the word of God, as a whole, is a perfect chain, one portion linking into and explaining another. True seekers for truth need not err; for not only is the word of God plain and simple in declaring the way of life, but the Holy Spirit is given as a guide in understanding the way of life therein revealed." "Early Writings", pages 220, 221. p. 83, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

And then the Reviewers say, "The quotation has no bearing whatsoever, upon versions, but deals with the Bible as a whole in *any language or Version."* (Emphasis mine.) I think that all here will admit that the Bible Sister White had in mind when she wrote this was her own Bible, the King James. No modern version had yet appeared. p. 83, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Will my Reviewers maintain that "ANY VERSION", EVERY VERSION is the true word of God? This is impossible. When the authors of the books of the Bible wrote by inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the first writing was, of course, the true word of God. A true copy, or a true translation would be a true manuscript, or a true version of the word of God, but if one thought was changed that would, to that extent, not be a true manuscript or a true version. p. 83, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

The most dangerous place that an error can be found is in a manuscript or version of the Bible. A falsehood in history or science would do infinitely less harm than an untruth in a book that passes for a Bible. A hypocrite, though he may do some excellent things, is the worst person in the world. A corrupted manuscript or version of the Bible is dangerous in the degree that the people trust it to be the true word of God. It may be almost wholly true, but one specious untruth may poison and counteract much of the good. p. 84, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

When my Reviewers say "any version", surely they cannot mean the Douay Version is the true word of God that teaches the worship of Mary in Genesis 3:15, "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed: She shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel." Or image worship, in Hebrews 11:21, "By faith Jacob dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph, and adored the top of his rod." Neither can my Reviewers mean the Bordeaux Version of the New Testament. This Version, published in 1686, translates Acts 13:2, "They ministered to the Lord" (KJ), as "They rendered unto the Lord the sacrifice of the mass." Can all of this version be the word of the Lord? Further, where the apostle writes "He himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire". 1 Cor. 3:15, this version has it, "by the fire of purgatory." This is a version of the Scriptures. Is this Version altogether the word of the Lord? p. 84, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Neither can my Reviewers mean the Unitarian Version of the New Testament by Gilbert Wakefield. (1795). This version translates Hebrews 1:2, "by whom he made the worlds", as "through whom he also settled the ages." It also translates John 1:1, 2 as follows: "In the beginning was wisdom, and wisdom was with God, and Wisdom was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by it and without it was nothing made." Is this irreverent use of the pronoun "it" to designate our Lord Jesus Christ, the true word of God? Yet this is a version of the New Testament. p. 84, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers may say that they do not mean *any* version, although it is here plainly stated in their document, but that they mean any *standard* version. What is the standard, we would ask? A standard of the word of God must be the truth. The Authorized Version, although the language may not be modern, contains no false doctrine. One scripture in the AV explains another. The Revised Version contains things which cannot be the truth. For instance, Matt. 14:30 reads, "And when he saw the wind he was afraid." We do not wonder that he was afraid, for he was the *first* and the last man that ever saw the wind. Is this absurdity the truth? p. 84, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Do we not judge all Versions unconsciously by the Authorized? Are not the dangers of other versions less keenly felt because we have with us the AV to protect us and to which we can flee as a standard? In our reasoning, however, just visualize the King James blotted out of existence or utterly discredited, could we then find the third angel's message in other discordant or corrupted versions? p. 84, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Note the following seven absurdities as a few illustrations of many similar cases found in the Revised Version: p. 85, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

(1) "The seven angels that had the seven plagues, arrayed with precious stones" Rev. 15:6; p. 85, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

(2) "She (Mary) turneth herself, and saith unto him in Hebrew". John 20:16; p. 85, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

(3) "The sun eclipsed at the time of a full moon." Luke 23:44, 45 (Greek text); p. 85, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

(4) "This he (Jesus) said, making all meats clean". Mark 7:19. Thus accusing Jesus of abolishing the distinction, which nature never yet has abolished, between clean and unclean animals. p. 85, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

(5) "That ye be not quickly shaken from your mind." 2 Thess. 2:2; p. 85, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

(6) "But when he (Peter) saw the wind, he was afraid." Matt. 14:30. p. 85, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

(7) "And the third part of the earth was burnt up." Rev. 8:7. It is strange that geographers and geologists have not discovered that one third of the earth has been burnt up. Yet this strange fact is found in the Vulgate, in the Jesuit Bible of 1582, and in the Revised. Was the fear of the sailors of Columbus, which led them more than once to threaten mutiny as they sailed westward, due to fear of sailing into a great gap in the earth? p. 85, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Are these evidences of accuracy? Are these scientific? Sister White said (Great Controversy, page 245) that the Textus Receptus brought out by Erasmus corrected many errors of former versions and gave the sense more clearly. p. 85, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

In 2 Peter 2:9 it is stated that "the Lord knoweth how... to keep the unrighteous under punishment *unto* the *day* of Judgment." That is the direct teaching of purgatory. My Reviewers, themselves, acknowledge that the views of the Revisers colored this text with the tincture of Romanism. Is the rendering of this verse the truth? Does the Revised Version then meet the standard of truth? Because it is *called* a standard version does not prove that it is. p. 85, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

The Spirit of Prophecy says on page 245 of "Great Controversy" that "Wycliffe's Bible had been translated from the Latin text, which *contained many errors."* And that Erasmus corrected many of these errors. The Spirit of Prophecy thus teaches that all versions are not alike, the true word of God. These false versions may contain truths, and Sister White quoted from the 'true' passages they contain, but this would not endorse the falsehoods as truth, and could not mean that the whole Version was the

authoritative Word of God. p. 85, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

In the same book, "Great Controversy", (page 65), it is stated that the Waldenses "possessed the Bible in manuscript in their native tongue. They had the truth unadulterated", and (page 69) "In a most wonderful manner it (the word of truth) was preserved *uncorrupted* through all the ages of darkness." We have evidence that a text like the Received Text was thus preserved until translated by Luther into German and by Tyndale into English, and by the translators of 1611 into the Authorized Version. p. 85, Para. 12, [ANSWERS].

We are indebted to the Waldenses and not to the Church of Rome for our Bible. When I saw the gigantic bulwarks of rock with sharp ravines and mountain caves of the Northern Italian Alps, I was profoundly impressed with the statement that the church "fled into the wilderness where she had a place prepared of God that He should feed her there" with the living Word of God while Rome fiercely fought the Bible and sought in vain during the world's midnight to destroy the Waldenses, the guardians of the Word, and the very Word itself. p. 86, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

On the other hand, can we not truthfully say that there are two foundation MSS of the Revised Version, (the Vaticanus and Sinaticus), early corrupted and changed in more than a thousand places by the mystery of iniquity which slept through centuries, unused and perhaps forgotten, only to be brought out again, once when the Reformers forced the papacy to it for refuge, and the other later. (LOA note: The second time was when the Revisers resurrected it) p. 86, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

The philosophy of the Revisers and the Reviewers seems to be that the church of Rome was the real guardian of the true Word of God; while the Waldenses held only inferior manuscripts. This is squarely contradictory to the Spirit of Prophecy. I quote from the "Great Controversy", (page 64), p. 86, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"The church in the wilderness, and not the proud hierarchy enthroned in the world's great capital, was the true church of Christ, the guardian of the treasures of truth which God has committed to His people to be given to the world." p. 86, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

The Vaticanus MS was preserved in the Vatican Library; the Sinaiticus was preserved in a Catholic monastery. Both of these MSS were thus kept and guarded by "the proud hierarchy enthroned in the world's great capital." *But* Sister White says the church in the Wilderness, and not this proud hierarchy was "the guardian of the treasures of truth", or as she states above, "the written Word of God". What is this but equivalent to saying that the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus are not the treasures of truth, the written Word of God. The church in the wilderness did not preserve the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS, but those which agreed with the Received Text. p. 86, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

The Sinaiticus and the Vatican MSS kept by the Roman Catholic Church then could not be the true word of God, if Great Controversy states the truth. p. 86, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

The Spirit of Prophecy is God's last word to His Church in this final crisis, when Rome has regained temporal sovereignty and is fast climbing into the throne of world dominion again, determined to use her fearful power to destroy the truth and reign triumphant just before the coming of Christ. I raise my voice, in my book, in protest against this teaching that the Waldenses kept only inferior manuscripts; and that the church of Rome "who wore out the saints of the most high," the great destroyer, that this power controlled by Satan preserved the true word of God. p. 86, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers, in their defense of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus and the Revised Version built on these Catholic manuscripts, seem to be driven to depreciate the Waldenses and their Bible and to defend Rome. p. 86, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers take exception to my position on the Waldenses and their Bible, while my position is in harmony with both the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy, that the Waldenses had the true Word of God. They argue throughout for the MSS of Rome. Has it come to this pass that I must plead for this fact established by the Spirit of Prophecy before a representative body of Seventh-day Adventists? p. 87, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

In the Index to the Writings of Mrs. E. G. White, I find that in the 28 volumes of her works that are there listed,

that she is credited with making 15,117 references to the Bible. Of these, more than 95 out of every 100 are from the AV (KJV), and therefore less than 5 in 100 are from the Revised Version and all other versions combined. Less than 14 are from the Noyes', Leesers', and Rotherhams's Versions. The RV was issued in 1881, and more than three fourths of the works of Sister White, listed in the Index were published after that date, so that the RV was accessible while more than three-fourths of her books were being written. In one of her books she gives 406 references to the AV (KJV) and 65 to other Versions. This is the largest departure from the AV in any of her works. In another she gives 940 references to the AV, 59 in the RV and ARV. In Volume 8 of the Testimonies she quotes the AV 666 times, the ARV 53 times, and the RV 3 times. In this volume she refers 45 times to the O.T., in the ARV, only 8 times to the New Testament. She quotes the poetical Psalms sometimes entire and other Old Testament scriptures where the change is largely verbal and slight. In another large book she makes 865 quotations from the AV and 4 from the Revised Version. In several she makes 865 quotations from the AV and 4 from the Revised Version. In several she makes only one quotation from the RV to several hundred in the AV. With this mathematically exact evidence before you, no one can truthfully say that she showed any *preference* for the Revised Version, or by any means regarded it as *on an equality* with the AV, but the very opposite. It is a most significant fact that she made no reference whatever, so far as the Index indicates, quoted not one verse in the Revised Version in Volume 9 of the "Testimonies", the last Testimony of the Spirit of Prophecy to the Church. This is also true of 13 other books listed in the Index, nearly all of them written after the Revised Version was published, the prophet of the Lord began with the AV *alone;* she closed with the AV *alone.* It was to her evidently the supreme authority. p. 87, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Of the historical quotations in "Great Controversy", Sister White says in her introduction, page XII, "The quotations are not given for the purpose of citing that writer as authority." It is common knowledge that Darwin got his foundation in evolution from Lyell, when Sister White quoted from Sir Charles Lyell, (Great Controversy), page 305) did she therefore indorse evolution or uphold Lyell as a scientific and true authority? The answer is plain that she simply took from him a specific statement of some single fact just as she quoted the Revised Version in

certain texts where it rendered the text more clearly then the Authorized Version. Therefore, as in other quotations, she uses it as a reference book. If to quote an author makes that author an authority, then Paul indorsed the heathen poets as authority, for at Athens he quoted the following words from a Greek poet: p. 87, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are his offspring." Acts 17:28. p. 87, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Will my Reviewers kindly note this fact; if quoting from the Revised Version proves that Sister White recognized it as the true Word of God equally with the Authorized Version, then by the same logic, Noyes', Leeser's and Rotherham's Versions are of equal authority with the AV. But this is impossible. For Sister White quotes in "Mount of Blessing" the closing part of Matt. as a part of the Lord's prayer. All this glorious close to the model prayer is omitted by both Noyes and Rotherham without even a margin to indicate the human amputation of these divine words. p. 88, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

If these inspired words are not a part of the Word of God, then the Holy Spirit, writing through God's prophet, was mistaken. That is impossible; therefore Noyes' and Rotherham's translation are not authority and neither is the ARV. Noyes also preaches purgatory in its rendering of 2 Peter 2:9, which states: "The Lord knoweth how to reserve the righteous under punishment to the day of judgment." p. 88, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Rotherham, who built his version on the text of Tregelles omits Acts 8:37 as does also Noyes, but this precious spiritual statement is quoted by the Spirit of Prophecy as a part of the word of God. (See Testimonies, Vol. 8, page 58). Therefore, if the Holy Spirit is authority, the translations of Noyes and Rotherham are not. As for Leeser's translation, I would say that he translates Job 19:26, "Then freed from my body shall I behold God." This is in direct agreement with the ARV, which reads: "Then without my flesh shall I see God." Both are in square contradiction to the AV and the Spirit of Prophecy, which reads, "Yet in my flesh shall I see God." (Great Controversy, page 299, and is thus quoted in four other places.) Leeser also translates Haggai, 2:7, "The precious

things of all the nations shall come." While the AV and the Spirit of Prophecy agree in applying this prophecy not to national riches, as in Leeser's translation, but to Christ, himself. Sister White says: "The promise of God given to Haggai has been fulfilled; yet in the advent of Jesus of Nazareth, the "desire of all nations"', etc., Prophets and Kings, page 597. So by the authority of the Spirit of God we know that the Leeser translation is untrue in this passage and therefore not divine authority. But if those three translations are thus proven unauthoritative, by the same evidence over and over again, at least to the Seventh-day Adventists, the Revised Version is as a whole eliminated as authority. After careful examination of every text listed in the Index of Sister White's writings, I ask: When did Sister White ever weaken the great Scripture fortification on the law by saying, "Blessed are they that wash their robes" as rendered in the Revised Version? In the AV and in Great Controversy, (page 541), and 12 other places, the Holy Spirit thunders down to us from the farewell chapter of the Bible, *"Blessed are they that do His Commandments."* Where does the Spirit of Prophecy endorse, instead of the mighty statement of 1 Tim. 3:16, "God was manifested in the flesh", the weak Unitarian change, "He who was manifested in the flesh"? This text is quoted as in the AV, in Testimonies, Vol. 5 (page 746) and in several other places in the books inspired by the Spirit of God. p. 88, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

When does Sister White permit the cutting out of Acts 8:37: The RV omits it. The RV is therefore not complete and therefore imperfect and not an authority. p. 88, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers have stated that Sister White quoted the Revised Version *as the Word of God.* I answer that when the Revised Version or any other version translates a particular text clearly without error or untruth, that ONE special reference is surely the Word of God, wherever it is found in any version. Many statements may be quoted from the Douay Version that express the same truth as the Authorized Version, which agrees with the text which came through the uncorrupted manuscripts kept by the Waldenses and endorsed by the Spirit of Prophecy as the true Word of God. But a text in the Douay Version which teaches the worship of images or the worship of Mary, cannot be the true Word of God. Therefore she could never quote the Douay as the authoritative, complete Word of God. The same with

the omissions and changes of the Unitarian or the Revised Version. p. 88, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

She quoted scripture as the Word of God from any Version that is entirely endorsed under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, but any text or translation that is not entirely in harmony with that which she has accepted, cannot be the entire and authoritative Word of God. These references in the Revised Version previously indicated, cannot be quoted as the Word of God, therefore, all Versions, including the Revised, which hold serious errors and omissions must be quoted by her, not as the complete authoritative word of God, but as the statements of scientists, historians, simply as books of reference. p. 89, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Certainly Sister White quoted the Revised and several other versions. The question is not, did she quote the Revised Version but what part of it did she quote? Did she ever quote any text from the Revised Version which is entirely omitted in the Authorized Version? There is no true scripture which is not found in the Authorized Version. It is a complete, perfect, authoritative Bible. But did she ever quote any scripture as the true Word of God from the Authorized Version which is not found in the Revised? Certainly she did. Then which is the complete authoritative word of God? Mathematically, we must say "YES", the Authorized and NOT the Revised. In other words the Revised Version is not the complete, authoritative WORD of God because, first, it is not all there, and secondly, because it is not all there straight. p. 89, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

When Sister White quotes as the Word of God texts which the Reviewers regard as spurious, to that extent, to that degree, they teach that the writings of Sister White are spurious. This is the logic of the Revised Version and those who accept it as authority. The omissions and many of the changes in the Revised are spurious or many of the AV quotations of Sister White are spurious. There is no middle ground. p. 89, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

When does the Holy Spirit in the works of Sister White intimate, by so much as a marginal note, the foolish proclamation if 616 instead of 666 as the number of the beast? When does the Holy Ghost, through God's appointed prophet in this last solemn message ever endorse the elimination of the glorious finale of the Lord's Prayer or

relegate it to the uncertainty of a marginal note? The revised Version is guilty of adding to, changing and omitting the precious words of God. The Vatican and the Sinaitic MSS, with more than 1,000 omissions and changes each, the Westcott and Hort text, the foundation of the Revised Version, are thus each and all weighed in the balances and found wanting. All this I say while reminding my hearers that full liberty to use this or any Version is granted, even as I, in the beginning of this chapter, said I use them myself. p. 89, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

The men who are responsible for the 1,000 omissions must come under the solemn denunciation: p. 90, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"For I testify unto every man that heareth the word of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things God will add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." Rev. 22:18, 19. p. 90, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

It is not possible that there can be any higher witness as to what is and what is not the Word of God than the Holy Spirit. For all the Word of God came by the Spirit, and the Lord has honoured us above all other people by giving us his Holy Spirit in the wonderful gift of prophecy. p. 90, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

God foresaw that the last glorious third angel's message would originate in the United States. He knew that it would first be proclaimed in the English language. He foresaw that the pioneers would use as there supreme authority the King James Version of 1611. Would the all-wise, all-foreseeing Author and Planner of the last appeal to fallen man, permit the translators of the Authorized Version of 1611 to give us an inferior version? Was the message which was endorsed and sealed by the Spirit of Prophecy, ever based upon an crystallized around a faulty translation? p. 90, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Was not the great last message preached as fully in its purity by Elder James White and other pioneers from 1844 to 1881, (or 1901, when the American Revised edition appeared), as it has been since those dates? Did the

Message start wrong? Did the Message have to wait until the Revised Version appeared before it could be perfect? To every Seventh-day Adventist, the divine foreknowledge of God in this matter is an unanswerable argument for the truly superior authority of the Authorized Version. Of course, we do not claim that the translators of the King James were actually inspired, but they were the greatest scholars of the greatest literary age in the history of the world. They had the correct copies of the divinely written manuscripts of the Word of God. And God, foreseeing the tremendous structure of saving, testing truth that would be built upon their translation, must have guarded them from making serious mistakes in translating from the original work into the English language in which the last message was to originate and be first published to a lost world. p. 90, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

We must never lose sight of the fact that of all the boasted MSS to which the Revisers had access, it matters little how many they had, since they used only one out of 100 and brushed the 99 aside, because they did not agree with their two prized manuscripts, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. p. 90, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

While Sister White quoted from a number of texts with slight verbal changes in translation in the English and American Revised, the Noyes, the Rotherham, and the Leeser Version, yet she never quoted the contradictory changes brought in by the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS, the Westcott and Hort text based on them, or the Revised readings that widely change or omit so many important scriptures. p. 90, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

She never endorses those changes or omissions, but quoting them as in the AV and quoting texts omitted or discarded in the Revised, she thus absolutely denies and contradicts the authority of the Revised Version, and demonstrates that *it is not the complete* and authorized word of God. p. 91, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

She states that the manuscripts and texts that the Waldenses preserved as the Word of God were "uncorrupted" and "unadulterated." Then how can we need a new revised text? The Received Text was the text from which Luther translated his Bible into German, which was the heart of the Reformation power; the text from which Tyndale translated his English Bible, the divine truth for which he

died a martyr's death; the text from which our Authorized Version came to bless and build up the most enlightened nations from whence liberty and truth have gone out to all the world, and to be the foundation, the source of power of this last great Message. p. 91, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

How can you reconcile the fact that Sister White quotes verses of Scripture as the Word of God which the Revisers reject as spurious; and that she quotes verses from the Authorized Version which the ARV changes so as to entirely alter the sense? And how can you justify the Reviewers aligning themselves uniformly on the side of the Revisers on these very passages rather than with Sister White? Whenever you find me defending a body of Revisers and bolstering up their revised readings against the plain usage of Sister White, I will accept the charge. I reject this charge and appeal to the field for vindication. Because every Seventh-day Adventist who has ever known me in Europe or America for these past forty years knows that no one amongst us has held up Sister White and her writings in higher esteem than I do. p. 91, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

When the Holy Spirit, through God's appointed prophet, endorses the MSS of the Waldenses as uncorrupted and unadulterated, then they are the "BEST ATTESTED MANUSCRIPTS", and not the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus as my Reviewers told you. On this authority I rest, as final and decisive. To a Seventh-day Adventist, there is no appeal from this authority. On this rock, brethren, we may all build for eternity and "the gates of hell" shall not prevail against it. p. 91, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

SECTION V -- THE VATICANUS AND SINAITICUS. p. 91, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

VATICANUS AND SINAITICUS; TEXTUAL THEORY OF WESTCOTT AND HORT: DR. SCHAFF. p. 91, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

I feel that my book has completely covered the ground of the manuscript and the quotations from my authorities have fully sustained my positions. However, since my Reviewers bring a number of charges against me, relating to the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus in particular, we will be obliged to beg your indulgence to take the matter a little further. They have brought against me the following charges: p. 91, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

1. That I failed to show any relationship between the Hexapla or Origen, and the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus of the New Testament. (Review, Concl. page 4 #4) p. 91, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

2. That I failed to establish Eusebius as the author of the Vaticanus and Origen as the author of the Sinaiticus. (Review, Concl. page 4 #3) p. 91, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

3. That I failed to prove that these two MSS could be two of the 50 Bibles supplied to Constantine from Caesarea by Eusebius. (Review Concl. page 4 #4.) p. 92, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

4. That in the case of a quotation from the Catholic Encyclopedia, with reference to the Hexapla, I failed, (a) to prove that the MS had ever been at Constantinople; (Sec. I, page 26 #2); (b) to prove its origin (Sec. I, page 26, #1); and (c) to prove that Aleph can be "descended from the same ancestor" as B. (Sec. I, page 26, #3) p. 92, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

5. That I failed to show the manuscripts were corrupted by the papists. (Review concl. page 5, #5) p. 92, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

With regard to No. 1, namely, that I failed to show any relationship between the Hexapla of Origen and B (The Vaticanus) and Aleph (Sinaiticus) in the New Testament, I will quote from Dr. A. T. Robertson that the Old Testament and New Testament were bound together in one volume. p. 92, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"But now" (In days of Constantine) "a complete Bible for the first time could be bound together containing both the Old Testament and the New Testament." "Introduction to N. T. Criticism", page 80. p. 92, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Now the manuscripts prepared by Eusebius for the Emperor Constantine must have had a New Testament of an Origenistic type, because Eusebius was admitted by all historians and textual critics to be an admirer and follower of Origen. I will quote from Dr. F. C. Cook, an outstanding textual scholar who was invited to sit on the New Testament Revision Committee, but refused. He says: p. 92, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"In his *criticism of the New Testament* Origen had greater advantages, and he used them with greater success. Every available source of information he studied carefully. Manuscripts and Versions were before him; both manuscripts and versions he examined, and brought out the results of his researches with unrivalled power.... A text formed more or less directly under his influence would of course command a certain amount of general adhesion.... Now when we once more apply these observations to a text, which on other grounds we maintain to be substantially or completely identical with that which was published under the influence of Eusebius, we are driven to the conclusion that such characteristics are to be looked for... That Eusebius was an enthusiastic admirer, a devoted adherent of Origen, no one need to be reminded who knows aught of the history of that age, or who has read, however hastily, his history of the early church; that in all questions he would defer absolutely to the authority of Origen, especially in questions of criticism, is almost equally undeniable; or do I hesitate to state my immovable conviction that in that influence' is to be found the true solution of the principal phenomena which perplex or distress us in considering the readings of the Vatican and Sinaitic Manuscripts." "History of the Revised Version" pages 155, 157. (Emphasis mine.) p. 92, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

It must be perfectly plain to you that Dr. Cook here ties Origen to Eusebius and to the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts: and in the New Testament as well as in the Old. p. 93, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Now all these conclusions are practically given in my book; if not expressly, at least by implication. Was I under obligation to say everything that can be said about an event, especially when my book covered such a vast amount of territory? p. 93, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers seek to indict me for considering that the Eusebian New Testament part of the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS was the text of Origen, as they seem to admit was the case with the Old Testament. (Sec. I, pages 27, 28) Then they must indict Dr. Price, Dr. Robertson, Dr. Gregory, Burgon and Miller, and Dr. Schrivener, Dr. Tischendorf even; for they all assume that the N.T. part of the Eusebius Bibles were of the Eusebio-Origen type as well as the Old Testament portion. p. 93, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

I wrote in my book (pages 20, 21) that "both these MSS were written in Greek, each contained the whole Bible." Statements from Dr. Robertson and others prove: p. 93, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

(1) That the Old Testament part of the Constantine Bibles was the Hexapla of Origen, and p. 93, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

(2) That it was bound with a Greek New Testament in the same Bible. I have right here raised a strong probability of a relationship between the Hexapla of the Old Testament and the New Testament of the Constantine Bibles. Now I did bring such good authorities to show that the Old Testament portion of the Constantine Bibles was the Hexapla, that my Reviewers admitted proof on that point. They say, (Section I, page 28): p. 93, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"The conclusion is, therefore unavoidable that the fifty copies of the Hexapla made for Constantine were of the fifth column Septuagint, which is confined to the Old Testament." p. 93, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Very well; when they say that fifty copies made for Constantine possessed for the Old Testament the Hexapla, they admit that the Old Testament of the fifty copies was of a Eusebio-Origen type, since the text is Origen and the manuscript upon which the text is written is of Eusebius; and this you note is all I claimed in my book. For in my book I said (page 21): p. 93, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

"Whether or not the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus were actually two of the fifty Bibles furnished by Eusebius for Constantine, at least they belonged to the same family as the Hexapla, the Eusebio-Origen type." p. 93, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

For further proof, just at this point, I would like to give quotations from seven authorities that these two MSS could very well be part of the fifty Bibles furnished by Eusebius for Constantine. p. 93, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

(1) Dr. Robertson singles out these two manuscripts as possibly two of the fifty Constantine Bibles. He says: p. 93, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

"Constantine himself ordered fifty Greek Bibles from Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, for the churches in

Constantinople. It is quite possible that Aleph and B are two of these fifty." "Introduction to Textual Criticism," page 80. (Emphasis mine) p. 93, Para. 12, [ANSWERS].

(2) Dr. Gregory, a recent scholar in the field of manuscripts, also thinks of them in connection with the fifty. We quote him: p. 94, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"This Manuscript (Vaticanus) is supposed, as we have seen, to have come from the same place as the Sinaitic Manuscript. I have said that these two show connections with each other, and that they would suit very well as a pair of the fifty manuscripts written at Caesarea for Constantine the Great." "The Canon and Text of New Testament," page 345. p. 94, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

(3) Two outstanding scholars, Burgon and Mille, thus expressed their belief that in the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus MSS we have two of the Bibles prepared by Eusebius for the Emperor: p. 94, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"Constantine applied to Eusebius for fifty handsome copies, among which *it is not improbable that the manuscripts B and Aleph were to be actually found.* But even if that is not so, The Emperor would not have selected Eusebius for the order, if that Bishop had not been in the habit of providing copies: and Eusebius in fact carried on the work which he had commenced under his friend Pamphilus, and in which the latter must have followed the path pursued by Origen. Again Jerome is known to have resorted to this quarter." "Traditional Text", page 163. (Emphasis mine) p. 94, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

(4) Dr. cook in his "Revised Version of the first Three Gospels" says: p. 94, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"And if not absolutely proved, *I hold it to be established as in the highest degree probable,* that Eusebius was the superintendent; and that we have *in these two manuscripts* (Vatican and Sinaitic) the only extant memorials of his recension." page 183. (Emphasis mine) p. 94, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

(5) Dr. Schaff also says, of the copies of the Constantine Bible provided by Eusebius, the following: p. 94, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"Molz, in a note regards these as lectionaries, but they are usually thought to have been regular copies of the Scriptures in Greek-Septuagint and N.T. *and the Codex Sinaiticus has been thought to be one of them...* The fact that the Sinaiticus exhibits two or three hands suggests that it was prepared with rapidity, and the having various scribes was a way to speed." p. 94, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

"The parchment copies were usually arranged in quartenions i.e. four leaves made up together, as the ternions consisted of three leaves. The Quartenions each contained sixteen pages, the ternions twelve.... So probably, although the three-columned form of the Sinaiticus and the four of the Vaticanus suggest a possible other meaning." Footnote on "Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers" Vol. I, page 549. (Emphasis mine) p. 94, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

(6) I quote again from Burgon and Miller: p. 94, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

"But in connecting B and Aleph with the library at Caesarea we are not left only to conjecture or inference. In a well known colophon affixed to the end of the book of Esther in Aleph by the third corrector, it is stated that from the beginning of the book of Kings to the end of Esther the MS was compared with a copy 'corrected by the hand of the holy martyr Pamphilus,' which itself was written and corrected after the Hexapla of Origen. And a similar colophon may be found attached to the book of Ezra. It is added that the Codex Sinaiticus... and the Codex Pamphili manifested great agreement with one another. The probability that Aleph was thus at least in part copied from a manuscript executed by *Pamphilus* and *Eusebius;* and that Origen's recension of the Old Testament, although he published no edition of the text of the New, possessed a great reputation. On the books of the Chronicles, St. Jerome mentions manuscripts executed by Origen with great care, which were published by Pamphilus and Eusebius. And in Codex H of St. Paul it is stated that that MS was compare with a MS in the library of Caesarea 'which was written by the hand of the holy *Pamphilus.'* These notices added to the frequent reference by St. Jerome and others to the critical MSS, by which we are to understand those which were distinguished by the approval of Origen or were in consonance with the spirit of Origen, show evidently the position in criticism which the Library at Caesarea and its illustrious founder had won in those days. *And it is quite*

in keeping with that position that Aleph should have been sent forth from that 'school of criticism." **"The Traditional Text", pages 164, 165. (Emphasis mine) p. 94, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].**

In this quotation from Burgon and Miller, you will note that he marshals in line seven separate proofs that B and Aleph were Eusebio-Origen manuscripts. First, from the well-known colophon at the end of Esther, claiming that the portion of the Old Testament from Kings to Esther was corrected by the hand of the "holy martyr, Pamphilus." Secondly, that a similar colophon was attached to Ezra. Thirdly, this colophon adds that the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Pamphili manifested great agreement with one another. Fourthly the Codex Marchalianus is often mentioned which was due to Pamphilus and Eusebius. Fifthly, St. Jerome on the books of Chronicles mentions that manuscripts executed by Origen with great care and published by Pamphilus and Eusebius. Sixthly, the Codex H of St. Paul states that it was compared with the manuscripts in the Library of Caesarea, "which was written by the hand of the Holy Pamphilus". Seventhly, Jerome and others give references to critical manuscripts which are understood to be those distinguished by the approval or in consonance with the spirit of Origen. p. 95, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

7. Dr. Tischendorf takes the same position. (Dr. Robinson, "Where Did We Get Our Bible" page 116) p. 95, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

8. Abbe Martin, celebrated Catholic textual critic, claims that the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus (as well as 3 other ancient MSS, A, C, D) were "fabricated" from the Origen and other Greek fathers. (See Schaff, "Companion to the Greek Testament" page XIV). p. 95, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Burgon and Miller then concluded that if Aleph was from the Library of Caesarea then B must also have been; that is, if the supposition certified by Tischendorf and Scrivener be true, that the six conjugated leaves in Aleph were written by the scribe of B. Dr. Robinson (Where Did We Get Our Bible, page 117), and others say that there is (on the general fact of Aleph and B agreeing against the Textus Receptus) not much difference between the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. p. 95, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Right here I wish to bring in a fact not very well known

but which enters in a significant way into the whole situation. When the Council of Trent, (1545-1563) in its effort to check Protestantism voted to adopt the Vulgate as the authoritative Bible of the Roman Catholic Church, it sought to find a backing for the Vulgate in some Greek manuscripts. I will quote the following from Dr. Swete: p. 96, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"The reader will not fail to note the intelligent appreciation of the LXX., and the wide outlook over the history of the Greek versions which are implied by these documents. They show that the Vatican had already learnt the true value of the Alexandrian Old Testament and, as a consequence, had resolved to place in the hands of the scholars of Europe as pure a text as could be obtained of the version which was used by the ancient Church, and was now felt to be essential to a *right understanding* of the Fathers and of *the Latin Vulgate.* The inception of the work was due to Pope Sixtus himself, who had suggested it to his predecessor Gregory XIII in 1578; but the execution was entrusted to Cardinal Antonio Carara and a little band of Roman scholars including Cardinal Sirleto, Antonil Agelli, and Petrus Morinus. Search was made in the libraries of Italy was well as in the Vatican for MSS of the LXX., but the result of these inquiries satisfied the editors of the superiority of the great Vatican Codex (B-cod. Vat. gr. 1209) over all other known codices, and it was accordingly taken as the basis of the new addition." "Introduction to the O.T. in Greek," pages 180, 181. (Emphasis mine.) p. 96, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Another quotation, from Tregelles, will sustain my contention that it was the anxious desire of the Council of Trent to use the Vulgate as its great battle weapon against Protestantism, which sent the Catholic Church hurrying to the Vatican MS for refuge and for a foundation. Note that this was in the year 1578, or a quarter of a century before the AV appeared. In fact it was because the Council of Trent chose and printed and circulated in 1586 the Old Testament portion of the Vatican MS that Dr. Tregelles was convinced that he should choose the Vatican MS as his model for the New Testament. Notice that Dr. Tregelles was a model for Westcott and Hort, and that he was a member of the New Testament Revision Committee, but he in turn received his light, his lead from the Council of Trent. Tregelles says: p. 96, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"About seventy years after this first (i.e., the Aldine Edition) appeared, the Roman edition of the LXX was published (1586), based on the Codex Vaticanus; how was it that the Roman text obtained such a currency as to displace the Aldine, and to maintain its stand in public estimation for more than two centuries and a half? How should *Protestants* be willing to concede such an hour to this text which appeared under Papal sanction? It gained its ground and kept it because it was really an ancient text, such in its general complexion as was read by the early fathers. The Roman editors shrewdly guessed the antiquity of their MS from the form of the letters, etc., and that too in an age when Palaeography was but little know; they inferred the character of its text, partly from its age, partly from its accordance with early citations; and thus, even though they departed at times inadvertently from their MS they gave a text vastly superior to that of the New Testament in common use from the days of Erasmus." "Account of Printed Text", page 185. p. 96, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Now we see where the great importance of the action of the Council of Trent leads us. It declared that Jerome's Vulgate to be properly grounded upon a substantial Greek Manuscript must rely upon the Vaticanus Manuscript in Greek as the bulwark and defense of Jerome's version in Latin, would be a Eusebio-Origen manuscript. p. 97, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Dr. Hoskier informs us that Drs. Wordsworth and White think Jerome used a codex very much resembling Aleph (Sinaiticus) and B (Vaticanus). (Hoskier, Codex B and Its Allies II: 194 note). Dr. Philip Schaff points out that Abbie Martin, the famous Roman Catholic textual critic, claims that the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus were "fabricated" by Origen (Companion XIII, XIV). p. 97, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Since the Constantine Bible containing both the O.T. and N.T. is proved to be a Bible of the Eusebio-Origen type; and since B and Aleph are manuscripts of the Eusebio-Origen type, it follows then that the statement I made in my book is true, and not "unwarranted" as my Reviewers say; "The Latin Vulgate, the Sinaiticus, the Vaticanus, the Hexapla, Jerome, Eusebius, and Origen, are terms for ideas that are inseparable in the minds of those who know." page 22, "Our Authorized Bible Vindicated." p. 97, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Furthermore my Reviewers, as well as the Revisers, are determined to place the date of the execution of Codices Aleph and B about the year 350 A.D. Now we know that Eusebius produced for Constantine his fifty Bibles somewhere between 330 and 340 A.D. We positively know that Aleph and B could not be the Textus Receptus; and neither my Reviewers nor the Revisers would stand for that. It is therefore conclusive that both the Constantine Bibles and the Codices Aleph and B were of the Eusebio-Origen school. p. 97, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

With regard to Origen, Pamphilus and Eusebius and their work upon the New Testament, I will give three quotations. The first is from Dr. Kenyon, who says: p. 97, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"In textual scholarship, indeed, Origen has no rival among ancient writers, and no single individual has exercised so wide an influence upon the Biblical text as he. It is with regard to the Greek text of the Old Testament that the precise character of his work is most fully known; *but there can be little doubt that his critical labours on the New Testament were almost equally epoch making."* "Criticism of the New Testament," pages 251, 252. (Emphasis mine). p. 97, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Again on page 329 of his book, Kenyon says: p. 98, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"If, however, the statement is made a little wider, *and B and Aleph are connected with the Origenian school of textual criticism,* whether in Alexandria OR in Caesarea, the evidence in support of it is more adequate. Directly or indirectly, the, it would appear that we must look to Egypt for the origin of the 'Beta text', of which these MSS are the principal representatives." "Criticism of N.T.", pages 329, 330. p. 98, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Dr. Robertson thinks of Aleph and B in connection with the labours of Pamphilus and Eusebius in the Library of Caesarea filled with the manuscripts of Origen. He says: p. 98, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"Pamphilus of Caesarea (died 309) did not write much, but he founded a great theological library at Caesarea which included the works of Origen. He was a disciple of Origen. It is possible that both Aleph and B were copied in this

library, though most likely in Egypt, but both MSS were at any rate once in Caesarea if the correctors can be trusted." ... "Eusebius of Caesarea lived from about 270 to 340. For the last twenty seven years he was Bishop of Caesarea. He was a pupil and protege of Pamphilus and had full access to his library." "Introduction to Textual Criticism," page 140. p. 98, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Another quotation from Dr. Nolan, will show the corrupt influence of Origen on the New Testament as well as upon the Old. He says: p. 98, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"As he had laboured to supersede the authorized version of the Old Testament, he contributed to weaken the authority of the received text of the New. In the course of his Commentaries, he cited the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, on the former part of the Canon, he appealed to the authority of Valentinus and Heracleon on the latter. While he thus raised the credit of those revisals, which had been made by the heretics, he detracted from the authority of that text which had been received by the orthodox. Some difficulties which he found himself unable to solve in the Evangelists, he undertook to remove, by expressing doubts of the integrity of the text. In some instances he ventured to impeach the reading of the New Testament on the testimony of the Old, and to convict the copies of one Gospel on the evidence of another thus giving loose to his fancy, and indulging in many wild conjectures, *he considerably impaired the credit of the vulgar or common edition as well in the New as in the Old Testament."* "Integrity of the Greek Vulgate", pages 432, 434. (Emphasis mine.) p. 98, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

In view of the above evidence I contend that I have answered the first accusation; namely, that I failed to show any relationship between the Hexapla of Origen and B and Aleph of the New Testament. Though I have multiplied authorities here, the same proof and same conclusion however is in my book. I further contend that I have answered the second charge, that I failed to establish Eusebius as the author of the Vaticanus, and Origen as the author of the Sinaiticus; because I plainly showed that these manuscripts were of a Eusebio-Origen type. Of course, this must be taken in a general sense for two reasons: (1) Neither Eusebius nor Origen, technically speaking, put their hand to any of those manuscripts; for an army of scribes both at their command, and in other centers of

learning would copy their texts. (2) I plainly indicated in my book by several expressions, that I was talking also in a general sense. p. 98, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

I have now proven that which they said in the third charge, that I failed to prove; namely, that these two manuscripts could be two of the fifty Bibles supplied to Constantine by Eusebius. p. 99, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Now with regard to the fourth charge made against me (Sec. I, page 26.) because of my use of the quotation from the Catholic Encyclopedia, with reference to the Hexapla, that (a) I failed to prove its origin, (b) I failed to prove that the MSS had ever been at Constantinople, (c) I failed to prove that Aleph can be "descended from the same ancestor" as B! p. 99, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Charges a, b and c (Sec. I, page 26) are based upon what they claim to be my misuse of a quotation from the Catholic Encyclopedia, but here again my Reviewers fail to grasp my procedure. I did not use the Catholic Encyclopedia as the source of my authority in what I was saying. I used the Catholic Encyclopedia as an authority to show what was written upon the Sinaitic manuscript by the hand of its third corrector. In other words I had a quotation within a quotation. The interior quotation was what was written in the Sinaitic manuscript itself. My argument was based upon that and not from any opinion given from the Catholic Encyclopedia. It is true that I used an introductory phrase and a closing phrase from the Catholic Encyclopedia simply to make the connection, but I was not using it as an authority; because, generally speaking, it is not an authority with me in matters of opinion, only in matters of fact. p. 99, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

(a) With regard to charge (a) I think all that I have said above is evidence enough that in my book I proved the Eusebio-Origen source of the Sinaitic manuscript. p. 99, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

(b) I will now answer the charge that I failed to prove that the MS had ever been at Constantinople. Of course my Reviewers are using that statement in the Catholic Encyclopedia which says, "there is no sign of it having been at Constantinople". In the first place this is not a point of vital importance to the main line of argument; and in the second place, there are authorities who indicate all

of the fifty manuscripts ordered by Constantine may not have gone to Constantinople. I quote the following from Dr. Gregory. p. 99, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"Those (churches) in Constantinople itself probably got the greater part of them, (50 Bibles), since Constantine mentioned them in writing to Eusebius. *Yet he may have sent one or another to a more distant church of importance in order to honour the bishop who presided over it."* "Canon and Text", page 328. (Emphasis mine) p. 99, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

It is evident that my Reviewers made too much of this technicality. p. 100, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

(c) I certainly am surprised that my Reviewers have brought against me this additional count based on the Catholic Encyclopedia quotation, that the omitted part reads: 'It cannot be descended from the same ancestor." (Sec. I, page 26, #3). Will my hearers be surprised to learn that the omitted part does not read that way? Kindly glance back to the quotation which they quoted from the Catholic Encyclopedia. In the Catholic Encyclopedia the omitted part reads "Though it cannot be descended from the same *immediate* ancestor." (Emphasis mine). I submit to you whether there is not a difference between the same ancestor and the same *immediate* ancestor. My uncle and I are descended from the same ancestor but not from the same 'immediate' ancestor. It would be proper now for my Reviewers to indict *themselves* instead of me for quoting wrongly from the Catholic Encyclopedia, and basing an argument upon the wrong quotation. p. 100, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

I will now answer the fifth of the charges, which center around the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus to the effect that "I failed to show that the MSS were corrupted by the papists." (Sec. Concl., page 5, #5) I will now cite seven authorities to show that those MSS were corrupted: p. 100, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

1. I will first quote from Dr. F. C. Cook, textual critic who was invited to sit on the Revision Committee, but refused. He said: p. 100, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"But it is precisely on this ground that I have throughout maintained the wrongfulness of the innovations introduced

into the Revised Version, so far as they affect leading facts and great words recorded in the first three Gospels. The reader need but look at the passages enumerated in the classification given above, page 136 seq., to be convinced that so far from resting upon the consentient testimony of ancient manuscripts, Versions, and Fathers, by far the greater number of innovations including those which give the severest shocks to our minds are adopted on the authority of two manuscripts (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus), or even of one manuscript, against the distinct testimony of all other manuscripts, uncial and cursive." "Revised Version of First Three Gospels," page 227. p. 100, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

And again: p. 100, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"I cannot but maintain that if the majority of those readings, which we call omissions, are subjected to any external test, if tried by any other measure than that of the manuscripts themselves, they will be convicted as defects, or blunders, or innovations more or less erroneous, to whatever cause the mischief be attributable. The tests to which I would refer are, first, the more ancient and trustworthy Versions; secondly, citations in ante-Nicene Fathers; and thirdly, the consensus of manuscripts, including those which in doubtful cases so generally coincide with Aleph and B as to leave little room for doubt that their text was founded on the same original authorities." Idem, page 171. p. 100, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Dr. Cook also says: p. 101, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"Reiche then observes that he fully admits the value of those manuscripts, A, B, C, D, which often retain true readings alone or in combination with a few other authorities; but that it is equally true that it is impossible to deny that in very many places (permultis locis) they have false readings partly due to negligence, partly *intentional;...* Moreover that those MSS, to which critics in Germany attach exclusive importance, are of Egyptian, or rather Alexandrian origin, so that all belong to one family, a fact evidenced by their singular consent in peculiar readings; and lastly that all documents of the N.T. coming from Alexandria, at that time the home of ever-bold criticism, abound in readings which are manifestly false." Idem, page 7. (Emphasis mine) p. 101, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Dr. Miller says: p. 101, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"The marks of carelessness spread over them, especially prevailing in Aleph, (Sinaiticus) are incomparable with perfection. Tischendorf, after collating B, spoke of the blemishes that occur throughout. Dr. Dobbin reckons 2,556 omissions in B as far as Heb. 9:14, where it terminates. Vercellone, the editor, tells of 'perpetual omissions,' of half a verse, a whole verse, and even several verses.' This is just what examination reveals and Aleph is unquestionably worse," Miller's "Textual Guide", page 56. p. 101, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

With regard to Codex B (Vaticanus) Dr. Scrivener says: p. 101, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"One marked feature characteristic of this copy, is the great number of its omissions, which has induced Dr. Dobbin to speak of it as presenting an abbreviated text of the New Testament': and certainly the facts he states on this point are startling enough. He calculates that Codex B leaves out words or clauses no less than 330 times in Matthew, 365 in Mark, 439 in Luke, 357 in John, 384 in the Acts, 681 in the surviving Epistles; or 2,556 times in all. That no small proportion of these are mere oversights of the scribe seems evident from the circumstance that this same scribe has repeatedly written words and clauses *twice over,* a class of mistakes which Mai and the collators have seldom thought fit to notice, inasmuch as the false addition has not been retraced by the second hand, but which by no means enhances our estimate of the care employed in copying this venerable record of primitive Christianity." Scrivener "Introduction", Vol. I, page 120. p. 101, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

With regard to the Sinaiticus Dr. Scrivener published a book entitled, "A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus," and in his introduction he states: p. 101, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"The Codex is covered with such alterations," (alterations of an obviously textual character) "brought in by at least ten different revisers, some of them systematically spread over every page, others occasional or limited to separate portions of the manuscript, many of them being contemporaneous with the first writer, far the greater part

belonging to the sixth or seventh century..." "A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus," page XIX. Introduction. p. 101, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

This shows the thoroughly corrupt and defective work of the original scribes. p. 102, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Consider the meaning of the facts disclosed here. The Revisers considered this document to be sufficiently a standard by which all other manuscripts of the Bible were to be weighed and revised. Nevertheless the document itself bears upon the face of it the evidence that those who owned it permitted ten different correctors from the first, to stretch into several hundred years the work of going over it and spreading upon its face their corrections. p. 102, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

4. I will now submit to you two quotations from Burgon and Miller, which will present the corruptions of these manuscripts, and the three others which generally run with them, in a new light: p. 102, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"But when we study the New Testament by the light of such Codices as B, (?), D, L, we find ourselves in an entirely new experience; confronted by phenomena not only unique but even portentous. The text has undergone apparently an habitual, if not systematic, depravation; has been manipulated throughout in a wild way. Influences have been demonstrably at work which altogether perplex the judgment. The result is simply calamitous. There are evidences of persistent mutilation not only of words and clauses, but of entire sentences. The substitution of words, are phenomena of such perpetual occurrence, that it becomes evident at last that what lies before us is not so much an ancient copy, as an ancient recension of the Sacred Text." "Traditional Text," page 32. p. 102, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Again they say: p. 102, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"Now I submit that it is a sufficient condemnation of Codices B, (?), C, D as a supreme court of Judicature (1) that as a rule they are observed to be discordant in their judgments: (2) That when they thus differ among themselves it is generally demonstrable by an appeal to antiquity that the two principle judges B and Aleph have delivered a mistaken judgment: (3) That when these two differ one from the other, the supreme judge B is often wrong: and lastly

(4) That it constantly happens that all four agree and yet all four are in error." Idem, page 37. p. 102, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

I desire right here to particularly emphasize the three other uncials beside Aleph and B and several cursives, all of which generally run with Aleph and B. You will always notice, as many outstanding textual critics point out that cursives No. 1, 13, 23, 33, 69, 124, 127, 208, 209; these of the thousands of cursives, generally run with Aleph and B. They show plainly that they are from the Eusebio-Origen school. Dr. Hoskier says that it would almost seem as if the parents of the cursives No. 33 and 127 have been anointed by Origen himself. (Vol. 2, page 147). While I have recognized that in making up their Greek New Testament both the Revisers and Westcott and Hort used other manuscripts than Aleph and B; nevertheless, as I have indicated, generally they were manuscripts which also were for the most part of the Eusebio-Origen school, and few in number compared with the great body of MSS. p. 102, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

5. I will now add a quotation from Mr. Philip Mauro, as follows: p. 103, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"But there are other characteristics of this old MS (Sinaiticus) which have to be taken into consideration if a correct estimate of its evidential value is to be reached. Thus, there are internal evidences that lead to the conclusion that it was the work of the scribe who was singularly careless, or incompetent or both. In this MS the arrangement of the lines is peculiar, there being four columns on each page, each line containing about twelve letters... all capitals run together. There is no attempt to end a word at the end of a line, for even words having only two letters as 'en', 'ek', are split in the middle, the last letter being carried over to the beginning of the next line, though there was ample room for it on the line preceding. This and other peculiarities give us an idea of the character and competence of the scribe." "Which Version", page 45. p. 103, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

A few more words from Dr. Scrivener on the character of the Sinaiticus: p. 103, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"This manuscript must have been derived from one more ancient, in which the lines were similarly divided, since

the writer occasionally omits just the number of letters which would suffice to fill a line, and that to the utter ruin of the sense: as if his eye had heedlessly wandered to the line immediately below. Instances of this want of care will be found (in) Luke 21:8; 22:25, perhaps John 4:45; 12; 25, where complete lines are omitted; John 19:26; Heb. 13:18 (Partly corrected); Apoc. 8:16; 19:12; 22:2, where the copyist passed in the middle of a line to the corresponding portion of the line below. It must be confessed, indeed, that the Codex Sinaiticus abounds with similar errors of the eye and pen, to an extent not unparalleled, but happily rather unusual in documents of first-rate importance; so that Tregelles has freely pronounced that 'the state of text, as proceeding from the first scribe, may be regarded as very rough.'" "Collation on the Codex Sinaiticus," page XV. p. 103, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

6. Dr. Hoskier in his two large volumes covering 1,000 pages entitled "Codex B and its Allies; a Study and an Indictment" introduced his great work with this expression, "It is high time that the bubble of Codex B should be pricked." p. 103, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Dr. Hoskier wrote these two volumes in the year 1914. This is interesting to note, since my Reviewers charge me with using only authors who wrote during the heat of the controversy. Nevertheless I had occasion to quote from Dr. Hoskier in my book. p. 103, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

I will now read the verdict which Dr. Hoskier passes on the Codex Vaticanus: p. 104, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"That B is guilty of laches, of a tendency to 'improve' and of 'sunstroke' amounting to doctrinal bias. That the maligned *Textus Receptus* served in large measure *as the base which B tampered with and changed,* and that the Church at large recognized all this until the year 1881, when Hortism in other words Alexandrianism was allowed free play, and has not since retraced the path to sound traditions." "Codex B and Its Allies," Part I, page 465. (Emphasis mine) p. 104, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

7. With regard to the corruptions of these two manuscripts, Dean Burgon says: p. 104, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"(1) The impurity of the Texts exhibited by Codices B and

Aleph is not a matter of opinion, but a matter of fact. These are two of the least trustworthy documents in existence... Codices B and Aleph are, demonstrably nothing else but specimens of the depraved class thus characterized. Next: p. 104, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

(2) We assert that, so manifest are the disfigurements jointly and *exclusively* exhibited by Codices B and Aleph that instead of accepting these codices as the 'independent' witnesses to the impaired Original, we are constrained to regard them as little more than a single reproduction of one and the same scandalously corrupt and (comparatively) late copy." "Revision Revised," pages 315-318. p. 104, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

CORRUPTED BY PAPISTS p. 104, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

It seems incomprehensible to me that my Reviewers would claim that I failed to show that these manuscripts were corrupted by the papists. Evidently they did not read my first chapter in which I clearly presented the leading names in the founding of the mystery of iniquity, namely Justin Martyr, Tatian, Clement of Alexandria and Origen. (See also History of the Sabbath, by Andrews and Conradi, pages 347, 370). I clearly showed that these all were corrupters of manuscripts. If you do not think this is so, kindly read over again Chapter one of my book. And since Origen was one of them, and I have clearly proved that these two manuscripts are corrupted and that they are of the Eusebio-Origen school; then what other conclusion is possible but that these two manuscripts were corrupted by the papists? p. 104, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Moreover, later in the book I showed how the Vulgate was corrupted. I will now add another testimony from an author whom I often quoted in my book, Dr. Jacobus, to show that Jerome was a chronic corrupter of manuscripts. And surely he was a papist as were Eusebius and Origen, Dr. Jacobus says; p. 104, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

"Jerome was an earnest Christian, but at the same time a polemical theologian, with strong opinions as to the interpretation of prophetic passages; and he allowed his polemics and his prejudices to warp his translation in a way that Catholics frankly admit." "Roman Catholic and Protestant Bibles Compared." page 42. p. 104, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Again, "Now some of those may be simply blunders, but not all; and to say that these are 'serious defects' is less than truth! They betoken a willingness to tamper with the text." Idem, Appendix, Note 200. p. 105, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Jerome wrote a letter to Marcella from Rome 348 A.D. Letter XXVII in which he defends himself against the charge of having altered the text of Scripture, as follows: p. 105, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"After I had written my former letter, containing a few remarks on some Hebrew words, a report suddenly reached me that certain contemptible creatures *were deliberately assailing me with the charge that I had endeavored to correct passages in the gospels, against the authority of the ancients and the opinion of the whole world....* I am not, I repeat, so ignorant as to suppose that any of the Lord's words is either in need of correction or is not divinely inspired; but the Latin manuscripts of the Scriptures are proved to be faulty by the variations which all of them exhibit, and my object has been to restore them to the form of the Greek original." "Post Nicene Fathers," Second Series, Vol. VI, pages 43, 44. (Emphasis mine.) p. 105, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

It will also be recalled here, that I set forth in one or two places in my book that Helvidius, the famous scholar of Northern Italy, accused Jerome to his face of using corrupted Greek manuscripts. Of Jerome, the article on his name in the Mcclintock and Strong's Encyclopedia says: p. 105, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"Easily offended vanity", "a fanatical apologist of monkish extravagances "romanizing", pride, often concealed under the garb of humility" and "antichiliastic" that is against the millenium as we believe it. p. 105, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

A final note from Philip Mauro on this same point will show that there are others who believe that those manuscripts, and the Vaticanus in particular, are cherished by the papacy for their corruptions: p. 105, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"It is easy to understand why this particular MS

(Vaticanus) is cherished at the Vatican; for its corruptions are what make it of value to the leaders of the papal system. We can conceive therefore the satisfaction of those leaders that their highly prized manuscript has bee allowed to play the leading part in the revision of the English Bible, than which there is nothing on earth they have more reason to fear. On the other hand, may not this be one of the causes why God, in His over-ruling providence, has frustrated the attempt to displace the AV by a new version based upon such a sandy foundation?" "Which Version?" Note, page 50. p. 105, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

On the other hand there are other authorities who believe that the reason why those two beautiful Codices have been preserved, was that, because of their corruptions, they have not been worn out by use. p. 105, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

All Adventist ministers have preached upon Dan. 7:25 about that power which would change the law of God, and glory in changing it. If this power could change the very heart of the Bible, do you think they would hesitate to change anything else in the Bible, which they wished to change? p. 106, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

WESTCOTT AND HORT THEORY. p. 106, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

In view of what we have said concerning the corruptions of these manuscripts, one may wonder how it came about that they were put over and made the basis of the Revised Version. Find the explanation of how Darwin put over his theory of evolution and this will answer the question. For Dr. Salmon points out that Dr. Hort stands related to the new science of textual criticism in much the same way that Darwin stood related to the theory of evolution. Westcott and Hort did not collect Manuscripts. Indeed, they had no experience in either collecting or collating; they simply furnished the theory which they made dominant in the Revision Committee, chosen after Oxford University had been captured by the Jesuits. And let us not forget that Oxford University Press with Cambridge, paid the bill occasioned by the Revision. As Dr. Kenyon says: p. 106, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"Westcott and Hort did not themselves collate or edit manuscripts, but devoted themselves to the study of the material collected by others, and to the elaboration of a

theory... Briefly, this theory is a revival of Griesbach's classification of all textual authorities into families." "Criticism of the N.T., page 294. p. 106, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Dean Burgon so effectually exposed the wickedness of Dr. Hort's theory that he virtually killed the Revised Version in England. p. 106, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Dr. Scrivener concurred with Dean Burgon. Of the theory of Westcott and Hort, he says: p. 106, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

(1) "There is little hope for the stability of their imposing structure, if its foundations have been laid on the sandy ground of ingenious conjecture. And, since barely the smallest vestige of historical evidence has ever been alleged in support of the views of these accomplished Editors, their teaching must either be received as intuitively true, or dismissed from our consideration as precarious, and even visionary." Scrivener, "Introduction", Vol. II, page 285. p. 106, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

There could be no severer arraignment of the theory of Westcott and Hort, the theory upon which their Revised Version is based. Note that Dr. Scrivener says, "It must be accepted as intuitively true," (that is without any evidence or proof,) or else dismissed as "precarious or even visionary." p. 106, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

(2) "Dr. Hort's system, therefore, is entirely destitute of historical foundation." Idem, Vol. II, page 291. p. 106, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

(3) "We are compelled to repeat as emphatically as ever our strong conviction that the hypothesis to whose proof he has devoted so many laborious years, is destitute not only of historical foundation, but of all probability resulting from the internal goodness of the Text which its adoption would force upon us." Idem, page 296. p. 106, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

(4) "'We cannot doubt' (says Dr. Hort) 'that it (Luke 23:24) comes from an extraneous source.' (Hort, notes, page 68.) nor can we on our part doubt that the system which entails such consequences is hopelessly self-condemned." Idem, page 358. p. 107, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Dr. Kenyon, always a follower of Westcott and Hort, is one of the latest to attempt to defend their theory. But an examination of Kenyon's pages (Textual Criticism, pages 320-333), reveals that to do so he must appeal to classical (pagan) and to other irrelevant sources. Then feeling the weakness of this illogical analogy he falls back on Hort's fantastic imaginary and unhistorical recensions, which Scrivener and others surely denounced. p. 107, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers charge me with using writers who lived during the heat of the controversy. Do Luther and Wesley or Lincoln and Douglas lose any of their value because they wrote during the heat of the controversy? I used some of the very latest writers in my book. I will now present to you eight outstanding textual critics whose testimony, given as late as January, 1921 declares that the Westcott and Hort Greek Text is a failure. These men are Danday, Field, Kirsopp Lake, Julicher, J. Rendell Harris, Eberhard Nestle, Bernard Weiss, E. D. Burton, and Rudolph Knopf. A resume of these opinions is given in the "Bibliotheca Sacra", January, 1921, a volume I referred to in my book along with others. Here are two quotations from this volume: p. 107, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"Another Scheme devised by Dr. Hort to justify his abbreviated text was to put forward the Vatican Codex B as the purest text, and nearest to the original autographs. This preference has been condemned by later critics." "Bibliotheca Sacra", Jan. 1921, page 33. p. 107, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"All of his (Dr. Hort's) positions have been attacked, if not taken, and the mistakes of Hort's Greek text are transmitted in the Canterbury Revision (English Revised), which is thus so far discredited." Idem, page 36. p. 107, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

DR. PHILIP SCHAFF. p. 107, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

A final word in answer to the charge of my Reviewers that I failed to show that Aleph and B were corrupted by the papists. I wish to call attention to the fact that Dr. Schaff, President of both Old Testament and New Testament American Revision Committees, was completely subservient to the Westcott and Hort Textual theory. He chose the members of both the Old Testament and New Testament American

Revision Committees; he drew up the rules which guided them; in fact, he was the life and soul of what was done here in America. I simply recall to you again that chapter in my book which my Reviewers completely ignored, but which proved conclusively that Dr. Schaff's convictions, teachings, and writings and the whole logic of his work was Romanizing. Or as one writer puts it: p. 107, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"Our examination has extended only to a little beyond the middle of Dr. Schaff's work (i.e. his History of the Apostolic Church). But the positions he has already advanced, are such as to lay the whole truth and grace of God, and the whole liberty, hope, and salvation of the human race, at the feet of the Roman Papacy." "The New Brunswick Review," Aug. 1854, page 325. p. 107, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

I think that I proved to the satisfaction of all that the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus were corrupted, and were corrupted by the papists. p. 108, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

SECTION VI -- REVIEW OF SCRIPTURE TEXTS CITED IN CHAPTERS VI, XI, XII. p. 108, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

When the Reviewers brought against my various statements such high-sounding expressions as these: "The authenticated texts", "The major MSS", "The best of all Greek MSS", "The best attested MSS", etc. it must have almost overwhelmed you with the thought that my book was being demolished by these outstanding authoritative MSS. p. 108, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

In their reply to many of the scripture texts which were handled, they largely attempted to vindicate their opposition to what I said by appealing to manuscripts under the titles just given. However, this method involves six serious difficulties: p. 108, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

(1) They did not tell us what manuscripts they are: (2) they did not tell us how many there are; (3) they did not exhibit what right they had to apply these approving titles to the manuscripts; (4) they did not tell how many manuscripts were on the opposite side; (5) neither did they tell us what manuscripts were on the other side; and (6) finally, they have offered us no justifying reason why they grouped all the *thousands* of manuscripts on the opposite

side under the name of Textus Receptus and counted them as *one* witness. Evarts in the Bibliotheca Sacra of January 1921 quotes a textual critic to say that John 8:1-11 on the woman taken in adultery is witness to in 1650 codices. Since less than 1/10 of these are uncials, this authority must reckon the remaining 1490 cursives as each an independent witness. What right then, have my Reviewers to take a handful of manuscripts on their side, whose voice discounts from thousands of manuscripts on the other side of the question and count each one of this small handful of theirs a separate witness; while they count the thousands of manuscripts on the other side as simply one witness. When their repeated appeals to those high-sounding but meaningless terms to justify their defense of the following texts are shown to mean nothing, when each one must stand on the poverty of the other reasons they offer. An examination of this poverty makes very interesting reading. p. 108, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

But what are the facts? Which are those wonderful manuscripts to which they refer -- "the authenticated", "the major", "the noted", "the most valuable", "the best", "the best attested?" Would you be surprised to find that generally, they are just two principal manuscripts, the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus? p. 108, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

What right have they to describe them by all these high-sounding adjectives when they know and told you (on page 12, Section II of their Document) that authorities were divided in their estimate of their value -- one side regarding the Vaticanus, the better of the two, as the most vicious manuscript in existence. p. 108, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

What right had they to try to overwhelm your thinking with the idea that the great authorities were against me? This is some new logic. They prove the AV wrong and prove me in error, mainly two witnesses, the better of the two even being held as the most vicious MS in the world. Do you prove that the Prohibitionists are wrong by bringing in anti-prohibition witnesses, by calling the witnesses most noted, major, best, best attested, best authenticated? p. 109, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Does anyone think that the AV and my position relative to it can be set aside by such witnesses, witnesses without ancestry, without history, by witnesses which are rejected

as corrupt and unreliable? p. 109, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

They are condemned by their own internal evidence and by 99 witnesses out of every 100, condemned by the overwhelming testimony of the patristic writings, the MSS, and the Versions. My Reviewers' wise assertions that they are the best, major, best attested, etc. will not convince those who think fairly. p. 109, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Their nine (9) indictments of my methods (Section III, chapter II, pages 2, 3) were built upon their unjustifiable use of these high-sounding but meaningless terms about MSS; (2) their endorsement of doctrine-changing mistranslations; (3) their acceptance of the ruin of the established usages of words; (4) their unjustifiable claim upon parallel passages, on the ground that because God had said a thing once, there was no harm to cut out where he said it in another place; (5) upon their own self-made theological arguments. When all these questionable procedures are duly shown to be valueless these nine (9) indictments of my methods mean just nothing at all. They will stand or fall upon my examination of the individual texts. p. 109, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

In order that this document may not be too long, I propose not to notice, at length, a number of the scripture texts which are argued by my Reviewers. In fact, I am under no obligation to notice their arguments about doctrine with reference texts used in Chapter 6 of my book. Chapter 6 was not given to show how the Revisers changed doctrine. It was given to show the similarity, if not identity, of many passages in the ARV with the same passages in the Jesuit Bible of 1582, and how these two versions are leagued together on one side of the gulf between and the AV on the other side. p. 109, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

The accumulative argument produced by the totality of these comparisons is tremendous. This accumulative argument my Reviewers ignored. It was easier for them to notice the compared passages, one by one, on the basis that they were arguing a change of doctrine; thus the main effect of Chapter 6 they missed, Nevertheless, I wish to discuss in reply a number of these compared passages which they reviewed. p. 109, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

III-6-3 OABV-91 p. 109, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Let us first notice my Reviewers' defense of the Revised Version in 2 Sam. 21:19, which declares that Elhanan killed Goliath. My Reviewers indict the translators of the AV because they supplied certain words in italics and so made the Bible consistent with itself. They approved the ARV which translated the Hebrew text without italics and so made the Bible contradict itself. p. 109, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

By this argument the ARV is convicted, because in 2 Thess. 2:3 it supplied the four words, "it will not be"' for supplying which, they had no justification, except that internal evidence demanded these words to be supplied. The AV, therefore, stands justified because it supplied the proper words which a powerful internal evidence supported, in the case of the killing of Goliath, while the Revisers here side-stepped. This deplorable act of the Revisers has rocked two continents with the needless and doubt scattering debate. p. 110, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

The King James translators made the Hebrew agree with itself, while the ARV made it contradict itself. Then the Revisers emphasized the contradiction, by reading into the margin the AV reading. Modernists, at once, seize the contradiction and claim to prove that David did not kill Goliath. Then, and we have proof for this in the "Literary Digest" of March 9, 1929, modernists take the contradiction as the most historical. They actually claim that Elhanan did kill Goliath. Where now is your acid text? Where now are your primal laws of evidence? Do sincerity and fairness mean that we should make the Bible contradict itself? If the Revisers were justified in supplying the four words in 2 Thess. 2:3 by internal evidence which made common sense, how can they escape the charge of deliberately playing into the hands of skeptics, critics, and atheists by failing again to take advantage of what was the strongest kind of internal evidence. The famous Dr. Frederick Field, who spent his life on the Old Testament in Greek, brings as one of his strongest indictments against the Revisers that they ignored the great law of internal evidence, under the pretense of being obliged to be exactly literal. p. 110, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

III-6-4 OABV p. 110, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Matt. 6:13 -- On the Abbreviation of the Lord's Prayer. p. 110, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

We now come to the famous omission of the last part of the standard account of the Lord's Prayer. My Reviewers, in line with the Revisers and the Jesuits of 1582, defend this omission. Against it the great Reformers indignantly protested. Have you ever noticed that the King James, or Authorized Version, make the Lord's Prayer begin with the Lord and end with the Lord? But the ARV makes the Lord's Prayer begin with the Lord and end with the evil one. Sister White did not agree with the ARV, for she said: p. 110, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"The last like the first sentence of the Lord's Prayer, points to Our Father." "Mount of Blessing", page 174. p. 110, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

This puts the AV and Sister White on one side; and on the other side it puts my Reviewers, the Revisers, and the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS. p. 110, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

In defense, it is claimed that "the omitted part is not found in the oldest Greek MSS". The truth is it is lacking only in the Vaticanus, Sinaiticus and three uncials and five cursives; while on the other hand the other remaining uncials and the thousands of cursives are for it. Dr. Cook says: "In support of the rejected clause I have noticed the immense preponderance of authorities." "Revised Versions", page 57. This is proof enough that the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are corrupted. The probable reason why they are the oldest MSS is because they were so corrupted, they were not used or worn out in the hands of the people who studied or copied them. My Bible is worn out. To quote as my Reviewers did, that the Expositor's Greek Testament" says it was a liturgical ending, and no part of the Lord's Prayer, means nothing. How comes the Expositor's N.T. to be authority, especially greater than Sister White? p. 110, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

The "Expositor's Greek N.T." work does not purport to enter the field of textual criticism; it is no authority therein, and simply repeats parrot like what the critics furnished. My Reviewers give also, as additional evidence, a quotation from Dr. Scrivener which says "yes" and "no" on the question, therefore nothing. p. 111, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"Prophets and Kings" page 69 and "Mount of Blessing" pages

174-176 quote this portion of the Lord's Prayer which the ARV omitted, and therefore it should be in the text, the place of honor. It has been dishonored, it was placed in the margin. Now where is your acid test? Who says that the changes of the Revisers did not affect doctrine? What is doctrine? Why didn't my Reviewers, recognize Sister White? p. 111, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

III-6-5 OABV-92 p. 111, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Matt. 5:44 On Praying for Enemies. p. 111, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Here again my Reviewers fail in catching the argument in my book. They claim that because the ARV omits, "bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you," and also "which despitefully use you," that I declare on the strength on the strength of this omission that the Revised Version is not a revision in any sense whatever, but a new Bible based on different MSS from the King James, on Catholic MSS in fact." p. 111, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

This is not true. I quoted Canon Cook, that well-known scholar who had been invited to sit on the Revision Committee but who refused. My Reviewers ignored his quotation. He said: "Yet this enormous omission rests on the sole Authority of Aleph (Sinaiticus) and B (Vaticanus)." And since my Reviewers admit on this same passage that these two oldest MSS came to us directly from Catholic sources, I had a right to claim that the Revised Version was based on Catholic MSS, unless they could present some mitigating circumstances. What mitigating circumstances did they present? The brought up again Erasmus, that he was Catholic, that his new Greek Testament was dedicated to the Pope and received the written endorsement of the Pope; and that further, Erasmus printed in parallel columns the official Roman Catholic Testament in Latin with Greek Text. Thus they sought to parry the indictment of the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus as Catholic MSS by trying to make us believe that the Textus Receptus of Erasmus' was just as Catholic. p. 111, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Now notice the facts in the case. Was Erasmus a Catholic in reality? Was he in submission to the Pope as all really and truly Catholics virtually are? No. His work shook the Roman Catholic Church, and his books were put on the Index. Luther and Erasmus were at first Catholic in name, but

Protestants at heart. Erasmus was protesting. The Revisers on the other hand, were Protestants in name, but ceased protesting; were Catholics at heart, and headed toward ritualism and Romanism. p. 111, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Erasmus was driving the world toward Protestantism, it was toward Catholicism that the Revisers were driving the world. p. 112, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Why tell the world again that all Erasmus printed in parallel columns was the Greek Testament and the Catholic Vulgate? Why not tell the whole truth? Why not tell the world and our dear people that he printed in a third column his revised Vulgate which brought down upon him the storm of Catholic Europe. Why not tell everybody, everywhere, that later the Pope put all his books on the Index Expurgatorius? Will somebody please tell me when the Pope put the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus on the Index Expurgatorius? Thus Putnam speaks of it: p. 112, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"In the Index of 1559, the name of Erasmus is placed under the class of *Auctores quorum libri et scripta omnia prohibentur.* After the entry of the name however, comes the following specification? *cum universis Commantariis, Annotationibus, Schollis, Dialogis, Epistolis, Censuris, Persionibus, Libris et Scriptis suis, etian si nil ponitus contra Religionem, vei di Religione contineant."* "The Censorship of the Church of Rome." Vol. I, page 335. p. 112, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

But there is another angle to this proposition. How many Protestant Versions have been influenced by these two MSS? None but the Revised over which the discussion now is. You might include the individual versions, but they are not recognized, either by the Reviewers or by the authorities they quoted. My Reviewers say in so many words, speaking of the ARV, "Because its translators are guided by the oldest and most complete MSS". If my Reviewers mean by these words that the ARV translators were guided by the *two* oldest and most complete MSS which is virtually the truth then the ARV is built on Catholic MSS. p. 112, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers next claim that, "There is no historical proof that any Greek text was more directly influenced by Catholic hands, a Catholic version, and Catholic approval than was that of Erasmus, yet the text of Erasmus was the

basis of what has since been called the Textus Receptus, which the author lauds so highly as a pure, uncorrupted text." p. 112, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

What are my Reviewers trying to do? Are they trying to make out the AV, the Protestant Bible, as taken from the Textus Receptus to be in fact a Catholic Bible? My astonishment knows no bounds. The Pope put the Textus Receptus on the Index, condemned it, and condemned (as well) the AV. Faber, one of the perverts from Protestantism to Catholicism in the Oxford Movement called the Authorized Version "one of the greatest strongholds of heresy". Eadie, "English Bible," page 158). And the Catholic Bishop of Eric calls it "their own vile version." Probably the Bishop learned it from Dr. Hort, who at the age of 23 called the Textus Receptus "vile" and "villainous". Cardinal Wiseman attempts to show that the rush of certain Protestants to the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, proves that the Vulgate was taken from the best MSS. (Wiseman's Essays, Vol. 1, page 104). Do my Reviewers then arrange themselves alongside of Faber, Cardinal Wiseman, and the Catholic Bishop of Eric? Do they also try to make out that our great Protestant Bible is, in fact, a Catholic one? I protest, in the name of Protestantism and Seventh-day Adventistism, and in the name of truth. Might as well brand Luther, and the Reformation also Catholic. See to what lengths the defenders of the Revised Version are driven. p. 112, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers next defend this "enormous omission" from Matt. 5:44 by declaring that the ARV, with great fidelity, has retained in Luke 6:27, 28, the words omitted in Matt. 5:44. This is the old story. On that principle you could leave out all the gospels but one making a composite gospel and thus improve on what the lord has done. My Reviewers talk about an "imposition on the laity". What would the people in the field think if you went out and gave them such principle as this namely? Because the Revisers did not corrupt every text therefore they are at liberty to corrupt this one? Will my Reviewers claim because the Revisers did not knock the whole wall down, therefore they did not make any breaches in the wall? Do they mean to imply that it is not necessary for the Lord to say a thing twice because He said it once? Did He not repeat the story of taking of Israel out of the land of Egypt many, many, times? Will my Reviewers say that once was enough? Would not taking this position make the Bible out as being full of redundancies

and superfluities and repetitions? Why have four gospels; why not be satisfied with one? Why have parallel readings? Why tell the story of the Cross so often? Is not *once* enough? Why not have an abbreviated Bible? Do they really mean to defend the Revisers in omitting a passage of Scripture, because it is found elsewhere in the Bible? Are they defending the Word of God or the Work of the Revisers? p. 113, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Did not Sister White plainly say in "Great Controversy", page 245, speaking of Erasmus and his Greek and Latin Versions of the New Testament: p. 113, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"In this work many errors of former versions were corrected, and the same more clearly rendered." p. 113, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

She also said: p. 113, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"He (Tyndale) had received the gospel from the Greek Testament of Erasmus. He fearlessly preached his convictions, urging that all doctrines be tested by the Scriptures. To the papist claim that the church had given the Bible, and the Church alone could explain it, Tyndale responded... far from having given us the Scriptures, it is you who have hidden them from us; it is you who burn those who teach them, and if you could, you would burn the Scriptures themselves.'" "Great Controversy", pages 245, 246. p. 113, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

In the face of this ringing testimony from the Spirit of Prophecy, how can my Reviewers claim that the Greek New Testament of Erasmus was Catholic? p. 113, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers have spoken about imposing on the people. How long shall we stand to have these things told to the people the way they are here telling them? How long shall we line ourselves up with this campaign against Erasmus and his Greek Text; and consequently against Tyndale and the Authorized Version, and the Spirit of Prophecy? Do you think that our own dear people should be saved from hearing these things in the wrong way and should be given the correct information? That is why I wrote my book. I wrote my book in order that the world at large and our own dear people should have the correct information on this whole situation. p. 113, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

III-6-6 OABV-92-3 p. 114, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Luke 2:33. On Joseph's being the Father of Jesus. p. 114, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Here again the Reviewers neglected to answer a telling witness. I showed that Helvidius, the devoted scholar of Northern Italy (400 A.D.) who had the pure MSS, accused Jerome of using corrupt manuscripts on this very text. I gave my authority for this, which authority is indisputable. By looking at the Vulgate, we know that in Luke 2:33, Jerome did exactly what the American Revised and Jesuit Bibles did, that is, they gave Jesus a human father. How could Helvidius accuse Jerome of using corrupt Greek Manuscripts if Helvidius did not have the true manuscripts? Moreover, Dean Burgon says that his rendering is a "depravation of the text". (Revision Revised", page 161.) All the answer my Reviewers give is a theological argument. They bring forth Luke 2:48 where Mary says to the child Jesus, "Thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing." Well, these are the words of 'Mary', they are not the words of *inspiration.* Nevertheless, the record of what Mary said is inspired, but we are not told that what Mary *said* was inspired. p. 114, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers make a further appeal to verses 27 and 41 where the word "parents" is used. My Reviewers ought to know that the word "parents" is an omnibus term; it includes the father and the mother. It is so used that it might refer to a mother and a foster-father. Therefore no argument can be grounded upon any of the three texts which my Reviewers offer in opposition to the testimony of Helvidius and of Burgon. Why did not my Reviewers call attention to Luke 2:43 which *also* was changed from "Joseph and his mother" in the AV to "his parents" in the RV, a change in the direction of the text under discussion? p. 114, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

III-6-7 OABV-93 p. 114, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Luke 4:8. On Get Thee Behind Me Satan. p. 114, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers commit three errors in discussing the omission in the Revised of the words, "Get thee behind me, Satan". *First,* they claim that the testimony of the MSS is

so positively against including this omitted clause. On the contrary, Burgon and Miller say; p. 114, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"It is plain, from the consent of (so to speak) all the copies, that our Saviour rejected the Temptation which stands second in St. Luke's Gospel with the words, 'Get thee behind me Satan.'" "The Traditional Text", page 169. p. 114, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

The *second* error of my Reviewers is in leading us to believe that the omission of the clause in Luke 4:8 is fully compensated for in Matthew 4:10. This is not the fact. The clause in Matthew reads, "Get thee hence, Satan". Quite a difference as I will now proceed to explain. p. 114, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

The *third* error of my Reviewers is in their attempt to say that doctrine is not affected. It is evident that they are not acquainted with the testimony of Origen or Jerome on this text. Origen distinctly says that the reason why Jesus said to Peter "Get thee behind Me, Satan;" while to the devil he said "Get thee hence" without the addition, "behind me", was, that to be behind Jesus is a good thing." Jerome follows Origen in his reasonings. This omission was made evidently to point out that to put Peter directly behind the Lord was to put him in a good place in line, following Jesus, to receive apostolic succession. The argument of my Reviewers seems to be in harmony with this doctrine of Peter receiving apostolic succession because they support the change. In fact my Reviewers appear to me to be more anxious to support the Revisers than they are to support the text. My reason for saying this is that the Spirit of Prophecy quotes Luke 4:8; just as it reads in the AV. Thus the AV and Sister White again are on the same side of the question. Volume V, page 409 reads: p. 114, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

"They will meet the adversary with the simple weapon that Christ used, 'It is written,' or will repulse him with, 'Get thee behind me, Satan.'" p. 115, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

III-6-7 OABV-93 p. 115, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Luke 11:2-4. On the Lord's Prayer in Luke. p. 115, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

This shocking mutilation of the Lord's Prayer in Luke 11:2-4 is accepted and justified by my Reviewers on the ground that it agrees with "the best attested manuscripts". What are the facts? Besides one phrase being omitted in the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, it is omitted in only one other uncial and two cursives. What about all the other uncials and all the thousands of cursives? (See Dr. Cook, page 85). The other phrase is omitted in the five uncials only, Aleph, A, B, C, D. The preponderance of authorities in favor "is immense'. page 86. On this depravation Dean Burgon says: p. 115, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"An instructive specimen of depravation follows, which can be traced to Marcion's mutilated recension of St. Luke's Gospel." p. 115, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Then, after noticing the blundering mutilations, he says: p. 115, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"So then these five 'first class authorities' are found to throw themselves into six different combinations in their departures from St. Luke's way of exhibiting the Lord's Prayer, which, among them, they contrive to falsify in respect of no less than 45 words; and yet they are never able to agree among themselves as to any single various reading;... What need to declare that it is certainly false in every instance? Such however is the infatuation of the Critics, that the vagaries of B are all taken for gospel." "The Revision Revised", pages 34, 35. p. 115, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

The testimonies of many other eminent critics could be given here, who are shocked beyond measure at this mutilation of the Lord's Prayer. p. 115, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Again the Reviewers attempt to parry the thrust of this mutilation by calling attention to the Authorized readings in the margin. Here again my Reviewers flee to the margin for refuge. They make a good deal of the fact that I use the margin as evidence in certain things. But they have no right to relegate constituent parts of the Lord's Prayer to the margin. p. 115, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

III-6-8 OABV-94-VI p. 116, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Acts 13:42. On the Sabbath of the Jews. p. 116, Para. 2,

[ANSWERS].

We are asked to notice verses 14, 15 and 43 to solve the difficulty here. They fail to solve the difficulty. The authorized Version in verse 42 has the [*] Jews leaving; the Gentiles are then left in the synagogue with Paul; and request that these words be spoken again to them the next Sabbath. In the AV the Gentiles and the Sabbath are put together, not so in the ARV. The only excuse the Reviewers have again, is to fall back upon the manuscripts. They confess, however, that this text is found in the Textus Receptus MSS. If so, I want to tell you it is found in 950 out of every 1,000 MSS. Right here I desire to take special notice of the last sentence of the comment of my Reviewers, which seemed to say that the AV creates more embarrassment with regard to the Sabbath than the ARV. p. 116, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

[[*] (the Jews leaving the synagogue)] p. 116, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

If so, why did the American Revised make such an astounding change in Col. 2:16. Notice the difference: p. 116, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

King James: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days:" p. 116, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

ARV: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day or a new moon or of a sabbath day:" p. 116, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Why did the Revisers in Col. 2:16 translate a plural noun in the Greek meaning "sabbath days" by a single noun. "a sabbath day"? Do you not see how Seventh-day Adventists, by this translation are reduced to embarrassment when they put this verse to comparison with the other damaging way that the ARV translates the Sabbath command: p. 116, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Exodus 20:8-10 ARV: Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is a sabbath unto Jehovah thy God"... p. 116, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

The AV makes the Sabbath commanded in Exodus, singular and

definite, ... "the Sabbath day"'; but in Col. 2:16, the AV makes the sabbath abolished, plural and indefinite. On the other hand, the Revised Version makes both the Sabbath commandment in Exodus 20:8 singular and indefinite; and that which is abolished in Col. 2:16 also singular and indefinite. That is, according to the Revised Version the identical thing which is commanded in the law of God, "a sabbath" is abolished in Col. 2:16, "a sabbath day". And this, in spite of the fact that the Greek noun of Col. 2;16 is in the plural. p. 116, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Where now is the boasted accuracy of the ARV, and that on a vital point of doctrine? How many can the claim of being literal be sustained? In this rendering we have neither the literal, nor the accurate, nor yet a translation. Where now is the acid test? The document talks about our being a laughing stock. By this fatal combination in translation between Exodus 20:10 and Col. 2:16, Seventh-day Adventists are now where they cannot protect themselves on the doctrine of the abolition of the Sabbath. I say that this is systematic depravation. As proof of my contention, I have ample evidence that our enemies have not been slow to use against us this very systematic depravation. In the newspaper debate between Maclennan (Seventh-day Adventist) and Brewer (Christian Disciple) as issued from the General Conference Press Bureau, we read these words from our antagonist the Disciple minister. p. 116, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

"There is no authority at all for Christians to keep the Sabbath. Rather we are strictly admonished to allow no man to judge us with reference to the Sabbath. (Col. 2:16): p. 117, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Again he says: p. 117, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"There is no excuse for saying 'sabbath DAYS' in this passage. A 'sabbath day', the Revised Version says, and that gets all of them." p. 117, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Brethren, I would not know how, in view of this, to defend the Sabbath if I were totally dependent upon the ARV. I thank the Lord for the King James Version as an anchor to our faith in such difficult situations as this. In fact our ministers in the field have been greatly troubled to know how to meet an opponent on the Sabbath question who faced them with the Revised Version. This demonstrates the close

affinity between the King James Bible and the fundamentals of our message. p. 117, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

For over 80 years it has been possible ably to defend the third angel's message with the AV. The AV is a complete whole, its teachings are clear. On doctrinal points we find in it no contradictions. All its parts form a complete harmony and it leads us to the truth by the authority of the fitness of things. The united appeal to its consistent testimony is irresistible. It is not a Greek N.T. put together by scissors and paste. It is the Textus Receptus witnessed to by thousands of MSS, having the highest antiquity, harmoniously witnessed to by various nations and various centuries, and has been since the beginning, the generally accepted Bible of God's people. It is an eternal bulwark of the church and the truth of the Living God. p. 117, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

III-6-8 OABV -94-7 p. 117, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Acts 15:23. On the Clergy and the Laity. p. 117, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Again I must protest against my Reviewers' ignoring the evidence of the change in Acts 15:23, by leaving out the two Greek words which stand for "and the"; ignoring, I say, that this opened the way for Romanizers to claim that the clergy ruled the church without the presence of the laity. I gave sufficient evidence in my book that battles on this text raged in the Reformation period. I will give additional evidence from later writers. Dr. Meyers' "Commentary on the New Testament" (Acts page 282) says: p. 117, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

"The omission of *kai oi* is on hierarchical grounds." p. 117, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

This is just what I said in my book. The only manuscripts he quotes in favor of this, are the usual five uncials which are found together, the greatest ones of which are the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. p. 118, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Another quotation on this point from Dr. G. T. Strokes, whose work on "The Acts of The Apostles" is one of the latest and most up-to-date. His words are very directly to the point: p. 118, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"A great battle indeed has raged round the words of the Authorized Version of the twenty-third verse. 'The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles', which are otherwise rendered in the Revised Version. The presence or the absence of the 'and' between elders and brethren has formed the battle ground between two parties, the one upholding, the other opposing the right of the laity to take part in church synods and councils." "The Acts of the Apostles", page 236. p. 118, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

So you see my position on Acts 15:23 is correct. My Reviewers have certainly not studied and informed themselves as to the real meaning underlying the Revised reading. p. 118, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

III-6-9 OABV-94-VIII p. 118, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Acts 16:7. On the Spirit of Jesus. p. 118, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

I will simply call attention to the fact that the Revisers broke the higher critics' rule by taking the larger reading for the shorter. This is one of the places where the revisers added to the Textus Receptus. There is more involved, however than this. Kindly read my book, page 192. p. 118, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

III-6-9 OABV-95-IX p. 118, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Romans 5:1. On *We have* or *Let us have* Peace. p. 118, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers endeavor to make out quite a case on the way I handle the marginal reading from Romans 5:1. Wherein does the difference between my Reviewers and me lie? The difference is this; they say that what I treated of was a mere marginal note and not an alternative reading. The truth of the matter is that I used the English Revised Version which plainly in the *text* (not in the margin), says, "let us have peace"; whereas the margin of the ARV says, "many ancient authorities read "let us have'". Why were not my Reviewers frank enough to tell you that the expression "let us have peace" is in the *text* of the English Revised. And in chapters 11 and 12 of my book where I compared texts from the standpoint of doctrine I usually used the English Revised, especially noting whenever I used

the ARV. But in chapter 6 now under consideration I was not primarily comparing texts from the standpoint of doctrine; I was showing the similarity if not identity of the American Revised with the Jesuit Bible of 1582 in the passages under consideration. p. 118, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Nevertheless, considering the strength of what is said in the margin of the ARV the Reviewers were not entitled to say that this was not an alternative marginal reading but a mere marginal note. Why should not the charge which they brought against me of perversion really lie against them? p. 118, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

Moreover... I deny that, in any way, whatever, I misrepresented Dr. G. L. Robinson. They say (Section I, page 30) "This is perhaps as striking a perversion of authority as is found in this book." I was not reviewing Dr. Robinson. I was not endeavoring to show he was anti-Revised Version, nor was I under any obligation to say that he endorsed the ARV. I simply used him as a witness when he said that the reading "let us have peace" is a serious error of doctrine. p. 119, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

And so it is. If we start out as Paul does in Romans 5:1 to say "Being justified by faith:, and then add, "let us have peace" this is plainly a Catholic doctrine, that is justification by works. Dr. Robinson is right; moreover, the constant belittling of Protestant Versions on the ground that they are based on faulty and recent manuscripts turns the hearts of the people to ancient manuscripts. In the AV you cannot find ten marginal references to other MSS; while in Matthew alone in the Revised there are over fifty. The Revised version choked its margin with alternative readings from other MSS. Here is one in the margin of the ARV of Romans 5:1. Of course the most ancient and most eminent manuscript used by all the higher critics for the last one hundred years is the Vatican Manuscript, then which there is none other in the world more Catholic. p. 119, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

III-6-10 OABV-95-X p. 119, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

1 Cor. 5:7. On omission of the phrase "for us". p. 119, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers defend the omission of the words, "for us" from the passage "for Christ our passover was sacrificed

for us' by saying that six other manuscripts besides the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus omit it. Well, what about the thousands that contain it? p. 119, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Is not this a pivotal text? Is not this one of the most important for the Protestant doctrine of atonement? Suppose the next time they revise the Bible they change another one. Very soon the changed ones, affecting a great doctrine get in a majority and the unchanged ones are in a minority. Is not this a sinister change? If they changed all these texts at once, everybody would rise up and protest. I do not think we can brush aside the protest which I have quoted in my book, from a Protestant minister on this text. p. 119, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers offer other Scriptures such as Romans 5:8, 1 Peter 1:17, 21, as if we could find the same expression there. Not so. The first one does not say that Christ was sacrificed for us; while the second one does not even use the expression "for us". "Precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little." (Isa. 28:10). So does God teach us. It is the reverse of God's teaching when we begin to weaken one of these precepts or lines. Who is to say that it is not dangerous to mutilate one of these verses because there is another verse left somewhere contains a truth like it? p. 120, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Catholics teach that any one act of Christ's life would have atoned for us. We do not agree with this. We point to the act of eternal consequence, his death on the cross. We say "Behold the Lamb of God". It is most unfortunate that this outstanding text of 1 Cor. 5:7 has been so changed in the Revised that it is adaptable to the Catholic doctrine of atonement. In a few moments we will see that another text has been changed so as to leave out this expression, "through his blood". p. 120, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Sister White referring to this text says; p. 120, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"The slaying of the Passover lamb was a shadow of the death of Christ. Says Paul, 'Christ our passover is sacrificed for us.'" "Great Controversy" page 399, (See also P.P. page 277) p. 120, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

III-6-10 OABV-95-11 p. 120, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

1 Cor. 15:47. On the omission of "the Lord". p. 120, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

All we will do, is only emphasize once again that this Chapter 6 was given principally to show the similarity if not the identity of these passages in the Revised and Jesuit Bible of 1582, both agreeing between themselves and disagreeing with the King James. I will say here, however, that considerable use is made of this text as it now stands in the ARV to advance the new Person of Christ theory. Notice this, as a little further on I discuss the change in 1 Tim. 3:16. p. 120, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

III-6-10 OABV-96-XII p. 120, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Eph. 3:9. On omission of the phrase, "by Jesus Christ". p. 120, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers endeavor to defend the omission of the phrase "by Jesus Christ" on the grounds that the truth that Jesus is creator, can be found in three other texts in the ARV; namely, John 1:1-3, Col. 1:16 and Heb. 1:2. My Reviewers claim that the inclusion of the thought in these three other texts exonerates the Revisers from displaying ulterior purposes in this omission. Quite the contrary. My Reviewers failed to call attention to the fact that I have these *three very same texts* under indictment elsewhere for revealing these same ulterior purposes. In fact my Reviewers forget that they confessed that I had just grounds for criticism against the first of these texts (John 1:1-3) as handled by the Revisers. p. 120, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

III-6-11 OABV-96-XIII p. 120, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

Col. 1:14. On omission of the phrase, "his blood". p. 121, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers attempt to evade the force of the parallelism between the ARV and the Jesuit Bible of 1582 on the omission of the phrase "his blood". It is beside the point for them to say that if I am seeking for parallelisms of this nature I would have to reject the most of the New Testament. Because we are not arguing about where the Jesuit and the Revised agree; but where the Jesuit and the Revised agree *in opposition to the AV.* What kind of

reasoning do you call this? Nobody ever doubted that the great bulk of the verses of all Versions are practically alike. It is where the Jesuit and Revised agree with each other, but differ from the AV that we must determine our estimation of the Version. My Reviewers again fall back on 1 Peter 1:17-19. So this verse must do double duty. It must bolster us up for the omission of the words "through his blood" in Col. 1:14. Perhaps we shall have to use it again to bolster us up for other omissions from the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. If we remove, one by one, the strands from which the suspension bridge is hung, very soon we shall have the whole super-structure supported by only one strand. And what is the need of all this? The Authorized Version is sufficient for all needs. It has been with us in the Protestant world for three hundred years, and for eighty years in the third angel's message. What then is the need of all these omissions defended by such explaining and arguing? p. 121, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

III-6-11 OABV-97-XIV p. 121, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

1 Tim. 3:16. On the substitution of *He who* for *God.* p. 121, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Before bringing the evidence from the Spirit of Prophecy forward on this question, let me say that this text has been the battle-ground for the ages. As it now stands, in the AV it is both a cause and a bulwark of Protestantism. As it now stands in the Revised, it becomes one of the great texts for propaganda by Romanizing Protestants and Catholics. To illustrate: on the change of "he who" for "God" Bishop Westcott says: p. 121, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"The reader may easily miss the real character of this deeply instructive change. The passage now becomes a description of the essential character of the gospel, and not simply a series of historical statements. The gospel is personal. The gospel 'the revelation of godliness' is, in a word, Christ Himself, and not any propositions about Christ". Westcott, "Some Lessons", page 198. p. 121, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

The Revisers made this change which confounds Christ with the movement He instituted, the gospel, and leads our minds away from Christ the person on His heavenly throne, to Christ, the bread of the Lord's Supper, (Mass), on the ritualistic altar-throne. What is this, if not a change of

doctrine? Bishop Westcott was conscious of the change the Revisers were making in this reading. On this the "Princeton Review" says: p. 121, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"Making Christianity a life, the divine human life of Christ has far reaching consequences. It confounds and contradicts the Scriptures and church doctrine as to the Person of Christ." "Princeton Review", Jan. 1854. p. 121, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

In the great tremendous stirs made the last 100 years by trials of Protestant clergymen for heresy, none was more widely followed than the trial of Dr. Briggs of Union Theological Seminary, New York. He believed this new doctrine of the person of Christ, as did Dr. Schaff here in America, like Dr. Westcott in England, and like the majority of those who were, and are, active in promoting the revision of the Bible. By some it is called Christology; by others The Development Theory. Its dangerous possibility can be shown by the following quotation concerning Dr. Briggs: p. 122, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"Dr. Briggs, now a member of the Episcopal Church, has from time to time brought into expression certain ideals in regard to the development of the Church Universal. If one understands him aright, he looks forward to the reconstruction under the new conditions of the twentieth century, of a world's Church or Church Universal, which was so nearly realized under the very different conditions of the fifteenth century. He is, therefore, sympathetically interested in the policy of the Church of Rome and he is in close personal relations with not a few of the scholarly leaders of the Church." "The Censorship of the Church of Rome", Vol. II, pages 470, 471. p. 122, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

This new theory concerning the person of Christ or the Development theory; which gives Christ two bodies, one in heaven and another, his church, on earth, was aimed at the Bible. It gives a personality to the church and to the Holy Spirit in the church in such a real way, that the church is self-sufficient, of herself to develop doctrine and to meet the changing problems of the age. How does it affect the doctrine of the second coming of Christ? Let me quote from "The Mercersburg Theology" by Dr. Swander: p. 122, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"The only question remaining to be touched upon is: when shall the last physical change take place in the history of each second-Adamite? Down to this time, the weight of theological sentiment, as formulated in the confessions and taught in the divinity schools, had favored its postponement to some unknown future period, when the dethronement of death and the aggregate rising of the dead are to constitute the grand and final act in time's great theater. There is now, however, a gradual breaking away from all such interpretation of the Scripture. Many believe that the doctrine never had any fellowship with the truth. As soon as an individual becomes a member of the second Adam, there is a beginning of the process by which 'this mortal shall put on immortality.'" "The Mercersburg Theology" page 300. p. 122, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Sister White says: p. 122, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"The union of the divine with the human nature is one of the most precious and most mysterious truths of the plan of redemption. It is this of which Paul speaks when he says, 'Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh.' p. 122, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"This truth has been to many a cause of doubt and unbelief. When Christ came into the world, the Son of God and the Son of man, he was not understood by the people of his time." Testimonies for the Church" Vol. V, page 746. (See also "Counsels to Teachers" page 262). p. 123, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

As usual the Reviewers fall back on a little circle of unmutilated texts found elsewhere to assure us that we still can find a fundamental doctrine which had been destroyed in the mutilated text. Nevertheless, by ten references to the Spirit of Prophecy we find the Authorized Version and the "Testimonies to the Church" in agreement on this point: while the Reviewers uphold the Revisers and others on the other side. p. 123, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers (on Section III, chapter 6, page 12) say: "But nothing can be said to be essentially lost whichever reading is followed." What am I to think? Must I believe that the Reviewers are not sufficiently informed about the Mercersburg Theology and the Development Theory to see in

the changed reading what is there and what others see who know this theory? p. 123, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

III -6-12 OABV-97-XV p. 123, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

2 Tim. 4:1. On the judgment and appearing of Christ. p. 123, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Can anybody get anything out of the incomprehensible wordiness into which 2 Tim. 4;1 has been changed in the Revised? My Reviewers claim that it does not refer to the executive judgement, but that it refers to the investigative judgment. If my Reviewers had taken pains to read all the verses which follow down to verse 8 they would have seen that the Apostle Paul is talking of "THAT DAY". It is the same "that day" spoken of in Luke 21:31, the great day of rewards. My Reviewers talk about my interpreting passages out of their context. What have they done here? Of what value is their discussion between the two Greek words 'kai' and 'data'? The executive judgment of Christ takes place at His coming; I quote: p. 123, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him." Jude 14, 15. p. 123, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers do not believe that 2 Tim. 4:1 refers to this executive judgment. I submit the evidence to the decision of my hearers without argument. p. 123, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

III-6-13 OABV-97-XVI p. 123, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Heb. 7:21. On omitting "after the order of Melchisedec." p. 123, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Here again I will desist from doctrinal argument on this point. These passages were compared to show the similarity, if not the identity, which the Revised Versions and the Jesuit Bible or 1582 exhibit, as against the Authorized Version of 1611. p. 123, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

III-6-13 OABV-98-XVII p. 124, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Rev. 22:14. On the robes and the commandments. p. 124, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

I must contend again for the Authorized Version reading "blessed are they that do His commandments" instead of "blessed are they that wash their robes". Why do my Reviewers claim that the testimony of the MSS is so strong against the genuineness of the clause "that do His commandments", when the "Expositor's Greek Testament" Vol. 5, page 490, in discussing the MSS and versions on this text calls it "the well supported Hoi poiountes tas entolas autou" (that do His commandments)? p. 124, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

It is further surprising to note that this same authority, while giving the preference to the Greek of the Revisers, informs us that the clause ("that do His commandments") was "possibly due to the feeling that some moral characteristic was needed after verse 11". This is good Adventist doctrine. My Reviewers think that the Greek will not permit the implication that the saints are washing their robes *during* the entrance into the city. They say that either reading is orthodox and disturbs no doctrine. We certainly would insist that we shall be keeping His commandments during the entrance into the city, but as equally strong do we insist that we will NOT be washing our robes *during* the entrance into the city. p. 124, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

For a whole year during the plagues we will *NOT* be washing our robes that is sinning and being forgiven because there is no blood atoning. But for a whole year we will be keeping His commandments and for eternity ever after. In the light of the message of verses 11 and 12 even as discerned by this non-Adventist commentator, it is impossible for the construction "wash their robes" to stand the test. *Hina,* according to my dictionary, after the word "do", has the sense of causing or affecting. The verb here is the verb "do", *poieo.* Hence the sentence would then read, "Blessed are they, doing His commandments, causing them to have the right to the tree of life and to enter into the city." In other words it is not purpose. They do not do His commandments in order that they may have right, but because they are doing His commandments they do have the right. p. 124, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"Great Controversy", (page 466) says: p. 124, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"And the Revelator, half a century after the crucifixion, pronounces a blessing upon them 'that do His commandments, they that have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.'" p. 124, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

(See also volume 5, page 628, 693; Testimonies to Ministers, pages 133, 235; P.P., page 208; A.A., page 592; Volume 9, page 130). p. 124, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Here again the Spirit of Prophecy lines up with the AV on this not in significant passage; in this great Adventist passage, which belongs to no other people so peculiarly as to Adventist. We regret to say that the Reviewers, and the Rheims New Testament of 1582 are on the other side. p. 125, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

CHAPTER XI -- BLOW AFTER BLOW AGAINST THE TRUTH. p. 126, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

You will recall that in Section I, example 4, on the mistakes of citations by the Reviewers, I proved anew that Bishop Westcott confesses that by repetitive changes, by changing here a little and there a little, the Revisers effected changes in articles of faith. To refresh your mind about this matter I will quote again from Bishop Westcott's book: p. 126, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"But the value of the Revision is most clearly seen when the student considers together a considerable group of passages, which bear upon some article of the Faith. The accumulation of small details then produce its full effect. Points on which it might have seemed pedantic to insist in a single passage become impressive by repetition, the close rendering of the original Greek in the Revised Version appears to suggest ideas of creation and life and providence, of the course and end of finite being, and of the Person of the Lord, who is the source of all truth and hope, which are of deepest interest at the present time." "Some Lessons", pages 184, 185. p. 126, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

And further I will give a quotation from Bishop Ellicott, who for ten years was Chairman of the English Revision

Committee. This is what he said in his book entitled, "Consideration on the Revision," which he wrote two years after the Revision Committee began its work. He said: p. 126, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"Passages involving doctrinal error. Here our duty is obvious. Faithfulness, and loyalty to God's truth, require that the correction should be made unhesitatingly. This class of cases, will, however, embrace many different instances; some of real and primary importance, some in which the sense will be little affected, when the error, grammatically great as it may be, is removed, and the true rendering substituted. For instance, we shall have in the class we are now considering, passages in which the error is one of a *doctrinal* nature, or, to use the most guarded language, involves some degree of liability to doctrinal misconception." "Considerations", page 88. p. 126, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

This proves the Revisers were not only translating but considering doctrines. Surely it is not the business of translators to consider the theology of the text to be translated. My Reviewers are again shown to be wrong. p. 126, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

III-11-1 OABV-184 p. 126, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

2 Tim. 3:16. On the Inspiration of the Scriptures. p. 126, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers say, "Though this rendering by the Revisers is much to be regretted, it does not state an untruth, but only part of the truth, fully explained elsewhere in the same Version." p. 126, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

I agree with my Reviewers that the Revised Version gives only a part of the truth. I prefer the Authorized which gives the whole truth. p. 126, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

This Scripture, as in the Revised Version, is quoted once in the writing of Sister White, not in the book itself, but in the introduction; and it is not listed in the Index. In the immediate connection with it, however, she speaks of the Bible as the "infallible" Word of God. In Vol. 5, page 747, she affirms when quoting this text as in the AV, thus indicating a very decided preference for the AV. p. 127, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

III-11-2 OABV-185 p. 127, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

John 5:39. On searching the Scriptures. p. 127, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

This text, now under consideration, is not so glaring an example as some. There is not as square a contradiction between the two renderings as there is in some others. The preponderating balance of evidence as we find it, both in the ranks of commentators and the Spirit of Prophecy indicates that the fundamental idea of what Jesus says was a *direction, a command.* The famous Dr. Frederick Field, who spent all his life in researches, reconstructing the Greek Old Testament, and became famous therein, tells us that the mistake of the Revisers in adopting the affirmatory view instead of the command or direction, was because they placed too much stress upon the parenthetical clause, for in them ye think ye have eternal life." (Notes on Translation" page 90.) Leaving out the parenthetical clause, what then do you think is the more clear rendering, the AV, which says, "Search the scriptures for they are they which testify of me", or the Revised rendering 'Ye search the scriptures for they are they which testify of me." We do not think that the Jews actually searched the scriptures when Jesus was speaking because the scriptures testified of him. In other words, the underlying, idea of the passage is a command, or direction, or, as Sister White says: (Vol. 2, page 633): p. 127, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"The followers of Jesus are not meeting the mind and will of God, if they are content to remain in ignorance of his word. All should become Bible students. *Christ commanded his followers,* 'Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me.'" (Emphasis mine) p. 127, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

And also Volume 5, page 388, "Repeat to all the Saviour's command, 'Search the scripture.'" p. 127, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Twice this text is quoted by Sister White as in the RV. In Vol. 5, I find these words, "Repeat to all the Saviour's Command -- Search the Scriptures." Several times it is directly stated that it is a "command" and a "duty". This is consistent with the AV not the RV. Twenty-three times it is quoted in the Spirit of Prophecy as in the Av. thus it

must be evident that Sister White very much preferred the AV on this text to the RV. p. 127, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

III-11-3 OABV-186 p. 127, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

John 2:11. On the question of miracles. p. 127, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers see nothing wrong in the fact that the Revisers have struck out from the N.T. the word *miracle* in 23 of the 32 instances where it is used, or that in the case of the other nine, if they use the term in the text they robbed it of its authority by a weakening substitute in the margin; or that in the Old Testament they drove it out entirely in the five instances where it occurred in the AV. p. 128, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

THEY SAY: p. 128, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"There are two different words rendering miracle in the New Testament. One is *semeion,* meaning sign, which is the base of signify, signification, and significance. The other is 'dynamis', which means power." p. 128, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

I REPLY: p. 128, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Do my Reviewers mean to say that it is simply by their grace or the grace of the translators that they allow the idea of miracle or miraculous to enter into these words? If so, there is this against them; (1) the word of God (2) the history of the words; (3) common sense. p. 128, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Hebrews 2:4. "God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with diverse miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?" Here the word *semeion* is placed along side of "wonders' and "miracles" and "gifts" of the Holy Spirit; inspiration declaring that *God* used all these four things by which to "bear witness". This text specifically shows that *semeion* is not just an ordinary sign, but is equivalent to wonders, miracles and the works of the Holy Ghost; therefore, inspiration itself has put the supernatural into the word *semeion.* p. 128, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

With regard to the history of the word, it may be said

that the word "miracle" comes from the Latin word mirabilia from which, in English, we get the words "marvel", "marvelous", "miracle", and "miraculous", etc.; also in the French, merveille; and lastly common sense would tell us that the authority of the fitness of things would show that this word has in it the miraculous and the supernatural when it is used in circumstances that in themselves betoken the supernatural and miraculous, and when used in connection with the manifestation of God's power. The word "sign," alone, would be utterly insufficient for the proper translation from the Greek. So here both the revisers and the Reviewers fail to discern the fitness of things regarding the meaning of the word. p. 128, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers attempt a grouping of instances; and right here I may say, let none be misled by grouping of the uses of a Greek word. It is a striking fact that the word "miracle" singular or plural is found 37 times in the AV and only 9 times in the RV. The Greek word *semeion,* the one in the text under consideration, is used 75 times and out of that is translated 22 times as "miracle" in the AV. Only three times in the ARV is this same word translated "miracle"' and then because they were compelled to do it; for it would have made utter nonsense to translate it any other way. I will now give these 3 times and let you judge for yourself. This is proof positive that the Greek word *semeion* has an intrinsic meaning in itself of a "miracle." p. 128, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

(1) Luke 23:8. "And when Herod saw Jesus, he was exceeding glad; for he was desirous to see him of a long season, because he had heard many things of him; and he hoped to have seen some miracles done by him." p. 129, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

See how ridiculous it would be to translate the word *semeion* by "sign," as: "he hoped to have some sign done by him." This is why the ARV was compelled to put miracle here. p. 129, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

(2) Acts 4:16. "Saying what shall we do to these men? For what indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them is manifest to all them that dwell in Jerusalem and we cannot deny it." p. 129, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

(3) To further get the force of this we will now *read the*

22nd verse. "For the man was above forty years old on whom this miracle of healing was shewed." Please substitute the word "sign" here and see how ridiculous it would be. This is the last of the three instances in which the Revisers translated the word *semeion* as "miracles" and in each of the three they were obliged to do so because of the utter nonsense, otherwise. p. 129, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

So I still maintain, as in my book, that to change the sentence, "this beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee", shows a radical change of doctrine. Added to it is the fact that the word "miracle" used 32 times in the N.T., 5 times in the O.T. or 37 times in the AV, had been reduced down to nine times in the ARV, only three of which are translated from *semeion.* Is not this a great step in the direction of modernism and away from the supernatural? Is not this tantamount to a change of doctrine? Can we not say that the doctrine of the Authorized is the supernatural; while the doctrine of the RV is the natural? p. 129, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

But I am not through with this case yet: p. 129, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

1. The Greek word *angelos* strictly means a messenger. Then why, on this theory of literalism, advanced by the Revisers, and followed by my Reviewers, should we not translate, -- p. 129, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Hebrews 1:7. (RV) "Who maketh his angels winds", by, "Who maketh his messengers winds". p. 129, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

There is a closing note in my Reviewers' comment on this question of miracles which says that they are giving the opinion of a member of the 1611 Revision Committee, namely, Dr. Trench. (Sec. III-11-4). What do my Reviewers mean? Dr. Trench died about 1886. How then could he have been a member of the 1611 Revision Committee. And since Dr. Trench, according to the quotation, would prefer always to translate *semeion* by sign, this would be a natural procedure for him for he also was a member of the 1881 Revision Committee. Then why in the name of all that is right, make him a member of the 1611 Committee? p. 129, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

2. In Greek the word *hypocrites* strictly means "actor". In strict literalism why not translate, p. 130, Para. 1,

[ANSWERS].

Matt. 23:23. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites" by "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, actors"? p. 130, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

3. And further *graphe* literally means "writing". Then why not translate, 2 Tim. 3:16. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God" by "All writing is given by inspiration of God"? What do you think of this, brethren, would this be correct? And so I might go on and on with other Greek N.T. words which have established different from the Greek use. Greek words have gathered up established English equivalents. Shall we now, after 300 years say "messenger," "actor", "writing", when the established use is "angel", "hypocrite", and "scripture"? In other words, has not the ARV begun a campaign to tear down established truth by uprooting established usage of words? Also is there not a further disastrous result to our beautiful English language? Let me exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." Jude 3. What can be the purpose of the Reviewers' defense of the Revisers in uprooting the established usage in the New Testament language? p. 130, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

III-11-4 OABV-187 p. 130, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Matt. 18:2, 3. On conversion. p. 130, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

The arguments of my Reviewers in their objection to what I have said on the matter of "Conversion" in my book is just another specimen of wrong grouping and re-grouping of the different instances in which a Greek word is used. p. 130, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

THEY SAY: "But the author overlooks the fact that these same men (two writers) could have found in the AV at least 9 times as many passages rendered with *turn* in the sense of conversion, and could have used these to bolster up their false doctrine that a man can convert himself." p. 130, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

I REPLY: This is not the case. And I will proceed to show you from their own arguments on the two words (1) *Strepho* and (2) *epistrepho* that their groupings are wrong and that their conclusions are wrong. Here we will see the beautiful sense of the fitness of things which resides in the

Authorized translation as well as in its more skillful handling of the Greek than in the Revised Version. p. 130, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

MY REVIEWERS SAY on *strepho* "Here are the facts in the case; Matt. 18:2, 3, is the one N.T. passage using the simple form of the word *strepho* meaning *turn* in the sense of conversion. In the AV this same simple verb form is rendered 14 times in the passive, 11 times in the active, and 3 times in the reflexive." p. 130, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

I REPLY: This is not the truth. It is contrary to fact. (1) Strepho is not used 28 times in the Greek. "The Englishman's Greek Concordance" give it only 18 times. It is barely possible that my Reviewers, when they said: "is rendered 14 times in the passive, 11 times in the active, and 3 times in the reflexive" meant to say. 14 times in the passive of which 11 times was in the active; but of course that would be nonsense. It is barely possible they meant 4 times in the passive instead of 14 times, which would make it 17 times and would check nearly with the Greek Concordance of 18 times. In either case there is inaccuracy or bad reasoning in these figures; one or the other. Then (2) in the other 17 times it is used "turned and said" and "turned and saw"; none of which could, of course, have been conversion; and only twice: p. 130, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Acts 7:39. "And in their hearts turned back to Egypt," no conversion and Acts 7:42. "Then God turned, and gave them up" no conversion there. Which examination shows that in all the instances in which *strepho* is used, only once could it possibly be used of conversion, which is Matt. 18:2, 3, and on which the Revised Version fell down. p. 131, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

You will probably here raise this question of *strepho;* Since the substantial meaning of the word is turn, how then can you get out of it "conversion"? Here now is where the wonderful mastery of the subject by the King James Translation springs at once to view, which I will bring out when I finish *epistrepho.* p. 131, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

EPISTREPHO p. 131, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

In further defense of the Revised Version's elimination of "be converted" my Reviewers say of the verb *epistrepho* that is used 41 times in the N.T. 17 times of which are in the

sense of conversion; and further, that both the AV and the ARV render nine of these by *turn.* This is not the fact. These 9 times do not need to handle the word "convert" or "be converted", because the verb *turn* is used with an objective, such as, "turn to the Lord," or "turn from your idols unto the living God"; so that the word "convert" or "be converted" is not necessary. But there are 7 times in the N.T. clearly outstanding where the other application byr "be converted" would answer the situation, and on these the Revised Version fell down. Take as an example: p. 131, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Luke 22:31, 32. King James Version. p. 131, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat:... And when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." p. 131, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Revised Version. p. 131, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"Simon, Simon, behold Satan asked to have you... When once thou hast turned again, establish thy brethren." p. 131, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

I ask this audience if this is not a clear case where the ARV makes conversion possible through the human agency and not dependent upon God. p. 131, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Acts 3:19. King James Version. p. 131, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

"Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out..." p. 131, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

Revised Version. p. 132, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that you sins may be blotted out." p. 132, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

I submit it to you brethren, is not this a clear case where the ARV makes conversion possible through the human agency and not dependent on God? And so on through the 7 texts. Now here is where the King James translators discerned the fact that conversion is an event dependent upon God alone. This they saw because 4 of the times, in

which "be converted" is used in the AV N.T. in the sense of conversion, came over from Isa. 6:10, so that in the divine providence of God, at the time when Jesus announced the new birth from above to Nicodemus, *epistrepho* used passively without any qualifying clause, being a verb for *turn* in the Greek must have had the meaning of "be converted". The Revisers confess that they made this change for a purpose and were glad they did. I read from Westcott, "Some Lessons," page 172: p. 132, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"The change of a single word brings out the responsibility of man from the first. Thus, when we read in Acts 3:19, 'Repent ye and be converted,' the passive form of the second clause puts out of sight the thought of man's willing action, which lies in the original 'Repent ye, and turn again'." p. 132, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

And again on pages 191 and 192: p. 132, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"And the time of the fulfilment of the counsel of God depends on human effort: 'Repent and turn again', is St. Peter's plea to the Jews." p. 132, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Also from Dr. Milligan: p. 132, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"Thus in Matt. 18:3, the opening verb, though passive in form, is properly rendered actively, and the popular error of man being mere passive instruments in the hands of God thereby exploded." "Expository Value of the R.V." page 130. p. 132, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Again I repeat that those changes in these 7 texts, made where they should not be, were consciously and intentionally made to throw conversion back upon man's human effort. p. 132, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

III-11-5 OABV-189 p. 132, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Heb. 11:3. On *world* for *age*. p. 132, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers write one and one-half pages about the use of the word *aion,* and how the word *aion* in Greek in translated. They show how the AV and the ARV handle it in Hebrew, in Ephesians, in Revelation, etc. But what does it all amount to? Here is a significant fact: The word *aion* occurs, according to my Reviewers, 122 times in the N.T.;

according to my "Englishman's Concordance", 125 times. Would it surprise you to learn that the ARV translates it "age" or "ages" 61 times out of 122 in the text or margin while the AV translates it as such only 3 times, text and margin. p. 132, Para. 12, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers claim that the literal use of this Greek word is *age* or *ages:* then why were not the Revisers *always* literal in the case of this word, seeing that my Reviewers claim literalness as a great tribute to them? Suppose they had been literal in the case of: p. 133, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Luke 16:8 AV. "The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." Suppose we had there substituted "age" as in the margin of the ARV; it would then read, "The children of this *age* are in their generation wiser than the children of light." p. 133, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

This virtually would have said that all the children of the present evil age are wiser than the children of the redeemed world to come. Or that all the people that have ever lived since this age began are wiser then the redeemed members of the human race in Heaven. p. 133, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers complained because I said that Westcott and Hort injected evolution into ARV. First, I will show that they *intended* to do it; and secondly, I will show that they did it, and you can see it with your own eyes. To show that they intended to do it, I quote from Westcott: p. 133, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"In this connection we see the full meaning of the words used of creation in Hebrews 11:3: 'By faith we understand that the worlds (the ages i.e., the universe under the aspect of time) have been formed by the Word of God.... The whole sequence of life in time, which we call the world' has been 'fitted together' by God. His one creative word includes the harmonious unfolding on one plan of the last issues of all that was made. That which is in relation to Him 'one act at once' is in relation to us an *evolution* apprehended in orderly succession." "Some Lessons", page 187. (Emphasis mine) p. 133, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

When Westcott said of creation that "the ages, i.e. the

universe under the aspect of time have been formed by the word of God," and "His one creative word included the harmonious unfolding on one plan of the last issues of all that was made," or what was to Him *"one act at once"* is in relation to us an *Evolution* apprehended in orderly succession," he virtually said that Jesus Christ made not the physical world but he made the ages. Now you cannot make an age in a moment of time. It takes an age to make an age. And several ages cannot dwell together at the same time; they must succeed one another in single file. Therefore Bishop Westcott claims that the Revisers by the use of this word intended to present creation under the aspect of evolution. p. 133, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

We will now notice how we can see evolution by the repeated translation of "age" for *aion* instead of "worlds". The common people do not know much about evolution and would not see evolution in the translation if it were there in terms of evolution. But the intelligent people and these are the ones who concern us here, who have studied evolution more or less, or even if they have not, would be confirmed, by the prodigal use of this word 'ages' in this error; for a world can be made at once and age can not. Moreover if the Son of God made the ages, which would be the meaning if we substituted the margin for the text in Hebrews 1:2, what would we have when he got through making it? nothing visible, simply the past and gone forever. Let us read one of these texts from Ferrar Fenton: p. 133, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Hebrews 1:2. Fenton. "Whom He appointed Inheritor of all; and through whom he made the ages;" also p. 134, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Hebrews 11:3. Fenton. "By faith we comprehend that the periods were arranged by the continuous intention of God, so that from the unseen the visible appeared." p. 134, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

In other words, the only way the visible could appear from the unseen, here was because the periods were arranged by the continuous intention of God. According to the AV the "worlds were framed by the word of God" and from them we could understand how the visible appeared. But if it is no longer *worlds* but *periods,* or ages, which were framed by the word of God, then how from those which are invisible, can you understand that the visible appeared; for there was

not anything visible there. What is there to look at? This is evolution. This is something developing out of nothing through long periods. This is evolution. Even a way-farer can see this. While of course, we use Ferror Fenton here, nevertheless, the ARV by inserting "ages" systematically in the margin opens the way logically for this arrangement as given by Ferrar Fenton. p. 134, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Goodspeed, 20th Century, and Ferrar Fenton all translate the last part of Matt. 24:3 as "the close of the age". The ARV here in the margin gives "the consummation of the age". p. 134, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

The King James translators studiously avoided this word; the Revisers used it copiously, (61 out of 122 times), getting it into the margin when not possible to get it into the text. Here is where repetition is impressive as Westcott said; it emphasizes the unfolding ages. But with what are you impressed? Acts of creation? No, unfolding of evolving ages, which is *Evolution.* I am not talking theory and fancy, our ministers are meeting this difficulty in the field. p. 134, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

III-11-7 OABV-190 p. 134, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Col. 1:15, 16. On creation in Him, or by Him. p. 134, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

I regret very much to say that my Reviewers assailed my claim that the Revisers in this text change the doctrine, and concealed from their hearers in their first sentence an essential fact which I gave in my book. THEY SAY: "By quoting from a Unitarian minister the author seeks to make it appear..." Why do they hide the fact that this Unitarian minister was a Reviser, a member of the English N.T. Revision Committee? Why make believe he is a Unitarian minister at random without connection with this situation? He sat on the Committee, he knew what was intended by this charge. The Reviewers talk of unfairness, is this fairness for them to represent one of the Revision Committee as a Unitarian minister taken up at random. p. 134, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers cannot see that it makes any difference whether all things were created 'in' Him or 'by' Him. They admit that the "all things" referred to include the visible and material. But notice the little word "by" implies that

the agent is external to the thing acted upon; while "in" might identify the actor with the thing acted upon; and so without any great strain would really mean pantheism. If not pantheism, it would then be vague, indefinite, and mystic. p. 135, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers, by admitting that the *"all things"* created *in* Him include the visible and material, identify the totality of creation with the creator. What is this if not pantheism? In the AV we are protected in the little word "by"; but if you use "in" then when we look at all things do we see Him. Or when we look at Him do we see them? The sun and the moon were not made *"in Him"; they were made "by Him".* Were all the heavenly worlds made *"in"* Him? If when we look at the visible creation, we see Him, and if when we look at Him we see the visible creation, The Reviewers are but justifying the charge that the Revisers were pantheists. p. 135, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers attempt to justify this construction by quoting 'Ephesians 2:10', "We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus:. The reasoning fails because Eph. 2:10 refers to a spiritual creation. They take a material creation and make it spiritual; and then they take a spiritual creation and make it material. Is such confusion justifiable? p. 135, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers, referring back again to the Unitarian Reviser, say, "Some man's interpretation of the ARV rendering of Col. 1:15, 16 has no bearing on its correct translation or true meaning,..." They say, "Some man". I say "One of the Revisers". They imply that I took some man, somewhere. He was a duly appointed Reviser, had a powerful influence in moulding the text, and in fact, the regular chairman withdrew and there was a national upheaval because this "some man" was retained on the Committee despite public indignation. (See "Our Authorized Bible Vindicated" pages 168, 169). p. 135, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Why did Westcott and Hort stand for his being appointed on the Committee. Why did they defend him when public indignation demanded his removal? No one can read the life of Doctor Hort without knowing how powerfully he was under influence of Maurice, who was a regular descendant from Unitarian ancestry and was dismissed from the presidency of Kings College on heresy. p. 135, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

You will be interested to know that this phrase is translated in the Unitarian Bible just as it is in the ARV. p. 135, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Col. 1:15, 16. Wakefield Version. p. 135, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"Who is an image of the invisible God, a first born of the whole creation for in Him were created all the things in the heavens and upon the earth." p. 135, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

III-11-9 OABV-191-V-1 p. 135, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

1 Tim. 3:16. On *God* or *He who*. See answer in Chapter VI, Section VI. p. 135, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

III-11-8 OABV-192-V-2 p. 136, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Acts 16:7. On the Spirit of Jesus. See answer in Chapter VI, Section VI. p. 136, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

III-11-8 OABV-192-VI-1 p. 136, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Isa. 7:14. On *Virgin* or *Maiden*. p. 136, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

The Revisers put the word "maiden" in the margin of Isa. 7:14 as synonymous with "virgin". My Reviewers defend this action and claim I have not right to criticize it. Let us see. p. 136, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

The deity of Christ is proven by his Virgin birth; and the weight of the proof hangs on Isa. 7:14. There was a Unitarian on the English Revision Committee (as there also was on the American) and there were those of Unitarian leanings on the Old Testament Committee. Unitarians do not believe in deity, or Virgin Birth of Christ; therefore a strong probability was created beforehand that something would be done to weaken the force of Isa. 7:14. p. 136, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

That the Deity of Christ is proven by his virgin birth, I quote, from William Jennings Bryan: p. 136, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"If the Virgin Birth be rejected how shall the deity of

Christ be proven. It is quite common for modernists to affirm that the deity of Christ is entirely independent of the manner of his birth... If Christ's deity was not demonstrated by His birth, and was not proved by the manner of His birth the modernist will experience great embarrassment in convincing a questioner that there was any other time or way in which the deity of Christ became manifest." "Seven Questions in Dispute," page 57, 59. p. 136, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

The weight of proof for the Virgin Birth of Christ hangs on the great prophecy of it in Isa. 7:14, just as the greatest evidence for all outstanding plans of God usually is grounded upon the prophecy thereof. On the point in question, Dr. Howard Kelly, M.D., L.L.D., of Baltimore, says: p. 136, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

"Matthew is most explicit in his first chapter, and quotes Isaiah and tells us that the word Almah (Virgin) in the Hebrew of Isaiah (7:14) in his day meant a virgin, and that Jesus was conceived by the Virgin Mary of the Holy Spirit. Every time I call him 'Lord' I mean by that 'God' the Son of God, and proclaim his Virgin Birth." Idem, 56, 57. p. 136, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

By the alternative reading in the Revised Version, we can now talk not only of the Virgin Birth, but also of the Maiden Birth. p. 136, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

To show how the Unitarian views of the Unitarian scholar on the Revision Committee as well as the strong Unitarian leanings of Dr. Hort and other Revisers on both the Old and New Testament Committees, would reject a clear cut convincing doctrine of the Virgin birth, I quote from a recent advertisement in a Unitarian Book-room in one of our large cities as given in this book by Williams Jennings Bryan: p. 136, Para. 12, [ANSWERS].

"During the life of Jesus he was understood by all to be the son of Joseph and Mary born in holy wedlock. This is clear from a study of the Gospels in their early and most authentic form. But long after the death of Jesus unknown hands added to the copies of the Gospels, they were making those introductory chapters in Matthew and Luke which relate the legends of a miraculous birth. These legends... are as manifestly the product of an irrational point of view as are other tales of miracles. Miracles do not

happen." Idem, page 50, 51. p. 137, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Why did they play into the hands of those who belittle the Virgin birth by using this word "maiden" in the margin? What was the necessity of adding this word "maiden" which lacks the strict thought of absolute chastity or virginity as in the word "virgin", while it contains additional shades of meaning not proper to the word "virgin"? p. 137, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

To show how the Bible constantly couples the thought of purity with virginity and with the birth of Christ, we refer to Paul's thought of the church, "I have espoused you to one husband that I may present you as a chaste Virgin to Christ." (2 Cor. 11:2); and Isaiah's contrast between the purity of God's people and the heathen, "The Virgin, the daughter of Zion, hath despised thee." (Isa. 37:22); and in Revelation, chapter XII, the picture of the pure woman, the Church, travailing with the birth of Christ, as she is about to bring forth the man child. It is certainly adding an unnecessary complication to put in the margin a variant word which lends itself to questions on so great a doctrine as the Virgin birth of Christ. p. 137, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

III-11-8 OABV-193-VII-1 p. 137, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

1 Cor. 5:7. On the Passover for us. See answer Chapter VI, Section VI. p. 137, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

III-11-8 OABV-193-VIII-1 p. 137, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Job 19:25, 26. On the Resurrection. p. 137, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers justify the fact that the ARV presents Job rejoicing that if this present body is destroyed he shall, without his flesh see God. My Reviewers in defending the ARV have ceased, in so doing, to represent the Adventist doctrine. They are obliged to take this position because they follow and justify the ARV which in this instance has changed the doctrine of the resurrection. Then in this surrender of grand old Adventist doctrine to the, in their mind, overpowering authority of the ARV, my Reviewers have entangled themselves in three inexplicable and fatal positions. p. 137, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

1. They flee for refuge to Dr. Philip Schaff, president of

both American Committees of Revision. Did they expect that Dr. Schaff would abandon his own child, the ARV, by failing to testify in his own and my Reviewers behalf. Moreover, Dr. Schaff was not a Hebrew authority. His remarks about the AV in this passage abandoning the Hebrew text to translate from the Septuagint of Vulgate are neither clear nor of any weight. Over against Dr. Schaff I will put Dr. Kennicott, and greater authority in Hebrew it is not possible to find. He is recognized as one of the two outstanding Hebrew authorities on Hebrew manuscripts and their variations. Dr. Kennicott, as you will find in the commentaries of Dr. Adam Clark on this verse, translates it as in the AV. p. 138, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

2. The second count against my Reviewers, and the most serious to Seventh-day Adventists, is that they say, "It is not difficult to understand from the ARV translation that Job's sustaining hope was that though his body of flesh might be destroyed in the grave, yet in spite of that fact he was sure to see God. Moreover, Paul says 'Thou sowst not the *body which shall be.*" (Sec. III-11-9). It is a matter of profound regret to me that my Reviewers allowed these words either to be said or to be printed, conveying to the hearers or readers the idea that Job meant according to the ARV to say that without his worm-destroyed body he would see God; and nothing more. Why did not my Reviewers make it clear that in both the AV and the ARV Job states that his mortal body, obtained in birth, will be worn-destroyed before he states he shall see God? Why did not my Reviewers make it clear that in the AV Job presents his mortal body as worm-destroyed, but yet in another flesh shall he see God; while the ARV also presents his mortal-body-worm-destroyed, but yet without the immortal flesh of which the AV speaks, he shall see God? I feel very disappointed with such an exposition as this. p. 138, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

3. I notice now their third species of reasoning. If argument Number 2 is fatal to an outstanding Seventh-day Adventist doctrine, their argument Number 3 is seriously depressing to belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures. They say, "if this were the only passage we had on the resurrection of the body, we might be in a more difficult situation..." In other words, relying upon Job 19:26 ARV we are in a ship that is sinking us in the bottom of the sea, but be of good cheer, there are four squadrons of vessels which will hasten to our rescue: p. 138, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

1. Paul's great discourse on the resurrection. p. 138, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

2. The bodily state of Adam and Eve in Eden. p. 138, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

3. The future state of the righteous. p. 138, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

4. Other scriptural teachings. p. 138, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

In other words, these four groups of scriptures plainly contradict Job 19:26 in the ARV. These four sets of texts, therefore, destroy the bad influence of Job 19:26 ARV. Blessed be the fact there are plenty of contradictions to this text. This text will not hurt us because there are plenty of others to contradict it: *Not so.* If all the rest of the Bible teaches the resurrection of the body, all the more reason why the Revisers should have squared this passage with the generality of the Bible teaching. They have no business to impose its teaching on the rest of the Bible on the ground of textual difficulty. If 1 Cor. 15 teaches one thing and Job 19:25 another, which are we to believe? The translators of (?) happily were not under the influence of the modern rules of textual criticism which fact prevents them from exalting these above the harmony of the Bible. Certain of the members of the Revision Committee were spiritualists, Unitarians, and believers in purgatory. Therefore, our Protestant Bible received wounds in the house of friends. Job in the AV is clear, definite, conclusive. The only interpretation is that body and intelligence will again function together at the last day, and it definitely compels a resurrection. Job in the ARV is equally clear, definite conclusive. The only interpretation is that his intelligence will function apart from his body, which was destroyed by worms, and necessitates no resurrection before seeing God at the last day. This reading makes possible purgatory, prayers for the dead, disembodied spirits and spiritualism. p. 138, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

When I proved in my book that some of the Revisers were higher critics, others favorable to Rome, modernists and Unitarians, my Reviewers charged me with using the illogical argument *ad hominem;* but the issue can not be so

easily brushed aside. I showed that they held these theological views. Consequently that they were thus personally biased. Then I showed by their correspondence that they proposed to consider doctrinal questions in their revision. Next I showed that their revised readings lent themselves to these doctrines and that they commented upon their own translations accordingly. And finally, I showed that other prominent men used their readings to defend these doctrines. What more evidence do you want? It is not sufficient that my Reviewers give us critical technicalities upon which the authorities disagree. p. 139, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

How much better it would have been if my Reviewers, after reviewing my book, had openly acknowledged that the ARV was wrong on this passage and had here changed doctrine. Why did they not hold in this instance to the Spirit of Prophecy? From "Prophets and Kings," pages 163 and 164, I read: p. 139, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"From the depths of discouragement and despondency Job rose to the heights of implicit trust in the mercy and saving power of God. Triumphant he declared:... I know that my Redeemer liveth, And that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; And though after my skin worms destroy this body, Yet in my flesh shall I see God:" p. 139, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

In five other places besides this, the Spirit of Prophecy refers to this same text, always in the sense of the AV, Does this mean anything to us as Seventh-day Adventists? p. 139, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

III-11-9 OABV-194 p. 139, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Acts 24:15. On the question of the resurrection. p. 139, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

The only answer my Reviewers can give to the indictment of the AVR is omitting the phrase "of the dead", is, "textual reasons". The fact is, the omission has only 8 manuscripts in favor of it and 2,000 or more against it. If you call these "textual reasons" I do not. It is clear that they have chosen the reading of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus MSS and a few others to the exclusion of overwhelming testimony on the other side, to settle what is the true word of God and what is not. By reading 2 Tim. 2:16-18 we see that if

there was one heresy more prominent than another in the early days of the mystery of iniquity it was spiritualizing away the resurrection. p. 139, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers claim that there are 13 other instances in the ARV of the phrase "of the dead". I say this is all the more reason why it should be here. What do you think of such an argument? The phrase "of the dead" is found in 13 other scriptures, *hence* leave it out here. It is found in the passage in thousands of MSS but omitted in a few MSS! On what ground of reason would you leave it out here, in the face of its being found in 13 other scriptures and in 2000 or more manuscripts. This, then is good evidence that the text under consideration in the AV is good doctrine. How can we say that when God has said a thing 13 times, it is enough; that he does not need to say it the 14th time. Evidently my Reviewers do not hold to Isaiah, "Line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little, there a little." Are they heading toward the shorter Bible? p. 140, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

III-11-10 OABV-194 p. 140, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Matt. 24:3. On the Second Coming of Christ. p. 140, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers here defend the marginal reading of the ARV by flatly contradicting me. I said in my book that "the consummation of the age" in no sense means the same thing as the "end of the world". They reply that I criticize the ARV reading although it gives in the martin the literal meaning of the original of the phrase "end of the world". I submit it to my hearers to judge whether "end of the world" means the same thing as "the consummation of the age". p. 140, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

If they do not mean the same thing then the margin and the text contradict one another. If they do mean the same thing then the Russellites and Unitarians have been right all along in claiming Christians look forward to such a consummation of the age, which supports the Russellites' idea; namely, change from one human dispensation to another, as the closing of the Roman age; or the Age of Revolutions; or the Stone Age; of the Ice Age; or the Electric Age. I quote here from two modern Bibles: p. 140, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Matt. 24:3. Unitarian Bible. p. 140, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"What will be the sign of thy coming and the end of the age?" p. 140, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Matt. 24:3. 20th Century N.T. p. 140, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

"What will be the sign of your coming and of the close of the age?" p. 140, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Matt. 24:3. Goodspeed's N.T. p. 141, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"What will be the sign of your coming and of the close of the age?" p. 141, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

If "what the original means" is consummation of the age," then why did the Revisers not put it into the text as the preferred reading? The only excuse for sometimes putting the literal meaning of the Greek into the margin is in order to give an explanation of what is not very well grasped by the English rendering, but that is not needed in this case. The "Consummation of the age" naturally indicates the finishing of a period as the running out of the sands of an hour glass, without fore-shadowing great physical convulsions of nature. These convulsions were in the disciples minds according to the prophecy of Isaiah and other prophets, as accompanying the end of the world and so they meant to ask that of the Saviour, namely, when would the convulsed end of the world come? The Russellites rejoice in this ARV marginal translation so they put 1874 as the consummation of the age. There was no need to confuse good, plain, simple doctrine by putting in the margin the "consummation of the age." p. 141, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

I must again insist that when the ARV put "presence" in the margin of Matt. 24:3, for "coming" it is indicative of a change of doctrine. My reviewers say, no; they say that without knowing the literal meaning of *parous* we would miss the vividness in describing the return of Christ and the restoration of that marvelous presence. All this then is missed in the AV. But by putting "presence" in the margin of the ARV it is restored. p. 141, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

You ask a child about the return of its father. The child may reply, "His coming will be tomorrow", or "His presence will be tomorrow". There is an entirely different thought,

the last has no sense. *"Presence"* makes us think of a spiritualistic seance; all of a sudden a *"presence"* is there. Can't you feel his *presence?* But "coming" has a start, a sweep, and an arrival. "Presence" in place of "coming" fits in with "consummation" for "end". Jesus said, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am..." My Reviewers underline *"where I am"* they should have underlined *"I will come again.* The coming is necessary in order to produce the presence. The coming is first. His presence does not appear until after His coming. If "coming" means presence" then why expect the future advent of Jesus if we have His presence now. "Presence" is a continuous relationship; "coming" means an event. The question, "What is the sign of thy presence", would mean, what is the sign of thy fellowship with us, as now; the "sign of they coming" would demand forerunning events which show he is not here now, but will come. p. 141, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Jesus went on to tell of the darkening of the sun and falling of the stars; they were signs; they were not to be signs of His presence, they were precursors of His coming. We hold that "presence" is not the same as "coming". The "presence" and "coming" do not mean the same thing, then the margin and the text of the ARV contradict each other, which is a change of doctrine. p. 141, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

III-11-10 OABV-195 p. 142, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Phil. 3:30, 21. On our vile body. p. 142, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

King James Version: "Who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body." p. 142, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Revised: "Who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of His glory." p. 142, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers defend the change in translation from "His glorious body" in the AV to "the body of His glory" in the ARV, by again claiming that the Revisers *gave the literal meaning.* As I pointed out in my book, this is a Hebraism or an idiomatic structure in the Hebrew language, which often used two nouns in place of a noun modified by an adjective. This Hebriac construction of Phil. 3:20, 21 is found in the

Vulgate. Therefore, Wycliffe in 1380 and the Jesuits in 1582 followed this construction. Beginning in 1534, however, it was rejected by the outstanding English Versions, Tyndale, [Cram,] [this word may be Cranmer] and Geneva, as well as the AV; so that it is not because this translation was so wonderful and so new or that is was unknown to the Revisers that they adopted it. They rather took their stand with the Vulgate and the Rheims of 1582. If the excuse for so translating this was that they should be literal then why (in Luke 18:6) did they not translate the "judge of unrighteousness" instead of the "unrighteous judge" or "wonders of falsehood" instead of "lying wonders" (2 Thess. 2:9). Why this inconsistency? Could they not see that changing "His glorious body" into "the body of His glory" was weakening the second coming of Christ? Why did the Revisers choose a second coming of Christ passage to emphasize transliterating, not translating a Hebraism? p. 142, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

What does "the body of His glory" mean? Sister White says that "it is the glory of God to pardon the chiefest of sinners." A body of glory might mean the sum of total virtues. The change is the King James Version is physical: the ARV may be a spiritual change. It may be like this, "Who shall fashion our sinful body that it may conform to His perfect life or to the sum total of His virtues." If it is a spiritual change, it is possible for this spiritual change to take place now. Then so far as this version is concerned, the physical coming of Christ is not necessary to execute the glorious physical change. This is another proof that the Revisers have dimmed and blurred the second coming of Christ. If this translation is literal, why not put the two other places I just mentioned; and I could cite many more, into the text? p. 142, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

What does Sister White say on this passage: p. 142, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"As the antitype of the wave-sheaf, our Lord was raised from the dead on the third day, 'the first-fruits of them that slept,' A sample of all the resurrected just, whose 'vile body' shall be changed, and 'fashioned like unto His glorious body.'" "Great Controversy," page 399. p. 142, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

"Who shall change our vile body, that it may be like unto His glorious body." "Early Writings," page 31. p. 142,

Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

I am willing to accept Sister White and the AV on this text. p. 143, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

III-11-11 OABV-195 p. 143, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

2 Thess. 2:2. On the day of Christ at *hand* or now *present.* p. 143, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

King James: "That ye be not soon shaken in mind... as that day of Christ is at hand." p. 143, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Revised: "That ye be not quickly shaken from your mind... as that the day of the Lord is now present." p. 143, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers refer us to Heb. 9:9; also Romans 8:36; 1 Cor. 3:22; and Gal. 1:4 where a form of the same Greek verb is rendered with the meaning, "present". They omitted to tell us that in the places referred to we have a participle used as an adjective, whereas in the text under discussion we have a verb. Also they did not refer us to the well known 2 Tim. 3:1 where the same verb is used with future meaning in the expression, "grievous times shall come". The verb used in the text under discussion is in the perfect tense and can mean, "to stand in sight"; "to impend," and "to threaten," and "to be close at hand". My authority is Thayer's "Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament". Thayer was an American Reviser. p. 143, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

The Century Dictionary is quoted by my Reviewers to define the phrase "at hand" as meaning "within reach, nearby, *present."* We would simply say which of these three meanings would you use if you were talking of the day of the Lord? You certainly would not use the meaning "present". You might use "they were all present in the room with you"; but you would not use it of the day of the Lord, unless you believe as the Russellites do that the day of Christ is now present. Therefore the citation from the Century Dictionary does not apply. p. 143, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

III-11-11 OABV-196 p. 143, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Titus 2:13. On the glorious appearing. p. 143, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

King James: "Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." p. 143, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

The change from "the glorious appearing of the great God" in the AV to the "appearing of the glory of the great God", I contend does not give a picture of Christ's personal, visible, bodily return. As usual, my Reviewers plead the fact that the original gives two nouns. I have already criticized this literal bringing of a Hebraism found in the Greek, into the English. If my Reviewers are textual critics, they know I am right on this point. Suppose we translated into English the idioms of other languages on this same plea of following the original literally; where would we come out? Mark Twain said that if he had invented the German language he would have put the verb where you could find it at the end of at least two or three pages. I do not need to give here many German expressions familiar to you, to show you that that what is a splendid language to the German, if turned literally word for word into the English would make nonsense. Here is an example "Do you see barn? Will you go that barn around?" Or as the father said to his son, "Fritizie, run the stairs, and look the window out." Any one who has studied language to any extent whatever, ought to know that it is absurd to translate the idiom of a language literally. p. 143, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

Just a remark here from the grammar by Dr. Blass which says something about the Hebrew idioms found in New Testament Greek: p. 144, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"The national Hebrew or Aramaic element influenced Greek-writing Jews in a threefold manner. In the first place it is probable that the speaker or writer quite involuntarily and unconsciously rendered a phrase from his mother tongue by an accurately corresponding phrase; again, that the reading and hearing of the Old Testament in the Greek version coloured the writer's style, especially if he desired to write in a solemn and dignified manner. Third and last, a great part of the N.T. writings (the three first Gospels and the first half of the Acts) is in all probability a direct working over of Hebrew or Aramaic materials. This was not a translation like that executed by the LXX rendered word for word with the utmost fidelity, and almost without any regard to intelligibility; but it

was convenient to adhere to the originals even in expression instead of looking for a form of expression which was good Greek." "Grammar of New Testament Greek." page 4. p. 144, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

The foregoing quotation points out the fact that both by the influence of LXX and by translations not influenced by the LXX, but nevertheless as literal as the LXX, a good many Hebraisms were put into the New Testament Greek. p. 144, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

But the question which astonishes us most of all is, why did the Revisers avoid this fault in other places but used it with a serious effect in the two N.T. passages I have handled in the last few pages, touching the coming of Jesus Christ; therefore, I must quote again the citation I gave on this point in my book, from one of the Revisers. G. Vance Smith, a Reviser, says: p. 144, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"This idea of the Second Coming ought now to be passed by as a merely temporary incident of early Christian belief. Like many another error, it has answered its transitory purpose in the providential plan, and may well, at length, be left to rest in peace." "Bible and theology', page 281. p. 144, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Dr. Hort held practically the same view; so did Westcott. How could a body of Revisers among whom haziness and confusion marked their idea of the second coming of Christ do differently than to change strong passages on that subject into their own way of thinking. As a matter of fact they did, and I for one, decline to accept the false theology of their unwarranted translation. p. 144, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

III-11-12 OABV-196 p. 145, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Rev. 1:7. On wailing *because* of Him or *over* Him. p. 145, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

King James: "He cometh with clouds.... and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of Him." p. 145, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Revised: "He cometh with the clouds... and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn over Him." p. 145, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Since Bishop Westcott, dominant Reviser, stated, as I quoted him in my book to state, that the change from "shall wail because of him" in the AV to "shall mourn over Him" in the Revised, was intended to express penitential sorrow, I think he knew more than my Reviewers do what this change was intended for. p. 145, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers talk much over the different uses of the preposition in the Greek in order to explain away the damaging force of Bishop Westcott's testimony. p. 145, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Moreover, as I have already pointed out, the majority of the members of this N.T. Revision Committee believed in the Larger Hope or Universal Salvation. The arguments by my Reviewers are no protection against the damaging meaning which can be secured at once by the common people from Revised rendings. p. 145, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Again the plea is here produced that if this text opens the way to fall into false doctrine, the true doctrine is safe-guarded by other scriptures. Such a plea has been made so often in this document in defense of the very questionable translations of the Revisers, we wonder how many passages the Revisers can transfer over on to the side of false doctrine and still leave us a Bible capable of defending the Third Angel's message. The Reviewers argue that if the whole wall has not been thrown down you must not be alarmed because there are many breaches in the wall. The very fact that many other scriptures do teach a certain thing makes it the more evident that any other single scripture should agree with the many, especially when numerous MSS and versions so testify. I am glad that my Reviewers wish that the King James rendering had been retained. Nevertheless they think there is no danger, because, other scriptures take care of the doctrine by giving the opposite view. Are you ready to accept such reasoning? p. 145, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

III-11-12 OABV-197 p. 145, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Acts 3:19, 20. On times of refreshing. p. 145, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

King James: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing

shall come from the presence of the Lord: and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you." p. 145, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

Revised: "Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; and that he may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus." p. 145, Para. 12, [ANSWERS].

We now take up that famous passage, Acts 3:19, concerning the blotting out of sins, the times of refreshing, the sending of Jesus, and the restitution of all things. On this my Reviewers say, "This passage is an outstanding example of the help to the Bible student in a more accurate rendering of the original language." It is neither necessarily an accurate rendering of the Greek, nor is it a common sense adjustment to the internal evidence both in this passage and in the Bible as a whole; nor is it in harmony with the Spirit of Prophecy. We will first pay attention to the grammar which is the battlehorse of my Reviewers, and to the quotation they take from the Greek grammar of Dr. A. T. Robertson, a devoted follower of Westcott and Hort, and a member of the present Revision Committee which is now sitting to revise the ARV. p. 146, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Will my hearers notice in this passage that there are *three* "thats" in the Revised against *one* in the Authorized. The Authorized says *"that", "where",* and *"and";* but the Revised says *"that", "that so",* and *"that".* The argument turns on the little word "an" in Greek which follows the word *Hopos* after the expression "that your sins may be blotted out." Now the question arises, are our sins blotted out *when* the times of refreshing come. It depends whether the expression *Hopos an* means purpose (in order that) or means time (when). The quotation from Dr. Robertson, given by my Reviewers, claims, in substance, that purpose and not time is intended here. The view of this scholar accords here with the Catholic and modernistic view that this text means that as soon as we repent our sins are blotted out. On the other hand I will bring in opposition to this rendering, four famous Greek scholars, Beza, Castalio, Erasmus Schmid, Eckermann and others mentioned by Dr. Meyers in his "Commentary on the New Testament,"... on this text... who consider that the expression *Hopos an* is a particle of time and equals "when". Even Winer, the great

idol of the Reviewers, deserts them in this place. He say, "When the final particle, *Hopos* is joined with *an* it indicates a purpose, *the possibility of attainment of which is still doubtful; or the attainment of which is viewed as depending upon circumstances."* "Grammar," page 389. (Emphasis mine) p. 146, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

In a foot-note Winer quotes from another authority to say, -- p. 146, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"When the final sentence expresses an eventual conclusion, i.e. one in which an additional hypothesis is virtually contained, we may subjoin *an* to *Hopos* or *Hopos;* thus...' in order that you may, as by going there you will, etc. Compare Jelf 810, Green, page 169. p. 146, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Winer gives (Latin phrases) examples of rendering as does Meyers to indicate the use in a rendering of this kind so that this passage we would say: p. 146, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"Repent and be converted thatsoever, or whensoever, the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." p. 146, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Thus it will be seen that we have outstanding Greek grammarians to support the Authorized rendering "when". p. 146, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

The internal evidence also forbids the rendering given by the Revised Version. Peter brings before us four great events, not national nor international, but inter-stellar or inter-planetary, if you please: p. 146, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

1. The blotting of our sins. p. 147, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

2. The times of refreshing. p. 147, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

3. The sending of Jesus. p. 147, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

4. The restitution of all things. p. 147, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Not one of these events comes repetitively to each individual at different times; they each indicate a great

universal event, overtaking all concerned at one time. This is the Adventist's view; the other is the Catholic or modernistic view. p. 147, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

In my book I quoted from Dr. Roberts, a member of the Revision Committee who said that they changed the rendering of the Authorized for "eschatological reasons"; that is, for reasons springing from their view of the events at the end. He considered this change most important. I put this in my book, but it made no impression upon my Reviewers. Now in hopes that I may make an impression, I will quote from Dr. Westcott what he says about this change: p. 147, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"And the time of the fulfillment of the council of God *depends on human effort:* 'Repent and turn again' is St. Peter's plea to the Jews, that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come season... of refreshing from the presence of the Lord.' (Acts 3:19). Here the horizon of Faith is immeasurable extended. The immediate forgiveness of the sins of believers is shown to have a wider influence than on their own salvation. 'Seasons of refreshing' are placed in dependence on their personal faith." "Some Lessons" pages 191, 192. (Emphasis mine) p. 147, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Adventists believe nothing of the sort. They believe that the prophetic times of refreshing depend upon the plan of God and not upon our personal faith. p. 147, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

What does the Spirit of Prophecy have to say about this? My Reviewers claim that the times of refreshing come either at the coming of Christ or following personal repentance or forgiveness, or both; at least that construction is possible to their wording and punctuation. The Spirit of Prophecy places it at neither of these times, but immediately prior to the close of probation. I quote from "Great Controversy," pages 611, 612: p. 147, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

"The prophecies which were fulfilled in the outpouring of the former rain at the opening of the gospel, are again to be fulfilled in the latter rain at its close. Here are 'the times of refreshing (to which the apostle Peter looked forward when he said) 'Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out when the times

of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and He shall send Jesus.'" p. 147, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Notice also here that the Spirit of Prophecy used the AV. In the two pages of Great Controversy which follow, Sister White points out that this time of refreshing brings in the final converts just before the close of probation. *Apparently* my Reviewers disagree with the Spirit of Prophecy on this point. p. 147, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

III-11-13 OABV-198 p. 148, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Rev. 22:14. On the *robes* and *commandment.* See answer Chapter VI. p. 148, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

III-11-13 OABV-199 p. 148, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Acts 13:42. On the Sabbath of the Jews. See answer Chapter VI. p. 148, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

III-11-14 OABV-199 p. 148, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Mark 7;19. On Clean foods. p. 148, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

King James: "Because it entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out in the draught, purging all meats?" p. 148, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Revised: "Because it entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught? This he said, making all meats clean." p. 148, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

In a strained effort to make "purging all meats" in the AV mean the same as "This he said, making all meats clean", the two readings have exactly the same meaning. But the supplied words are *already there.* What business had the Revisers to supply these words? Wither they mean something, or they mean nothing. If they mean nothing the Revisers are unworthy of having any confidence put in them, to take such liberties with the scripture. And if they mean anything, the cause him to break down the ceremonial distinction between meats given in Leviticus. This interpretation was given to it by Origen anciently, and is followed by some modern commentators. When the Revised Version says, "This he said, making all meats clean", it makes a statement of fact that is no fact. No such idea can be taken from the original. It makes the Lord Jesus the author of a law which

the Saviour never ordered. This is serious. p. 148, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers say that I endeavor to make it appear that the Lord was dealing here with the distinction between animal meats. Why do the misrepresent me? It is very strange that any reader of my book should get such an idea. I never said a word about the Lord Jesus doing that. I said that this is the interpretation injected into the scripture by the Revised Version. Their mistranslation where is what makes it appear that the Lord Jesus was breaking down the distinction between the clean and unclean meats. p. 148, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

I feel that I cannot leave this case without summoning my Reviewers to a reckoning. They say, "By strange reasoning the author endeavors to make it appear that the Lord Jesus was here dealing with the distinction between animal meats..." I challenge them to produce one scintilla of evidence that I put forth any such endeavor. How do my Reviewers expect to get away with such statements as this? Over and over again they make such random charges against me, charges without foundation; do they expect that people will believe they are so, simply because they say so? I gave a strong quotation from Dr. Milligan, who proves that the Revisers intended to do the very same thing which I pointed out that they did do. My Reviewers find only one fact, bearing on the point from Dr. Milligan, and that is that the "little change in one Greek letter makes possible the connecting of the phrase 'making all meats clean' directly with the Lord Jesus as speaker..." Precisely, this little point is not so little as my Reviewers make it. It is the crux of the whole matter. If the participle, "purging" is changed from a neuter construction, referring to the process of the body, to a masculine construction, referring to the Lord Jesus, by changing of the vowel, then Christ becomes the agent of changing, by law, a thing he never yet changed in nature. This is impossible; this is unscientific. p. 148, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

The examination of the above passage, in the light of my Reviewers remarks, confirms more than ever that the Revisers intended a change of doctrine. p. 149, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

III-11-15 OABV-200 p. 149, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Luke 23:44, 45. On the darkening of the sun. p. 149, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

King James: "And there was a darkness over all the earth until the ninth hour. And the sun was darkened." p. 149, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Revised: "A darkness came over the whole land until the ninth hour, the sun's light failing." p. 149, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Moffatt: "And darkness covered the whole land until three o'clock, owing to an eclipse of the sun." p. 149, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Concerning the darkness which overspread the land at the time of the crucifixion, we will now take up the astounding change from the King James, which says, "and the sun was darkened" to the ARV which says, "the sun's light failing." I called attention to the great difference in the Greek words used. The Revised Version used *eklipontos* from which we get our word *eclipse.* The AV used an entirely different word. My Reviewers demand, "What difference can there really be between the sun's failing to shine as usual, and the sun's being darkened?" That is not the point at all. The Greek word in the ARV says that the sun underwent an eclipse. I will now quote from Field who says: p. 149, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"In answer to a remark of the *Quarterly Reviewers* (No. CCIV. page 343): 'In like manner *tou eliou ekleipontos,* as our Revisionist are perfectly well aware, means, "the sun becoming eclipsed," or "suffering an eclipse,"' the *Two Revisers* 9p. 60) reply: 'We emphatically deny that there is anything in the Greek word *ekleipein* when associated with the sun which involves necessarily the notion of an eclipse.' This is a most *rash* assertion. There can be no doubt that the phrases *ekelipen o elios...* whenever they occur in the Greek historians, necessarily describe the phenomenon of an astronomical eclipse, and nothing else. If, therefore, St. Luke really wrote *tou eliou ekleipontos* and his Greek is to be construed like that of any other Greek author, it can only be by rendering, 'the sun being eclipsed', and the version adopted by the revisers, 'the sun's light failing,' does NOT convey to the mind of an English reader what the original does to that of a Greek." "Notes on the translation of the N.T." pages 79, 80. p.

149, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Now let us hear from Salmon: p. 150, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"I will not lay over-much stress on such cases... as the WH make St. Mark say... that the girl who danced before Herod was not, as Josephus and other authorities tell us, the daughter of Herodias, by a former husband, but Herod's own daughter, Herodias; that it makes St. Luke call the miraculous darkness at the crucifixion an eclipse of the sun, a thing impossible at the time of full moon." "Some Criticism of the Text of the N.T." page 27, 28. (Emphasis mine) p. 150, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Cook says: p. 150, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"Luke 23:45. After this it is but a minor, though in itself a serious matter, that the Revised Version should make St. Luke relate a physical impossibility, an eclipse of the sun at the full moon. p. 150, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"This is, however, somewhat disguised in the English rendering, which gives as 'the sun's light failing', a phrase which, perplexing as it is to the English reader, might leave him unconscious of the meaning, even with the marginal comment, Gr. 'the sun failing', but which in the Greek, which is rendered thus oddly is without ambiguity, 'the sun undergoing an eclipse. p. 150, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"This is effected by substituting *tou eliou ekleipontos* for *eskotisthe o elios."* p. 150, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"Observe also that the Revised Version goes somewhat further then Westcott and Hort. They give the other reading in their margin. The Revised Version implies that it is the true and only Greek rendering. p. 150, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"For the alteration the responsibility lies with Aleph, B, and L (C is marked by Tischendorf as doubtful), and some few cursives, against all other MSS., nine uncial, nearly all cursives, the best Italic MSS, the Vulgate, the Syriac or Cureton, and others, followed by Tregelles." "Revised Version of the First Three Gospels." page 110, 111. p. 150, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

From Burgon we read: p. 150, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

"In the meantime, with more of ingenuity than of ingenuousness, our Revisionists attempt to conceal the foolishness of the text of their choice by translating unfairly. They present us with, 'the sun's light failing'. This is a gloss of their own. There is no mention of 'the sun's light' in the Greek. Nor perhaps, if the rationale of the original expression were accurately ascertained, would such a paraphrase of it prove correct. But, in fact, the phrase *ekleipsis eliou* means 'an eclipse of the sun,' and *no other thing.* In like manner *tou eliou ekleipontos* (as our Revisionists are perfectly well aware) means *the sun becoming eclipsed,* or suffering eclipse'. It is easy for Revisionists to 'emphatically deny that there is anything in the Greek word *ekleipein,* when associated with the sun, which involves necessarily the notion of an eclipse. The fact referred to may not be so disposed of. It lies outside the province of 'emphatic denial'. Let them ask any Scholar in Europe what *tou eliou ekleipontos* means; and see if he does not tell them that it can *only* mean, 'the sun having become eclipsed'! They know this every bit as well as their Reviewer. And they ought either to have had the manliness to render the words faithfully, or else the good sense to let the Greek alone, which they are respectfully assured was their only proper course." "The Revised Version," pages 64, 65. p. 150, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

And then from Beckett: p. 151, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"The Revisers knew better than to give us an eclipse at full moon, though the MS, or the technical meaning of that Greek phrase; and so they ride over their own Greek with the flat and dull evasion of 'the sun's light failing'! Which is the most likely, that Luke the physician, the best educated of the Evangelists, apart from inspiration, should record a solar eclipse at a full moon, or a MS copier make a blunder in attempting an improvement? The revisers are pleased to say the former; and expect the world to agree with them, but I hardly think it will: or on hundreds, if not thousands, of their other bringings up of the AV 'to a full standard of correction' both of Greek and English." "Revised N.T." page 47. p. 151, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

These quotations from outstanding scholars show you how that Greek text used by the Revisers required that the Revisers translate "eclipse" and that the dodged the issue. Finally, what does the Spirit of Prophecy say on this? p.

151, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

I quote: p. 151, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"With amazement angels witnessed the Saviour's despairing agony. The hosts of heaven veiled their faces from the fearful sight. Inanimate nature expressed sympathy with its insulted and dying Author. The sun refused to look upon the awful scene. Its full, bright rays were illuminating the earth at midday, when suddenly it seemed to be blotted out. Complete darkness, like a funeral pall, enveloped the cross. 'There was darkness over all the land until the ninth hour.' There was no eclipse or other natural cause for this darkness, which was as deep as midnight without moon or stars. It was a miraculous testimony given by God that the faith of after generations might be confirmed." "Desire of Ages", page 753. (Emphasis mine) p. 151, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Here as usual in these crucial passages the Spirit of Prophecy takes its stand with the AV. p. 152, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

III-11-16 OABV-201 p. 152, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Mark 16:9-20. On the ascension. p. 152, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Here is a portion of Scripture where the handling is most serious. My Reviewers take me to task because I object to the Revisers setting off the last 12 verses of Mark's gospel to one side, as suspicious. My Reviewers wonder what justice can be found in my saying that this either indicts the church of past ages as a poor keeper and teacher of Holy Writ, or indicts the Revisers as exercising and extreme and unwarrantable license. They say, "from the viewpoint of the MSS." How many MSS? p. 152, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

How do my Reviewers answer the note in the margin of the ARV? It reads: "The two oldest Greek MSS, and some other authorities, omit from verse 9 to the end. Some other authorities have a different ending to the gospel." They ask if I would have the Revisers cover up the truth, or is it more fair to Biblical students to know the truth concerning this passage. p. 152, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers call the Revisers' treatment of this question, "Fair"; fair to what? Fair to God; fair to the truth; fair to the believers, or fair to what? What are the other authorities which omit verses 9 to the end according to the Revisers? Of course we know which are the two oldest Greek manuscripts meant, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. Which MSS gave the other ending? What is the other ending? Who are the authorities who support the present ending? Please tell us. Which of the three endings to Mark's gospel is the one to get our vote, (1) The ending before us; (2) the other ending supported by other authorities or (3) the ending which does not exist? What kind of verses 9-20 shall we tack on to the first eight verses of Mark 16, (1) the twelve verses that we now have here; or (2) the unknown 12 verses referred to by the Revisers in the margin or (3) no verses at all? p. 152, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

The Spirit of Prophecy gives 45 references to the last twelve verses of Mark as we now have them in the King James Version. Does this have any weight with us in deciding whether the 16th chapter of Mark as in the King James Version is God's word, or are the uncertainties of the Revised Version God's word? My Reviewers called the Revisers' treatment of the last twelve verses of Mark, "FAIR". Is it fair to God's word to us to publish in it the good, bad, and indifferent, casting doubt upon the good? Do you call it fair treatment of God's word when a doubt on a portion of it is published in the margin? Why did not the Revisers introduce the Bible with a "fair" note, saying, "Much of this Bible is different in different manuscripts; we cannot be sure of much of it." Is not that fair? This is just what the higher critics did to the Old Testament. p. 152, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Where is there a scripture on which there has been no doubting commentator? Why not be fair? Why not publish a Bible with a big margin and be *fair* by giving in it all that doubting commentators have found wrong with that passage? Fair! Fair to what? Fair to God, fair to the truth, fair to the saints, or fair to the corrupters of God's word? p. 153, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

But I have something more to say on this. My Reviewers say, (Section III, 11-17), "But it is a fact that in Westcott and Hort's own Greek Testament they include verses 9-20 along with the rest of the chapter without any question in a footnote or elsewhere." I would like to ask

my Reviewers where did they get this information? I would like to ask my Reviewers why did they not read the select notes by Hort at the end of the second volume of the WH Greek N.T.? If they had, they would have seen that Hort devotes 21 pages to the condemnation of these last 12 verses. Here are two statements he makes in these select notes: p. 153, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"Its authorship and its precise date must remain unknown; it is however apparently older than the time when the Canonical Gospels were generally received; for, thought it has points of contact with them all, it contains no attempt to harmonize their various representations of the course of events. I manifestly cannot claim any apostolic authority; but it is doubtless founded on some tradition of the apostolic age." "The New Testament in Greek, Vol. II. Note page 51. p. 153, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Also in the Greek text itself these verses are closed in brackets. Their statement here is untrue to fact. Do my Reviewers call 21 pages of condemnation on the inclusion of the verses, "Without any question in a footnote or elsewhere"? p. 153, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Finally, I want to ask my Reviewers if it is really their best judgment that the evidence against verses 9-20 was sufficient to justify the Revisers in casting doubt upon their authenticity by the way they handle them? Do they really endorse such treatment of the Word of God? p. 153, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

III-11-17 OABV-202 p. 153, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Matt. 17:21. On fasting. p. 153, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

In answering the charge that the whole verse, Matt. 17:21 has been left out in the Revised Version, my Reviewers pass it up by calling attention to the margin of the ARV. They have fastened their eyes on only one word in the omitted verse, the word "fasting", they make some statements which could easily be misleading. They say; "An examination of the MSS shows that ten of them, including all of the major ones omit the word 'fasting' here, while only three secondary ones retain it." p. 153, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Well that might answer for the two references alluded to following the main text under discussion, but it does not

answer the main argument. p. 153, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

It still remains unanswered. The truth of the matter is only two uncials omit Matt. 17:21, namely, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, (See Expositor's Greek New Testament, Matt. 17:21) Then my Reviewers ask, "What should the translator do in such a case?" Of course, if the blind follow the blind and the blind fall into a ditch, you might just as well ask the same question, what was the translator to do in such a case? I think we all should see the point and decline as blind, to follow the blind. p. 154, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

This verse is vouched for by every known uncial but 2, every known cursive but 1, and is witnessed to by 8 ancient versions, by 14 of the fathers and above all, by the Universal East. Why then was it left out? (See Burgon, page 91, 92) p. 154, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

III-11-17 OABV-202 p. 154, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

John 8:1-11. On the woman taken in adultery. p. 154, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

I certainly must insist again on the fact that the ARV sets off to one side and brands with suspicion, the account of the woman taken in adultery, John 8:1-11. My Reviewers claim that it is not set off to one side because it is written in full, though enclosed in brackets. I wonder what setting off to one side is, if putting 11 verses in brackets with a big gulf in between them and the rest of the text, and a note in the margin branding them with suspicion does not do it. Nevertheless, modern textual critics condemn this rejection of John 8:1-11. Professor Burkett says: p. 154, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"The passage in the Gospel of John concerning the woman taken in adultery was one of the regular church lessons. Jerome found it in many Latin and Greek codices, and preserved it in his Vulgate. It is found in 1,650 codices. It seems difficult to account for such a blunder of omission." Bibliotheca Sacra," pages 32, 33. p. 154, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Sister White uses and refers to this one no less than 12 times; but my Reviewers say that "Westcott and Hort in their Greek Testament place this passage in the list of

both suspected and rejected readings," and "scholars must deal with facts as they find them in the best evidence available." Will my hearers agree that Westcott and Hort are the best evidence available over and against the Spirit of Prophecy? p. 154, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

III-11-18 OABV-202 p. 154, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Luke 9:55, 56. On another abbreviation. p. 154, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

King James: "But He turned and rebuked them, 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. And they went to another village." p. 154, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Revised: "But He turned and rebuked them. And then went to another village." p. 154, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers defend the omission in Luke 9:55, 56 of these words, "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". Their defense is "for lack of textual evidence". Dean Burgon, on this verse, says, "Manuscripts, Versions, Fathers from the second century downwards, (as Tischendorf admits,) witness eloquently in its favour." p. 155, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Sister White quotes it: p. 155, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"They were surprised to see that Jesus was pained by their words, and still more surprised as His rebuke fell upon their ears: p. 155, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

'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.'" "Acts of the Apostles," page 541. p. 155, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

It is marvelous how accurately Erasmus put together the sum total of the Textus Receptus, when after 400 years of most furious attacks we find that verses which a host of people following textual critics left out, must be restore by later and more thorough research. p. 155, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

III-11-18 OABV-202 p. 155, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Acts 8:37-202. On Philip and the eunuch. p. 155, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers justify the omission of this verse because besides the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, they have the help of six other MSS, but above all they think they have the help of Dr. Scrivener. On the other hand, Sister White gives this verse fully, as follows: p. 155, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

"Then Philip... began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus. And as they were on their way, they came unto a certain water; and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Vol. 8, page 58. p. 155, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Here as in many places elsewhere the Spirit of Prophecy shows that the Revised Version is not the true, complete, authoritative Word of God by quoting a text which the Revised omits as spurious. Other verses she quotes from the Authorized Version, which though included in the Revised, are so treated as to cast doubt upon their authenticity. p. 155, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

III-121-20 OABV- 202 p. 155, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

Eph. 5:30. On His flesh and His bones. p. 155, Para. 12, [ANSWERS].

King James: "For we are members of his body, of His flesh, and of His bones." p. 155, Para. 13, [ANSWERS].

Revised: "Because we are members of His body." p. 155, Para. 14, [ANSWERS].

Because I noticed that the AV says, "we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones" while the ARV says only, "we are members of His body" my Reviewers wonder how this effects the meaning, and virtually tell us that the Lord did not need to add "and of his flesh, and of His bones". An atheist protested to me once about putting in Revelation 7, all the names of the twelve tribes of Israel in a repetitive fashion, when one general summary would have done. But a close study reveals glorious truths in the Lord's doing it this way. I hold that there is a vast

difference between saying, "We are members of His body", and saying "We are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones". In the change in this text doctrine is affected. p. 156, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

It is peculiar that my Reviewers do not use here this generally used argument on textual attestation. They use a theological argument to sustain them in the cutting down of this verse. On the genuineness of these words Burgon and Miller say: p. 156, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"Yet are the words genuine. They are found in DFGKLP and the whole body of the cursives; in the Old Latin and Vulgate and the two Syriac Versions:" and then they name many Fathers." p. 156, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Thus by theological arguments sometimes, mainly by an appeal to the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus MSS, (which are sometimes supported by a few other authorities), verses of Holy Writ, which for 400 years have led the great Protestant world forward in magnificant triumph, are cut down. Brethren, I appeal to you, if we start on this road, where will it end? p. 156, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

III-11-20 OABV-203 p. 156, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Rev. 13:10. On captivity. p. 156, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

King James: "He that leadeth into captivity, shall go into captivity." p. 156, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

ARV: "If any man is for captivity, into captivity he goeth." p. 156, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

I claim that the ARV had changed it from a prophecy to an axiomatic statement and in the margin put a black mark against it. My Reviewers completely passed over this damaging evidence. "A straight line is the shortest distance between two points" is axiomatic; so is, "if any man is for captivity, into captivity he goeth." Well, I am not for captivity, who is? Thus a glorious prophecy of the papacy going into captivity is changed into an axiomatic statement. Since Rev. 13:10 is a verse Adventist preachers greatly use in their sermons on the United States in Prophecy, would you like to know what is said of it in the margin? The margin brands it this way: "The Greek text in this verse is somewhat uncertain." Do you call this

enlightening? Sister White did not think it was uncertain. She quoted the verse entire in "Great Controversy" page 439, just as it is in the King James Version. Does this not mean anything to us as Seventh-day Adventists? p. 156, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

CHAPTER XII -- BLOW AFTER BLOW IN FAVOR OF ROME. p. 157, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

III-12-1 OABV-204 p. 157, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

John 1:3, 4. On Creation. p. 157, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers agree with me, I see, that the marginal reading which I brought to notice here is unjustifiable. How many unjustifiable records must be written on the eternal pages, either in the text or in the margin, before my Reviewers will recognize that any part of the Revised Version is unjustifiable which threatens the standing of the Authorized. They inform us that this dangerous piece of Gnosticism was not taken from the Vaticanus or Sinaiticus, a fact which my reviewers bring into relief. Right here I might say that those authorities of first rank in the field of textual criticism, who have been shocked over the changes in the Revised Version, long recognized that when the Revisers failed to secure from the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, unjustifiable phrases which lent themselves to their theological bent of mind, then they used another manuscript. This is but another indication of the Gnosticism of the Revisers. p. 157, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

III-12-1 OABV-206 p. 157, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

1 Cor. 11:29. On the Sacraments. p. 157, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers admit, at least they do not oppose the conclusion I advanced that the omission of the two words "unworthily" and "Lord" would turn this verse into an Anti-Protestant verse, if the same words were not found in verse 27. In other words, they offer again their oft repeated argument, that because expressions are found once, there is no great danger if they are struck out in other instances. They failed to mention that the chief witnesses for these omissions are B and Aleph; two other of the manuscripts justify the King James. I reject the theory of my Reviewers that because a truth occurs in some other scripture, it

makes little or no difference whether we leave it in the particular scripture under consideration. p. 157, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

III-12-1 OABV-206 p. 157, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

James 5:16. On faults and sins. p. 157, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

The Revised Version made a serious change here when it told us to "confess therefore your sins to one another" instead of "Confess your faults one to another." The first reason given by the Reviewers for this change is that "the testimony of the best MSS requires the change." The truth of the matter is, that the change is found in the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, supported by two other uncials, three Old Latin MSS and one cursive; with an overwhelming host of MSS witnessing on the other side. Of course they can justify any of these startling changes on their assumption that the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are the best MSS. p. 157, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Then they launch into a discussion about the change from the Greek word *paraptoma* for *faults* in the AV, to the Greek word *harmartia* for *sins* in the Revised Version. Consider what a serious change this is. The Greek word for 'sin' in the Revised, is the same word found in 1 John 3:4, which in the AV reads: p. 157, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

"Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law." p. 158, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

(Right here to show how the Revised has weakened the force of our standard definition for 'sin' in 1 John 3:4, I give how it reads in the Revised: p. 158, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"Every one that doeth sin doeth also lawlessness; and sin is lawlessness." p. 158, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

***SIN,* hamartia, is the transgression of the law. It is the same word used for "the man of sin" (2 Thess. 2:3) in the Textus Receptus. p. 158, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].**

This word for sin, *hamartia,* is translated in the AV 171 out of 172 times as "sin"; only once as offense. This shows that the word is so serious that "offense" is not the

underlying idea. Whereas, *paraptoma* the new Greek word displayed by the ARV is used 23 times and translated "sin" only 3 times, 20 times as "trespasses", and "faults", and NEVER "sin" as in the meaning of *hamartia.* John said, "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive our sins..." Did Jesus here mean that we should confess our sins one to another? Absolutely not. We might tell to one another our sins asking for prayer, but never to confess one to another for forgiveness. For as Dean Alford says on this text; p. 158, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"It might appear astonishing, were it not notorious, that on this passage among others, is built the Romish doctrine of the necessity of confessing sins to a priest." "Greek Testament." Vol. IV, page 328. p. 158, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Therefore, with centuries behind us showing the danger of this change, the Revisers took upon themselves considerable liberty to change "faults" to "sins" in James 5:16. One by one the rings which hang the curtains of the sanctuary have been removed until the curtains hang dangerously near to fall. And yet my Reviewers are trying to defend these changes. They do not seem to see the danger in this verse. But Dean Alford saw it, and others outside of Seventh-day Adventists see it and my Reviewers ought to see it. Are we going to surrender the very gospel to Rome rather than relinquish the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus? p. 158, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

What has the Spirit of Prophecy to say on this? From "Ministry of Healing" pages 228, 229: p. 158, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

"The Scripture bids us, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed!" To the one asking for prayer, let thoughts like these be presented: "We cannot read the heart, or know the secrets of your life. These are known only to yourself and to God. If you repent of your sins, it is your duty to make confession of them." Sin of a private character is to be confessed to Christ, the only mediator between God and man... Every sin is an offense against God, and is to be confessed to Him through Christ." p. 158, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers ask, "What bearing does the interpretation of the Catholic Dublin Review have on the translation"? I

wonder if my Reviewers will accept the authority of Sister White on this point. She says: p. 159, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"Confess your *sins* to God, who only can forgive them, and your faults to one another." "Testimonies", Vol. V, page 539. (Emphasis mine) p. 159, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

This is the very position I take in my book. My Reviewers took exception to it. p. 159, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Thus we see Sister White endorses the reading as in the AV. Sister White uses sixteen other references in the Spirit of Prophecy, all throwing the weight on the side of the AV. p. 159, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Does this mean anything to us? Do we not here again see the Spirit of Prophecy lined up on the side of the AV; while on the other side the Reviewers, the Revisers, and Rheims of 1582 stand together? p. 159, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

III-12-3 OABV-207 p. 159, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Hebrews 10:21. On the Priesthood. p. 159, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

In the translating of this text the Revisers have nowhere else more clearly shown their inferiority to the translators of the Authorized Version, in the handling of the Greek, than here. In defending the Revisers, my Reviewers say, "Undoubtedly." This is my Reviewers opinion. I expect to give you something more than an opinion, something more in the Old Testament than simply Zechariah 6:11. p. 159, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

The expression "house of God" as found in this text is used only one other time outside of the Gospels in the New Testament, and that is in 1 Tim. 3:15 where this "house of God" is distinctly said to be the church. It is used in the Gospels in connection with only one incident, referring to the temple. Likewise the Greek word, *megan* for "high" referring to the high priest is used nowhere else in the New Testament with the word "priest". Is it not remarkable that: two exceptional expressions, used nowhere else in combination in the New Testament, come together in this verse? The Protestant scholars of 1611 saw that Jesus Christ in this verse was more emphatically referred to as "high" priest, than in any other verse in the New

Testament. p. 159, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

In other words, all through the Greek Old Testament, the word used for "high" in referring to the high priest, was not the Greek word "arch" which is generally used in the New Testament, but another Greek word "mega". Thus, by *not* translating "megan' as "high", is obscured this direct reference to our Lord as the antitype of the Jewish high priest. In the 20 references in the Old Testament, where the word "high priest" is used, the Septuagint translators always used the word "mega"! Therefore, if there was any verse at all in the New Testament in which the Greek word going with priest should distinctively have been translated "high", it is in this verse. Why did the Revisers not do it? There are two reasons which I now offer. p. 159, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

First, the scholars on the Revision Committee of 1871-1881 were deficient in their knowledge of the Septuagint, or of the Greek Old Testament. As Dean Burgon says, speaking of these same men: p. 160, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"One is surprised to discover that among so many respectable Divines there seems to have been *one* sufficiently familiar with the Septuagint to preserve his brethren from perpetually falling into such mistakes as the foregoing. We really had no idea that the Hellenistic scholarship of those who represented the Church and the sects in the Jerusalem Chamber, was so inconsiderable." "Revision Revised", pages 183, 184. p. 160, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

The second reason is that this verse, Hebrews 10;21, is a rare verse in the New Testament. It is composed of two rare expressions. The first is "the house of God" which is used outside of the Gospels only twice in the New Testament; once here, and once before, where it is defined as the church of the Living God. (1 Tim. 3:15) The second, is that the word for "high" here, as in the Authorized Version, is never used elsewhere in the New Testament for "high priest". The other Greek word "arch" the "chief" priest, is more generally used, and is also more often used for other priests than the high priest. But the word *megan* in the verse under consideration could never be used for other priests than the high priest, therefore it is a special word. So the Revisers of 1881 saw that to put the high priest over the church (house of God) would point to Jesus

only. Here was a good chance to put a "great priest" and not a "high priest" over the church. Since Dr. Hort, dominating Reviser, constantly and persistently complained of Protestants' horror of priesthood, here was a good chance to give the church "the house of God", a human priest whom they would call great. Dr. Hort wrote to Westcott, p. 160, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"But this last error can hardly be expelled until *Protestants unlearn the crazy horror of priesthood."* "Life of Hort". Vol. 11, page 51. (Emphasis mine) p. 160, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers have acknowledged (Section III, Chapter 12, page 8) that the Revisers did color the translation of Revelation 13:8 to the upholding of their theological views, and the Revisers have likewise, as well as the Reviewers confessed the same thing. Now as they did it once, why should they not do it here? In other words, the oft, repeated claim that the Revisers were true to the original Greek in its rendering, is not so. p. 160, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

III-12-4 OABV-207 p. 160, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Acts 15:23. On the Clergy and the Laity. p. 160, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

See my answer to this SECTION VI, Chapter 6, page 12. p. 160, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

III-12-4 OABV-208 p. 160, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Hebrews 9:27. On the judgment. p. 160, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers defend the omission of the article "the" from Heb. 9:27, making the passage read "after this cometh judgment" instead of as in the AV, "But after this, the judgment." And this in spite of the quotation I gave from Canon Farrar, who points out that the change in the Revised opened the way for the great doctrine of the "intermediate state". It will not answer for my Reviewers to make light of this statement by Canon Farrar. The Canon was a member of the Apostles Club, an organization in Cambridge University, frequented by the Revisers, who were members thereof, so that Canon Farrar was well aware of the

principles believed by these men; for they discussed them at the Club. p. 161, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

On this verse in the Greek, Dr. Middleton, who is an authority on the Greek article, having written a book under the title, says of the omission of the *Greek* articles: p. 161, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"Verse 27, *Krisis.* This word, though used of the final judgment, very properly wants the Greek Article in this place; the proposition not asserting the notoriety or magnitude of the event, but only that it will happen." "The Greek Article", page 418. p. 161, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Another quotation from Sir Edmund Beckett, L.L.D., Q. C.F.R.A.S. p. 161, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"Heb. 9:27. Here again they go out of their way to destroy a famous and solemn sentence, foisting in a dull prosaic word of their own which does not even profess to have any word for it in the original, and is not the least required. We are no longer to hear 'It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment', but... 'after this (cometh) judgment': evidently because they were determined to expunge 'the' on account of *krisis* there having no Greek article, as if there could be the smallest doubt that it meant THE judgment; and secondly, I suppose they thought the Authorized Version not grammatical enough for their precision, and did not see, or care, that it is all the more striking for the sudden change and break of the grammar, which is still more common in Greek" "Should the Revised N.T. be Authorized" pages 138, 139. p. 161, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

It is surprising how the Reviewers can defend in this text, its rendering as being literal when the Revisers have supplied the word "cometh". My Reviewers try to defend this liberty taken by the Revisers on the ground that it is "to ease reading". What startling changes could not translators make if they were allowed to operate under this excuse. There is only one judgment which comes to men after death, and it is general. Of course the Catholics and Romanizers teach that there is an individual judgment coming by repetition to each man at the death of each. In the blessed words of inspiration, freighted as they are with immortal importance what right had the Revisers here to omit the word which would designate this judgment as THE judgment,

the judgment par excellence, the general judgment, and take an unwarranted liberty to supply another word which would sustain their purpose. What is this but to change doctrine? p. 161, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

III-12-4 OABV-209 p. 162, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

John 14:2. On Mansions. Author's Title: The Larger Hope -- Another Chance After Death. p. 162, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

It is evident that the *Revisers* saw in these "mansions", as they say in their margin, "abiding places" or stations on the road in the intermediate state, if my Reviewers did not. Read the quotations in my book from Bishop Westcott and Mr. Cox. These prove that the Revisers intended to breathe their doctrine into the margin, whether my Reviewers get it out of the margin or not. p. 162, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

III-12-5 OABV-210 p. 162, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Luke 1:72. On Mercy to our Father. p. 162, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Probably in no other passage in the New Testament did the translators of 1611, show their splendid skill, delicate touch, and strong arrangement in translating, as they did in handling Luke 1:72. To effect this result the AV supplies the word "promised" which my Reviewers condemn, regardless of the great results achieved, forgetting how often the Revisers supplied words, not only effecting disastrous results, but sometimes to change God's immortal doctrines. p. 162, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers say of me, "He lauds the AV for putting into the text a word that is not there, and then wanders off into a digression on limbo and purgatory". I do not like that, "he wanders off". The fact of the matter is, I am not the originator of the purgatory exposition for this text in the Revised; I have no less an authority than the Catholic Bishop of Erie PA., who shows plainly that the Revised Version is so like the Jesuit New Testament of 1582, that the Catholic doctrine has been restored. The Catholic Bishop says: p. 162, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"For the text was one which, if rendered literally, no one could read without being convinced, or at least suspecting,

that the 'fathers' already dead needed 'mercy'; and that 'the Lord God of Israel' was prepared 'to perform' it to them. But where were those fathers? Not in heaven, where mercy is swallowed up in joy. And assuredly not in the hell of the damned, where mercy could not reach them. They must therefore have been in a place between both, or neither the one or the other. What? In Limbo or Purgatory? Why, certainly. In one or the other." Mullen, Canon," page 332. p. 162, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Will it lessen the indictment of the Revised Version to say that I was wandering off into digression, when I used statements made by Catholic scholars affirming the change in their favor by the Revised? Are you going to brush aside and ignore as evidence, the exultation of Catholic scholars, that the Revised Version has helped in restoring to Scriptural authority Catholic doctrines which cannot be sustained by the Authorized Version? p. 162, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers and the Revisers make three mistakes here. In the 'first' place, the Revised Version, as usual in the crucial cases I have been handling, does not agree with the context. Dr. Field has truly said of the Revised Version, it neglects the great testimony of Internal Evidence. Let us notice the triple alignment of these verses here and as found in the words of Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist. I quote Luke 1:70-73. p. 163, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"70. As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began: 71. That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; 72. To perform the mercy *promised* to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant." p. 163, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Thus Zacharias brings into relief three if not four of God's promises made in the past: A. -- What he predicted by the mouth of his holy prophets: B. -- His holy covenant which was to be remembered; C. -- the oath which he sware to our father Abraham. All these going before and after, proclaim that it was mercy promised. Therefore the AV rightly inserted the word *promised.* But to make assurance doubly sure, notice that Mary also covered the same ground in her beautiful hymn that follows: Luke 1: 54, 55. p. 163, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"54. He hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy; 55. As he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever." p. 163, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Thus the words of Mary in the same chapter definitely show that the subject under consideration was mercy *promised* to the fathers who long since were dead. This makes all the distinction in the world. It makes a great difference whether God is to show to us, their children, the mercy promised to the fathers; or to perform mercy not to us, but to the dead fathers. The argument is complete. The scholars of 1611 clearly saw through these two triple chains of statements and translated the verse so true to divine utterances that the doctrine of purgatory was shut out. Whereas the revisers, most all of whom believed in purgatory, either failed to see the evidence, or did not wish to see the evidence plainly manifest as to the Catholic Bishop says, to teach the doctrine of purgatory. p. 163, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

As to the *second* mistake of the Revisers, is there any one who can defend them, when here they translate the Greek verb *poieo,* meaning "to do," as, "to show", when the commonest knowledge of Greek teaches that this verb means "to do" or "to perform". What was their motive in so translating it? p. 163, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

The *third* mistake of the Revisers was substituting in the translation "toward" for "to". What is the difference between the King James translation "to perform the mercy promised to our fathers" and that of the Revised "to show mercy towards our fathers"? What is the use of stretching your imagination to understand it as in the Revised when you have it clearly in the AV, the difference is that the thought is clearly expressed in the AV while the ARV throws us back into the arms of the Jesuit Bible of 1582. Here again we need the King James Version to protect us from the Romish tendencies of the Revised. Here again my Reviewers criticize the King James for its righteous principles and approve the ARV for its unwarranted translation which favors Rome. Is not this a change of doctrine? p. 163, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

II-12-6 OABV-212 p. 164, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Job 26:5. On the Shades. p. 164, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers, when they seek to defend the spiritualistic translation of the ARV in Job 26:5, in my humble judgment, say just nothing at all. p. 164, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

They say that the only difference between the two verses is that the subject of the AV is "dead things", while the subject of the ARV is "They that are deceased", which they would let us believe mean the same thing. Pardon me. We are not talking about, the *subject* of the sentence; please notice that we are talking about the predicate. Why did not my Reviewers notice that this is the point between the two renderings in the text. It makes a vast difference whether dead things "are formed under the waters" as in the AV, or whether they that are deceased "tremble beneath the waters", as in the ARV. But I have another point at issue here. The margin of the ARV substitutes the expression "the shades" for "they that are deceased" in the text. Let me read you from the International Dictionary, the definition of the word "shade": p. 164, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"Shade, the soul after its separation from the body; so called because the ancients supposed it to be perceptible to the sight, though not to the touch; spirit; ghost; 'the shades', the nether world; Hades, supposed by the ancients to be the abode of disembodied spirits." p. 164, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

I ask my hearers to judge fairly if the margin, as well as the text, of the ARV does not give us a spiritualistic rendering. Is not this a change of doctrine? p. 164, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

But I have still a further point at issue with my Reviewers in this matter. They want to know what bearing has the comment of a Reviser on this matter, who plainly told us that the Revised Version changed this text so as to give "a vivid reference to God's control over departed spirits". I would answer that it indicates that some of the Revisers had a spiritualistic mentality. p. 164, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

III-12-7 OABV-212 p. 164, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

2 Peter 2:9. On Punishment. p. 164, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

I am very glad to notice that my Reviewers have acknowledged that I was right in my objection to the

Revised for its inacceptable translation of 2 Peter 2:9. This teaches the doctrine of Purgatory and I am happy that my Reviewers agree with me in saying that this text was colored by the theology of the Revisers. The Reviewers here rightly acknowledge, what they should always acknowledge that the context *must* be taken into consideration, should always acknowledge that the context *must* be taken into consideration. p. 164, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

III-12-8 OABV-213 p. 165, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Rev. 13:8. On Names in the Book of Life. p. 165, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Here again my Reviewers admit that I have found a just ground for my complaint against the inacceptable translation of Rev. 13:8. However, let it not be forgotten that I plainly pointed out that this text was the battle ground for decades between the Jesuits and the Reformers. The Jesuits claimed in their day a translation such as now appears in the ARV, because they knew it favored their doctrine. On the other hand, the Reformers contested this translation every step of the way. Do you think that the Revisers translated it wrong here, in view of these facts, am I not right in claiming that they translated it to suit their own doctrine, which was practically a Jesuitical doctrine? It is not fair for my Reviewers to claim that I said the Revisers rendered this passage in order to side with the Jesuits. I claim then as I claim now, that their doctrine was similar. p. 165, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

III-12-9 OABV-213 p. 165, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Rev. 13:18. On the number of the Beast. p. 165, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

We now come to the all important question of the number of the Beast, or the number of his name. Five times in the book of Revelation, this all important expression "the number of his name" is brought to our attention, but only *once* are we told the number. Moreover serious consequences hand upon our knowing what that number is. We are to drink of the wine of the wrath of God, if we have it; if we got the victory over it, we are to stand on the sea of glass. How important it is, then, that that information be correct. Yes, and more than correct, it must not be confusing or contradictory. Consider then with how great a

shock it comes to find that the margin of the Revised Version reads "616", and to us who for 300 years have been led to believe that the number was "666", and that only. p. 165, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Yet my Reviewers dismiss the whole problem with a toss of the hand, saying, "On the whole, however, we need not be disturbed by the harmless marginal note." I protest against this effort to convert one of the most shocking deeds committed by the ARV into a mere matter of no importance. Shall one of the most precious portions of inspired Revelation be cut down before our eyes, on the pretext that nothing great has happened. p. 165, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

I do not need to go further than this point here, to declare that the world at large, and our people in particular, need some pamphlet or book about safe and dangerous translations in order to protect them from just such dangers as this. p. 165, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Five times divine Revelation solicits us to learn the number of the Beast. It is important then that we rightly locate this great apostatizing system, whose name we are solemnly warned to discover with God's help. We shall then learn that its name is the name of blasphemy. We shall arise astonished, and have a commission appointed to publish that the Beast has a name unlike any other name in the world. But to locate, to discover, to learn that name, we must know the number of it. We go to the Revised Version to obtain this coveted information, and alas! We discover that the beast has two numbers. Whither shall we turn in our confusion and distress? p. 165, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Which of the two numbers is correct, 666 or 616? They both cannot be correct. Am I to understand that down through the ages, God was not able to protect the right number, and to transmit to me one marked with certainty? If He did, then what business had the Revisers to throw it into confusion and uncertainty? I reject with indignation their marginal reading. And unless they have some "preponderating evidence", as their appointing body charged them to have, to justify this other number of the Beast. I charge them with high-handed adding to the sacred word of God. p. 166, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

I gave in my book, a quotation from Dean Burgon on this deed of the Revisers. It was correct; it showed the

seriousness to the saints of the change; it uttered a grave indictment against the Revisers. My Reviewers acknowledged the correctness of Dean Burgon's conclusion. But that was all. Why did they fail to tell us also of the seriousness of the Dean's facts and of the gravity of his indictment? In order that my audience may hear all, I will produce again the quotation of Dean Burgon. Kindly note that the Dean recognized the margin, "616", as an "alternative reading" and protested against it, my Reviewers to the contrary notwithstanding. To prove that it is an "alternative reading", Burgon uses the Reviser's Preface, describing "alternative readings". Why did my Reviewers seek to make it a "harmless marginal note"? Dean Burgon said: p. 166, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"But why is not the *whole* truth told? viz., why are we not informed that *only one* corrupt uncial (C): *only one* cursive copy (11): *only one* Father (Tichonius): and *not one* ancient Version -- advocates this reading? which, on the contrary, Irenaeus (A.D. 170) knew, but rejected: remarking that 666, which is "found in all the best and oldest copies and is attested by men who saw John face to face," is unquestionably the true reading. Why is not the ordinary reader further informed that the same number (666) is expressly vouched for by Origen, Hippolytus, by Eusebius: as well as by Victorinus and Primasius, not to mention Andreas and Arethas? To come to the moderns, as a matter of fact the established reading is accepted by Lachmann. Tischendorf, Tregelles, even by Westcott and Hort. WHY therefore for what possible reason at the end [of] 1700 years and upwards, is this which is, so clearly nothing else by an ancient slip of the pen, to be forced upon the attention of 90 millions of English speaking people?" p. 166, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"Will Bishop Ellicott and his friends venture to tell us that it has been done because 'it would not be safe to accept' 666, 'to the absolute exclusion of' 616?... 'We have given *alternative readings* in the margin,' (say they) 'wherever they seem to be of sufficient importance or interest to deserve notice.' Will they venture to claim either 'interest' or 'importance' for THIS? p. 166, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Or pretend that it is an *'alternative reading'* at all? Has it been rescued from oblivion and paraded before universal Christendom in order to perplex, mystify, and discourage

'those that have understanding,' and 'would fain count the number of the beast,' if they were able? Or was the intention only to insinuate one more wretched doubt, one more miserable suspicion into minds which have been taught *(and rightly)* to place absolute reliance in the textual accuracy of all the gravest utterances of the SPIRIT; minds which are utterly incapable of dealing with the subtleties of Textual Criticism; and, from a one-sided statement like the present, will carry away none but entirely mistaken inferences, and the most unreasonable distrust?... Or, lastly, was it only because, in their opinion, the margin of every Englishman's N.T. is the fittest place for reviving the memory of obsolete blunders, and ventilating forgotten perversions of the Truth?... To really pause for an answer." Burgon, "Revision Revised", pages 135, 137. p. 167, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

You have been listening to this ringing, serious utterance of Dean Burgon on the number "616". Shall we seek to tone down the seriousness? My Reviewers call it a 'harmless marginal note'. It is a doubt about the number of the name of the Beast a harmless thing? Dean Burgon did not so regard it, yet he was only a critic of manuscripts. He was not an Adventist; he was not facing the Beast and the number of his name in the last great conflict as we are. We have a thousand reasons to make this substitute marginal reading a more serious matter than he did. p. 167, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

The forces in the world, working in favor of the Beast seek earnestly to blur all the identification marks which will fasten upon the Roman Catholic Church her identity with the Beast of the Bible. This substitute number "616" in the ARV blurs the number "666". God has branded the Beast with the number 666. Did the Revisers seek to put another brand upon it? To Adventists further argument is superfluous. p. 167, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Authorized and Revised Differ Profoundly. p. 167, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

To show how misleading is the statement that there is no great difference between Versions, I will give two quotations from the 28 pages which Dr. Schaff devotes to his estimate of Luther's Version, Vol. V. of his "History of the Christian Church": p. 167, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"A Roman Catholic version must be closely conformed to the Latin Vulgate, which the Council of Trent puts on an equal footing with the original text. A Protestant version is bound only by the original text, and breathes an air of freedom from traditional restraint. The Roman Church will never use Luther's Version or King James Version, and could not do so without endangering her creed; nor will German Protestants use Enser's and Eck's Versions, or English Protestants the Douay Version." page 365. p. 167, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"It (the Anglo-American Revision) involves a reconstruction of the original text, which the German Revision leaves almost untouched, as if all the pains-taking labors of critics since the days of Bengel and Griesbach down to Lachmann and Tischendorf (not to speak of the equally important labors of English scholars from Mill and Bently to Westcott and Hort had been in vain. p. 168, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"As to translation, the English Revision removes not only *misleading errors,* but corrects the far more numerous inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the minor details of grammar and vocabulary; while the German Revision of the New Testament numbers only about two hundred changes, the Anglo-American thirty-six thousand." page 367. p. 168, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Even though Germany was the home of destructive higher criticism, her Revisers never dared, because of the people, to take the shocking liberties with the German Revision that Westcott and Hort, followed by Schaff, did with the Anglo-American revisions. p. 168, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

III-12-9 OABV-215 p. 168, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Matt. 2:15. On being called out of Egypt. p. 168, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers committed an error in their endeavor to answer the claims of my book respecting the change in Matt. 2:15. I took this change as typical of hundreds of others. Farrar, Milligan, Westcott, Vaughn, and other writers acknowledge that the entire meaning of hundreds of texts in the New Testament relating to the Old Testament have been changed. p. 168, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

One of the instruments of this change is the new rule for handling the tense form, the "aorist". I note that my Reviewers' definition of this tense form is that it "is employed to denote the simple occurrence of an act in past time, without indicating whether the act is instantaneous, progressive, or in a completed state." This definition would give a great deal of latitude in translating the aorist, then why did they not abide by it? Evidently my Reviewers do not agree with the Revisers in their understanding of the aorist. Neither do I. p. 168, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers seek to interpret Dean Farrar's comment as giving "added light in the study of the Scriptures", and criticized me for indicating that those changes were extensive and revolutionary. They failed to notice the remark from Dean Farrar, quoted on page 209 in my book, where he says, p. 168, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

"The Revisers help, as they have done in so many other places, silently to remove deep seated errors." p. 168, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

If this is not extensive and revolutionary, then please tell me what is extensive and revolutionary, then please tell me what is extensive and revolutionary. Please note the word, "silently". p. 168, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

OABV-216 p. 169, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

1 Cor. 15:3, 4. On Tense change affecting Great Crises of Christian Life. p. 169, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers seek to parry the indictment that the Revisers change tense forms so as to throw the meaning of the great crises in Christian life; towards the teachings of Rome. But did I not (1) quote Dean Farrar when he truly claims that the Revisers change of tense form *did* change the meaning of the crises in Christian life; (2) and did I not quote Westcott, and other Revisers, that they sought to permeate Christendom with their conception of doctrines whose meaning to them was neither Presbyterian or Episcopalian, but whose meaning I showed to be Romish? I wish now to give a quotation from one of the learned nobility of England to the effect that the Apostles never made such distinction of tense forms as both the Reviewers and the Revisers claim they did. I now quote from Lord

Edmund Beckett: p. 169, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"The same may be said about the modern rules for construing aorists and perfect tenses, to which are due another multitude of alterations. Such rules are probably right enough generally (in the sense of usually), so far that there is a presumption in favor of observing them, but certainly no more, as we shall see continually. And as all such rules can only be a matter of induction from experience in the books to which they are intended to be applied, and cannot be deduced from any axioms or necessary truths, as in mathematics, the assertion that any such rule is universal is at once refuted by finding that it would sometimes produce absurd or manifestly wrong results... The English speaking people of the world want the English Bible to express the full and substantial meaning of the writers of the original in the best way, and not in the way that is used to test school boys; knowledge of the parsing of every word. It is nothing to us whether Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, James, Jude and the uncertain writer of Hebrews, all mind their aorists and articles, participles, and particles, as good scholars may expect them to have done, but as it is clear that they did not; because we find it sometimes makes nonsense or confusion to assume that they did." Beckett, "Revised N.T.", pages 14, 15. p. 169, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers emphasize the fact that the Greek verb here is in the present perfect passive form. Well what of it? It is used intransitively here, and when so used can be translated to *awake,* to *arise,* which is not passive. (See Robinson's Greek and English Lexicon, page 218.) If then, it could be translated the way it now is in the King James Version, and so fits in with the two other verbs, why did they not do it? Why did they not leave it alone as it was in the AV, and in there correctly? Why make the change, I repeat? Dean Farrar revealed that it was *in this very verse* THAT they made the change to minimize the death of Christ, and to magnify his resurrection, which is the doctrine of triumvirate. Westcott, Hort and Lightfoot, who had fully determined ten years before Revision began to find expressions to their convictions. Rome and Romanizers also minimize the death and magnify the resurrection of Christ. Such a belief strikes both at the Atonement and at the seventh day Sabbath, bringing in Sunday. p. 169, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

III-12-12 OABV-220 p. 170, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Matt. 27:46. A gain on the Tense Forms. p. 170, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Here again Sister White agrees with the Authorized Version. Christ was dying when he cried out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" She says? p. 170, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"No eye could pierce the gloom that surrounded the cross, and none could penetrate the deeper gloom that enshrouded the suffering soul of Christ. The angry lightenings seemed to be hurled at Him as He hung upon the cross. Then 'Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying Eloi, Eloi, lama Sabachthani?' 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken Me?'... The spotless Son of God hung upon the cross, His flesh lacerated with stripes... Amid the awful darkness, apparently forsaken of God, Christ had drained the last dregs in the cup of human woe." "Desire of Ages". pages 754-756. p. 170, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

The ARV margin says, "Why didst thou forsake me". This would mean that God has forsaken him for a moment in the past, but now as Christ was speaking God had returned to him. In other words, the Revisers would seem to teach that Christ's death was not accompanied by terrible sufferings and therefore that our redemption came not so much by His sufferings and death. As I will show in handling my next text, the change in the Revised Version was to teach that thought. p. 170, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

The Revisers in their doctrines, minimized the death of Christ, but magnified His incarnation and His resurrection. They used their "self-imposed rules" to bring this about. Did they have a purpose in it? p. 170, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers feel constrained to ask this question, "Does the author want it to appear that the apparent forsaking of Christ by the Father at the time of His agony should be *supreme* and continuous in effect?" No! I said nothing of the kind. I said that evidently the Revisers thought, that they feared, that the AV made the death of Christ too strong. This fear is a Catholic fear. Protestants make the death of Christ the supreme act of the Atonement. Romanists and Romanizers minimize the act. Sr. White says: "In consequence of limited ideas of the sufferings of Christ,

many place a low estimate upon the great work of the Atonement." Vol. II, page 200. p. 170, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

I protest against the weakening of this doctrine whether it is in the text, or in the margin. Bishop Westcott teaches this weakening, as I showed in my book, using this passage as his evidence. Evidently at the Revision table he failed to get it into the text, but succeeded in putting it into the margin. p. 170, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

III-12-12 OABV-222 p. 171, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

1 Cor. 11:24. The Jesuitical Doctrines of the Sacraments Favored by the Revised. p. 171, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers justify the omission of "take eat" in this text because these words ARE found in Matt. 26:26. Then they justify the omission of "broken" because they are NOT found in Matt., Mark, Luke. In other words I am justified in having an account of $1,000.00 in the Takoma Park Bank, because I have a similar account of $1,000.00 in the Riggs Bank in the City. Then I am justified in having another account of $500.00 in the Takoma Park Bank because I DO NOT have an account of $500.00 in the Riggs Bank. What kind of reasoning is that? What has Riggs Bank to do with Takoma Park Bank? Why does not each case stand on it own merits? Especially when they use the argument both ways. p. 171, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

The problem here which I present was the omission of the word "broken". This omission permits the ritualistic Protestants, to enforce their argument for sacramental salvation. I presented the quotation from Dr. Milligan who said very distinctly; p. 171, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"The doctrine of the Sacraments may next engage our attention, and here again the variations in the renderings of familiar texts, though they may not appear at first of great importance, involve far-reaching truths... The Bread that is the body of Christ, recalls more particularly His Incarnation apart from His sufferings." Milligan, "Expository Value." 120, 122. p. 171, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

The author of the above quotation, as well as the Revisers, who for ten years or more were in steady contact with this problem, and who knew much more than my Reviewers what happened, have no hesitation on declaring that if the

changes made in the Revision were important on other subjects, with regard to the doctrine of the sacraments, the "involve far reaching truths". p. 171, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

As power lay in the locks of Samson, so in the doctrine of Sacramental Salvation lay the power of Rome. Especially is this true of the sacrament the mass. Through this she commands to her priests to rule the spirits of men. Through this she buys the choicest lands, erects magnificant buildings, and orders kings to put their neck under her foot on penalty of losing their crowns. p. 171, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Only one help existed to keep the people from this awful tyranny -- that is the Bible. Yet it is from the Bible that Rome claims to secure her authority for her doctrine of the sacraments. How important then that we have the correct words of God in those four accounts of how Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper. p. 171, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

But would you be surprised to learn that the Revised Version could not keep its hands off any one of these four accounts? Would it interest you to know that it changed either in the text or in the margin each one of these accounts? The change is not serious, to be sure, in some instances, as in others. Nevertheless, each change is Romeward. It changed the account in 1 Cor. 11 in five places. It changed in three places (text and margin) the account of Luke. It changed in two places, the account in Mark, and in Matthew it changed the account in one place, 11 changes in all. p. 171, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Consider how serious this is. The whole Christian Protestant world is drifting toward Rome. Brethren, do you want also to see our Bible so doctored up that it also is drifting towards Rome? Once our good old Protestant Bible spake out in clear definite utterances; it gave the trumpet a certain sound. Do you want to see it speak with stammering lips and faltering tones? "Oh, the manuscripts, the manuscripts," they say. What manuscripts? Why a certain few, especially the one in the Vatican, which they choose by their own arguments to call ancient, to the exclusion of 3,000 or more other MSS which are against them and which we believe carry a Bible more ancient, more true and more apostolic than those MSS which are Catholic, not simply because the Catholic possess them, but because Rome needs

them, uses them, and relies on them. p. 172, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

This word "broken" found in the text under consideration in the AV, but omitted in the RV is a barrier in the way of new theology touching on the Lord's Supper and on the Person of Christ. Romanists and Romanizing Protestants claim that, in the Lord's Supper, the sufferings of Christ are represented in the cup only. The bread should not be "broken" as that represents the Incarnation, apart from Christ's sufferings. We are redeemed, they teach, not by the death and sufferings of Christ, but by his being made flesh and thus raising humanity from condemnation to fellowship with God. p. 172, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

When the priest puts the wafer on the tongue, when the Protestant ritualist gives the communicant the bread. Christ is (they claim) really and truly present. They partake of the Person of Christ. The church then is instilled with heavenly life. The church now becomes the body of Christ. This heavenly life, this light permeates the church and in the light of it we rate the Scriptures. In fact the impartation of this life puts the church above the Bible and salvation is acquired by the sacrament. The wafer must be whole not "broken"' so certain MSS omit the word "broken". Emphasis must *not* be placed upon, "Take, eat" but upon "this is my body." Therefore, certain MSS omit the words, "take, eat." p. 172, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Why should this information be withheld from the public? When I seek to show the background of the theology of the Revisers and how that would interest them to favor these eleven (11) changes in the four accounts of the Lord's Supper, my Reviewers make a few general statements, which I consider have no bearing on the problem, as sufficient reason why I should not expose the modernistic, ritualistic doctrine of "The Person of Christ" the chief inspiration of ritualists and Romanizers today. p. 172, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

One of the eleven changes favors the Catholic doctrine of Communion in one kind. The good old Protestant doctrine of Communion in two kinds points to the atoning death of Christ in both the wine and the blood; but communion in one kind points to the wine only as representing the blood of Christ, while the wafer points, not to His death, but to His Incarnation. Thus step by step, the later changes in

the Bible, whether based on the Greek text, or the English text, or the English margin, favor the drift towards Romanism. p. 172, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

THE ACID TEST. p. 173, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers say: "The author has utterly failed in the acid test of proving his contention by the results actually seen in the Revised translations submitted in evidence." (Conclusion, page 1). p. 173, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers seem pressed in spirit to single out certain propositions upon which they make stand or fall my book. Thus (Section I, page 13) they say: "The decisive consideration is "whether the Itala originated in N. Africa or not; and again, (Section I, page 17) they make bold to declare: "When this claim (i.e. that the Waldenses had a pure text Bible, the foundation of the Textus Receptus, etc.) is overthrown, the very foundation of the book under review is removed." Finally, they chose to make the discussion over the Bible passages compared in Chapters 6, 11, and 12 of my book, -- "the acid test". p. 173, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

They charge me (Section III, pages 2, 3) with: p. 173, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

I. Ignoring the contest; II. Disregarding parallel texts; III. Alternative readings in the margin; IV. Criticizing the marginal reading; V. Criticizing the Literal Reading; VI. Disregarding Greek forms; VII. Disregarding Greek MSS; VIII. Looseness of reasoning and assertion; and place opposite to each of the charges the example which they choose to consider as having, because of their treatment of those examples, supported those charges. p. 173, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

However, I have conclusively exposed their false reasoning on practically every one of the texts. Therefore, the charges based upon them, fall and their acid test vanishes. Likewise their eight pages of summary of scripture texts are answered. Manuscripts, authorities, history, and the Spirit of Prophecy are against them. p. 173, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

They especially charge me (Section III, Chapter 6, page 3) with using quotations from questionable sources and of

questionable kind. To the arguments used and the four (4) examples cited, I reply: Since a Catholic of the most dangerous type, Cardinal Newman, was invited to sit with the Revisers; Since a Unitarian was a member of the Committee; Since Revisers of Gnostic tendencies, and Protestants of faulty theological tendencies were in abundance on all Revision Committees, I had a right to quote these all. Moreover, since quotations of fact from the ranks of enemies constitute the highest kind of evidence, I had a right to quote authorities from the class mentioned. Of the four examples given, three refer to the "Dublin Review", of which Cardinal Newman was sometimes editor, and the fourth is from the renowned Canon Farrar, always closely associated with the Revisers. Pray tell us what is questionable about these authorities? p. 173, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

SECTION VII -- GENERAL ARGUMENTS. p. 174, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Sub-chapter I. Answer to General Arguments of my Reviewers. **p. 174, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].**

In the first 60 pages of the document, to which I am now replying, many arguments of a varied nature can be found in Sections I and II. I have endeavored to answer those which constitute a main line. However, there were a number of varied arguments which I shall be obliged to group in a section on general arguments. Of these I have selected those which I think would deserve consideration. There are a few other arguments which I did not think my hearers would consider it worthwhile for me to consume their time in answering. Nevertheless, if they should be called up, or anyone feels they must be noticed, I have an answer for them. Otherwise, I feel that my reply will constitute practically a complete answer to all the counter-arguments of my Reviewers worthy of consideration. p. 174, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

I. *The Parallel Streams of Bibles.* p. 174, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers claim, (Section I, page 9) that the "two parallel streams of Bible" (Our Authorized Bible Vindicated, page 43) is arbitrarily created and does not rest upon historical authority. In my book, however, I proved conclusively that both the Textus Receptus and the

Vaticanus MSS were already in existence in the days of Constantine; rivals to one another and constituting opposing Bibles. I also proved, historically, in the same chapter, that the Waldensian Bible was from the Textus Receptus. Now the Spirit of Prophecy says that the Waldensian Bible was of apostolic origin, uncorrupted, entire, and teaching apostolic Christianity. The Reformation adopted the Textus Receptus; the Jesuit counter-Reformation adopted the Vaticanus. Both these facts I proved soundly and completely in my book. If, therefore, the Textus Receptus and Vaticanus were rivals in the days of Constantine, the Textus Receptus being of apostolic origin, and the Vaticanus being a corruption of the Textus Receptus, then the old Latin Bible of the Waldenses from the Textus Receptus was and we proved it so, historically, the rival of the Vulgate taken from manuscripts of the Vaticanus type. p. 174, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

The Spirit of Prophecy endorses this line of reasoning. I gave in my book, (page 42) that quotation from Sister White which shows that the Waldenses possessed a Bible which came from apostolic days, was entire, was unadulterated and was ever sought by the fury of the papists to be corrupted. The Spirit of Prophecy, however, tells us that angels restrained their malignant hatred and their efforts to bury the Waldensian Bible under a mass of error and superstition. p. 174, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

The Spirit of Prophecy further tells us that the Bible of Wycliffe was from the Latin (Vulgate) and contained many errors, but the Vulgate was a Catholic Bible. On the other hand, the Spirit of Prophecy tells us that the Greek Text of Erasmus corrected these errors, but the Greek text of Erasmus was the Textus Receptus. Therefore, the Waldenses had a pure Bible from the beginning, based on the Textus Receptus or in harmony with it. The reasoning then goes thus: (a) The Waldenses endorsed what was the apostolic Bible; (b) The Reformers endorsed what was the Waldensian Bible; (c) Sister White endorsed the Bible of the Reformation and the Waldensian Bible; (d) the Waldenses could not have guarded the Vulgate because it contained many errors. p. 174, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Note the following testimonies from authorities showing how these two parallel streams rivaled one another at different epochs in history: p. 175, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

1. (a) In the first place Dr. Hort states definitely ("Introduction" pages 137, 138) Jerome's antagonism to Antioch's theology as he (Hort) declares Antioch to be the home of the Textus Receptus in 350 A.D.; and then ("Introduction", page 276) Dr. Hort places in opposition to this (Antioch's) Textus Receptus that text formed from Vaticanus and Sinaiticus types of MSS as being true apostolic text. Here is rivalry and opposition of the two Bibles in Constantine's time. p. 175, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

(b) Dr. Schaff ('Companion' etc. page 113) says the Codex A or Alexandrinus occupies "an intermediate position between the oldest uncial (Vaticanus type) and later cursive (Textus Receptus) text." Here again are the two streams at the earliest dates of their rivalry, Constantine's time. p. 175, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

(c) Dr. Kenyon proves -- as I previously showed -- that the Latin Textus Receptus type with the variant Textus Receptus readings removed. p. 175, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

(d) Dr. Nolan ("Integrity" pages 432, 434) declared that Origen's fabricated Greek Bible (Vaticanus type) tended to weaken the authority of the Authorized Greek Bible (Textus Receptus) in the Old as well as in the New Testament. p. 175, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

(e) And finally Dr. Swete shows that in the days of Constantine the Textus Receptus and the Eusebio-Origen Bible were rivals and opposing versions. He also mentions a third version, the Hosychian, or African Bible. This ceased to be a line of its own, came to an end, and is not represented in modern versions. p. 175, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

2. We proved from Dr. Swete that the old Latin opposed the Vulgate for 1,000 years. p. 175, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

3. We proved from the *preface of the Jesuit Bible* that the Waldensian Bible was the opponent of the Vulgate, the Jesuits called it the "false" heretical translation of the Waldenses, and Sister White says that the Waldenses kept the truth uncorrupted for 1,000 years. p. 175, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

4. We proved that the final split between the Catholics and Protestants came at the Council of Trent (1545-1563).

My Reviewers made no attempt to notice or to answer the first four resolutions of that Council which I gave in my book, decreeing the Vulgate the authoritative Bible of the Papacy. Moreover, to have a Greek Manuscript in which to base authoritatively the Vulgate, the learned fathers of the Council of Trent, after searching through all the libraries of Italy, shrewdly understood the Vaticanus to be the manuscript. p. 175, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

5. Dr. Fulke, when writing to the Queen of England in the preface of his book, just about the very time that the Council of Trent chose the Vaticanus, said: p. 175, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

"In which, that I speak nothing of their insincere purpose, in leaving the *pure fountain* of the original verity, to follow the crooked stream of their barbarous vulgar Latin translation, which (beside all other manifest corruptions) is found defective in more than an hundred places, as your majesty, according to the excellent knowledge in both the tongues wherewith God has bless you, is very well able to judge." (Emphasis mine), page 5. p. 175, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

6. Later in my book I presented the struggle between the Jesuit Bible of 1582 in English, and the Tyndale and Geneva Versions. p. 176, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

7. I presented very clearly the great struggles that were on around the Revision table for ten years between Dr. Hort and Dr. Schrivener, the one standing for the Textus Receptus and the other for the Vaticanus. Of these scenes, Bishop Ellicott, president of the committee says: "It was often a kind of critical duel between Dr. Hort and Dr. Scrivener, in which everything that could be urged on either side was placed before the Company." "Addresses", page 61. p. 176, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

8. And finally, Hastings says: p. 176, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"The *ordinary English student of the Bible is able readily to appreciate the points at issue in the controversy between* the Alpha (Textus Receptus) and Beta (WH) texts, because they are substantially represented to him by the differences (so far as they are differences in text, and not merely in rendering) between the AV and the RV."

"Dictionary of the Bible," page 927. (Emphasis mine). p. 176, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

On the quotation of the eclipse of the sun at the death of Christ, Dr. Frederick Fields says that the manuscripts began to divide on this point at the time of Origen. (Field's Notes, page 79). p. 176, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

I would also recall here that Erasmus divided all Greek manuscripts into two classes; one which agreed with the Textus Receptus and the other which agreed with the Vaticanus. My Reviewers revived the old grouping made by Griesbach, into three classes, but exploded by Archbishop Lawrence. I gave these conclusions in my Book. Everything which the Reviewers brought in counter argument, confirmed, but did not shake these conclusions. p. 176, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

I think now that I have given evidence abundant enough for this short document, and amply backed by authorities to show the two parallel streams of Bibles. p. 176, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

II. *The Theology of the Revisers.* p. 176, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers claim that the theology of the translators has no bearing upon their product. (Section I, page 17). Of course it ought not to. Nevertheless in my book, (page 159) I presented the evidence that there was collusion between Westcott, Hort and Lightfoot to carry through a thorough scheme in utter defiance of the rules of the body which appointed this Revision Committee to the scandal of some of the best members, who left the Committee, and which gave a terrible shock to the Protestant evangelical world at large. I also showed in my book (page 184) that Bishop Ellicott, afterwards Chairman of the Committee, wrote, previous to Revision, that in passages involving doctrinal error that their duty was obvious. Further, I showed that for ten years this committee worked in secret, refusing to take the public at large and scholars of eminent schools into their confidence so that the shocking changes they were making in the Greek New Testament might be thoroughly thrashed out before adoption. p. 176, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

And so I repeatedly showed that they were thus able to make their views heard in the Revision Committee, and to

dominate it. p. 177, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Why do my Reviewers take up some little point which I refer to in my book as Hort's anti-Americanism, and Westcott's spiritualistic tendencies, while they entirely ignore the indisputable evidence that I produced that they not only changed the underlying Greek text and translated the English accordingly, but that they wrote books defending these changes and seeking to permeate Christendom with their doctrines. Are we to ignore their own testimony written for all to read, and overlook the accumulated evidence that they *did* work to change doctrine to suit their own ideas? Why shut our eyes and blindly deny such plain and clear evidence? p. 177, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

In further support of their contention that the theology of translators matters little, my Reviewers bring to view hundreds of modern translations which they say were made by Evangelicals, etc." (Section I, page 18). Pardon me, brethren, but have they produced standard versions, like an English Version to command two hundred million English speaking people; or rather do they not translate for uncivilized primitive peoples like the Barotsi or the Matabeles, or for the people of Borneo? Such translators do not seek to change the original Greek Text; neither are they professional textual critics, who often are dangerous schemers, but are humble devoted Christian missionaries. p. 177, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

III. *That Persecution was a Matter of Texts and Versions.* p. 177, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers state that "It is preposterous to try to make it appear, as the author so strenuously does try, that the resistance to false teaching and the resulting persecution of the Waldenses and millions of other Christians by Rome, was a matter of Greek texts and translations and versions." (Section II, page 4) p. 177, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

In reply to this allegation I will simply say that I quote GREAT CONTROVERSY, pages 65, 66, 69, as follows: p. 177, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"The Waldenses were among the first of the peoples of Europe to obtain a *translation* of the Holy Scriptures. Hundreds of years before the Reformation, they possessed the *Bible in manuscripts* in their native tongue. They had

the truth unadulterated, and *this rendered them the special objects of hatred and persecution...* Here for a thousand years, witnesses for the truth maintained the ancient faith... in a most wonderful manner it (The Word of Truth) was preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness." (Emphasis mine). p. 177, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Notice that this quotation from Sister White is a matter of translations and versions, which she says "rendered them the special objects of hatred and persecution". Is it really necessary for me to defend Sister White among a body of Seventh-Day Adventists? This is all I have to say here on that point. p. 177, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

IV. *That Luther was Converted by the Vulgate.* p. 178, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers endeavor to make a point (Section II, page 4) upon the fact that Luther's "conversion to righteousness came by reading for himself a Catholic Bible in a Catholic Convent while himself yet a Catholic." p. 178, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

I believe that this was accomplished because of the earnest yearnings of Luther for light and because of the Holy Spirit working upon his heart to lead him out from Romanism. He used what light he had, but that is not an endorsement for the Vulgate. This can be seen in the fact that as Luther progressed farther away from Rome he abandoned the Vulgate. p. 178, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

V. *Dr. Riddle's Testimony regarding B and Aleph readings in the ARV.* p. 178, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers offer us a quotation (Section I, pages 19, 20) from Matthew Brown Riddle, D.D., LL.D., taken from his "Story of the Revised New Testament" to the effect (1) that the English Revisers accepted readings of Tregelles as frequently as those of Westcott and Hort; (2) that the partiality of those men for the Codex Vaticanus and of Tischendorf for the Codex Sinaiticus was guarded against. p. 178, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

This testimony means just nothing at all; because Tregelles, was a model and leader for Westcott and Hort. p. 178, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

(1) I have proved before that Tregelles took his inspiration from the Council of Trent, because they, 300 years previously, had resorted to the Old Testament portion of the Vatican manuscript. p. 178, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

(2) Regardless of what Dr. Riddle says of their guarding against a partiality for the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus in *this* portion of his book, he acknowledges in *another* part of the same book that to all intents and purposes the ARV and the ERV are the same. Not only that, but everybody knows that on the great controverted passages between the Textus Receptus on one hand, and the two Catholic MSS on the other, that these two versions are practically the same. p. 178, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Furthermore, Dr. Riddle had a well-known reputation for prejudiced opinions. I have before me now a letter sent to me personally, February 9, 1931 from a scholar in Pittsburg, PA. in which he says: p. 178, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

"I was well acquainted with Dr. Matthew B. Riddle of the Revision Committee. He was so prejudiced in favor of their work that he could scarcely see anything good in the AV." p. 178, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

VI. *Confuse Constructive Textual Criticism with Destructive Higher Criticism.* p. 178, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

In Section I, page 40, my Reviewers say many severe things about me as: p. 178, Para. 12, [ANSWERS].

(a) "There is hopeless confusion of fact, conjecture, and assertion." p. 178, Para. 13, [ANSWERS].

(b) "The volume abounds in illogical conclusions clothed in oratorical garb." p. 178, Para. 14, [ANSWERS].

(c) "The argument is plainly built upon the appeal to religious and denominational prejudice." p. 178, Para. 15, [ANSWERS].

On two pages preceding, under the heading, "A Strangely Related Discovery" the Reviewers also say, p. 179, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"That the ablest Protestant critics and scholars of the

past half-century... have failed to seriously discern the hand of Rome or the bias of Modernism in the Revised Versions is more than passing strange; it is pointedly significant." Section I, pages 38, 39. p. 179, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

The Reviewers seem to have reached the climax of their opposition to my book when they say (d) "constructive textual criticism is confused with destructive higher criticism in unwarranted and fantastic ways." (Section I, page 40). p. 179, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Why do these writers forget that I have either quoted from or called attention to such outstanding textual critics as Dr. J. G. Reiche, Dr. F. C. Cook, Dr. H. C. Hoskier, Dr. Miller, also a secondary writer by the name of Dr. Mauro, who see just as I see, the Origenistic atmosphere of these Revised Versions and some speak very plainly about the hand of Rome and the hand of Modernism. p. 179, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

To answer the last point about confusing lower and higher criticism, I will quote from that outstanding textual critic, Dr. H. C, Hoskier, who wrote in the year 1914 as follows: p. 179, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"Finally, observe that up to the time of Westcott and Hort the 'lower criticism' had kept itself quite apart from so-called 'higher criticism.' *Since the publication of Hort's text, however; and of that of the Revisers, much of the heresy of our time has fallen back upon the supposed results acquired by the 'lower criticism' to bolster up their views.* By a policy of indecision in the matter of the fundamental truths of the Christian religion, truths specifically set forth by its founder, and by a decided policy, on the other hand, of decision in the matter of heresy in the field of lower criticism, the beliefs of many have been shaken not only to their foundations, but they have been offered free scope to play the Marcion and excise whatever appeared extra-ordinary or unintelligible to them. Many, who should have raised their voices against the mischief wrought have sat by in apathy or wilfully fostered these heresies. Or, if not wilfully, they have assumed a faltering attitude which caused their own students to misinterpret their masters' lessons. Thus we have the spectacle of Thompson and Lake saying to Sanday: 'We learned that from you', and Sanday retorting" 'I never

meant to teach you that.' p. 179, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"A man like the Dean of Durham, not content with preaching Christmas sermons at Westminster attacking the Virgin Birth and vapouring in the United States about the close atmosphere of the theological seminaries which he would like to burn to the ground, has now decided to introduce the 'Revised Version' officially into the ancient cathedral of Durham. I am therefore correct in coupling these matters." Hoskier, "Codes B and Its Allies", pages 421, 422, Vol. I. (Emphasis mine) p. 179, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Notice how these facts answer all the objections and complaints raised in the treatment of this question. This is all I have to say on this subject. p. 180, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

VII. *Is This Sacrilege?* p. 180, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers make this strong statement: p. 180, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"The comparison of the blemishes in the AV to the five Scars on the resurrection body of Christ (pages 180, 181) is a travesty upon our divine Sacrifice for sin. And the comparison of the Received Text to the Star of Bethlehem (pages 178, 179) borders perilously on sacrilege!" (Section I, pages 5, 6) p. 180, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Christ is called the Word of God in the first chapter of John; and when he comes in His glory (Revelation 19) He is still called the Word of God. Many reverent writers speak in the same tones of awe and sacred solemnity when referring to the written and the Incarnate Word. When Jesus, in John, Chapter six, commands us to eat Him and shows us how; He says, *"The words* that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." As to my Reviewers statement that "the comparison of the Received Text to the Star of Bethlehem borders perilously on sacrilege, "it appears to me that this adjective applied more appropriately to their denunciation than to the comparison itself. p. 180, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

VIII. *Who Will be the Laughing Stock?* p. 180, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers make this statement; (Section I, page 39) "If

we were to accept denominationally, the unproven assertions in the volume under review... we would become the laughing stock of the reverent Christian scholarship of the world." Perhaps we will be better able to tell who is going to be the laughing stock by securing some competent testimonies as to how things actually are going. Are the reverent, devoted, intelligent, English Christian scholars throughout the world moving toward the Revised Versions and getting away from the Authorized Version, or is it just the contrary? p. 180, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

I will not weary you with further testimonies, of which I have already given an abundance, that the English Revised Version is dead in England. Now let us see which way the trend is going with respect to the American Revised Version. I will now submit three letters received from executive officers of three large Bible Publishing Houses: p. 180, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

(1) February 27, 1931. p. 180, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Dear Sir: p. 180, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Your letter of February 26 is received. p. 180, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

We have no way of calculating on the number of King James Version Bibles sold as compared to the American Revised Bibles. We would say however, that with each recent year the demand for the latter Bible seems to have diminished and consequently we assume that its sale has also been less. p. 180, Para. 12, [ANSWERS].

Very sincerely yours, THE JOHN C. WINSTON COMPANY. (Signed) Charles F. Kint, President. p. 181, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

(2) Dear sir: p. 181, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

We are indeed sorry that we cannot be of assistance in furnishing information regarding the comparative sales of the King James and American Revised Bibles. p. 181, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Sometime ago the writer recalls having seen a statement attributed to the British and Foreign Bible Society, in which was said, that there were about 100 copies of the

Authorized Version sold to every copy of the Revised. p. 181, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Regretting that we cannot furnish you with more detailed information, Yours very truly, OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, New York, William Krause, March 2, 1931. p. 181, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

(3) Dear Sir: p. 181, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

In response to your letter of February 26th, we do not know how many actually are sold. We should estimate that King James version is one hundred to one of the Revised Version or even greater proportion than that. p. 181, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

The Revised Version we would estimate would not exceed 50,000 copies a year and receding in sales from that figure. The Gideon Societies do not use it at all. Very truly yours, A. J. Holman Company. p. 181, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

From the foregoing information you can see that The Revised Version is constantly decreasing in sales in spite of the tremendous efforts that are being made to promote it. While on the other hand the AV is being sold, generally estimated, at the rate of 100 to 1. We have further testimony to the effect that the report of the British Bible Society for the year 1911 showed that the proportion between the sales of the two was 25 to 1, while in 1920 it was at the rate of 50 to 1. (See Mauro, "Which Version", pages 117, 118) The above letters show that in 1930 the proportion had reached 100 to 1. p. 181, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

A letter was written, presumably by my Reviewers, to Hugh S. Magill, general secretary of the International Council of Religious Education, which held the copyright of the ARV. (Section I, 39) to inquire on two counts; whether the ARV was born under "modernistic influence' or "Catholic bias:. Why did they not write to the Vatican to find out if the papacy was born under paganism; or why did they not write to the National Brewery Association to find out if drinking is harmful? Did my Reviewers expect that the secretary would reply saying that he deeply deplored that these two elements were discernable in the ARV? What kind of testimony is this to submit in defense? p. 182, Para.

1, [ANSWERS].

I *also* have some correspondence to submit along this line. A prominent clergyman in another denomination had read my book. He is General Sunday-school Secretary of a large Protestant denomination and editor of their Sunday-school literature. This prominent Protestant leader wrote me, July 28, 1930 *without any solicitation on my part,* as follows: p. 182, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"I presume that you are aware of the fact that the American Revised Version has been secured by the International Council of Religious Education, with all rights to publish and make further Revision. p. 182, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

As you are doubtless aware, the International council of Religious Education is quite largely in the hands of modernists. What will they finally make of the ARV?" p. 182, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

I received subsequently another letter from this same man in which he gave detailed information to show how this same association was working to permeate the Protestant churches of North America with modernists programs, with modernistic literature and modernistic influence. He writes me thus: p. 182, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"I found your book of great interest and highly satisfactory." p. 182, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Let us now come back to Hugh S. Magill. I also have a copy of a letter in my possession, written by Hugh S. Magill, to a member of the General Conference Committee, March 6, 1931, He writes thus: p. 182, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"We received today your letter of March 5th in which you state you have been in correspondence with Thomas Nelson and Sons, publishers of the American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible, and that you would like to have further information regarding the American Standard Bible Committee appointed by the International Council to have charge of the further revision of this edition of the Bible. p. 182, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

"This committee is now working on this undertaking and using the American Standard Version as the basis. It is

agreed that the Revised edition shall not be published before 1934. The reason for the revision is because of the new discoveries that have been made and the results of investigations since the publication of the American Standard Bible Committee." p. 182, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Appended to this communication is a list of the members of the Committee who are working to revise the Revised. Both the Old and New Testament sections contain the names of university professors well known to us all, and whose reputations for modernism are well known; such as, Dr. James Moffatt, Union Theological Seminary, Dr. J. M. Powis Smith, University of Chicago, and Dr. Edgar J. Godspeed, the University of Chicago. How does this comport with the Reviewers' statement that if they were to adopt the idea that the ARV is under modernistic influence we would become the laughing stock of the reverent Christian scholarship of the world? Certainly they cannot be unaware of the fact that Princeton University has gone modernistic; do they refer to its Christian scholarship? And surely they must know that the Union Theological Seminary of New York, and Chicago University, and Harvard University have long ago become ultra-modernistic. Is this the Christian scholarship to which they refer? If so; then Seventh-day Adventists have long ago been a laughing stock to these people. But is there a great possibility on the other side; that if we take a firm stand on the AV and against all versions tainted with and connected with modernistic influences, we will gain the confidence and respect of a great reverent scholarship that is found in other connections than with these modernistic theological schools, who endorse the ARV and who are furnishing the scholarship to further revise it in modernistic lines? If we are going to raise the question of becoming a laughing stock, it is necessary to inquire in the eyes of what kind of organizations do we feel we shall become a laughing stock. p. 183, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

On the other hand, with regard to my book being a laughing stock, I have received a great many letters from devout and reverent Christian workers, thanking God for the blessing it has been to them, and many of them testify that it has confirmed their faith in the Bible. Some of these letters are from men who are known to be prominent scholars in the theological field and no one could accuse them of being anything but reverent and devout Christian scholars. Of course I do not intend to make these letters public. Because I have authoritative information that the writers

have, in certain instances, become the recipient of embarrassing correspondence. But if any one questions the truth of the letters, I will be glad to show those to Elder Watson so that he can testify that I have told the truth. (At this point Elder Wilkinson read extracts from some letters from outside the denomination.) p. 183, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Right here it is interesting to note that Dr. Frederick Field. a member of the English O.T. Revision Committee and famous for a life-long work in the Greek O.T. to Philip Schaff pronouncing the Revised Version a failure. (Dr. Schaff's "Companion', page IX). p. 183, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Sub-Chapter II. *Discredit Cast upon Erasmus.* p. 184, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers claim (Section I, page 42) that my book will be justly construed as an attack upon the Bible itself. How can anyone read my book and not see that I am endeavoring to defend the Bible itself? The Bible of the Protestant nations for three hundred years, unquestionably accepted by this denomination, used by our pioneers in constructing the framework of this message. My book was written with one purpose, and one purpose only to establish faith in the true Word of God, preserved for us from apostolic times, intrinsically uncorrupted. p. 184, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

On the other hand, let us consider some of the statements made in this review and see whether this charge of attacking the Bible should not fall on other shoulders than mine. Let us consider some of the things my Reviewers have said about Erasmus: p. 184, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"Complete, and better attested MSS, and many more in number, that have come to light and been critically studied by a large number of expert scholars since the one man, Erasmus made up his hasty text from a few MSS under pressure of competition with another printer than his employer, but which the author calls 'a pure Greek Text.'" (Summary, page 2) p. 184, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Yet Sister White has held Erasmus up to us as an instrument in the hands of God to do a great and wonderful work. She says: p. 184, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"In 1516, a year before the appearance of Luther's theses, Erasmus had published his Greek and Latin version of the New Testament. Now for the first time the Word of God has been printed in the original tongue. In this work many errors of former versions were corrected, and the sense more clearly rendered. *It led many among the educated classes to a better knowledge of the truth, and gave a new impetus to the work of reform...* p. 184, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"A diligent student and an earnest seeker for truth, he (Tyndale) had received the gospel from the Greek Testament of Erasmus." "Great Controversy", page 245. (Italics mine.) p. 184, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

But what do my Reviewers say? Here are their words: p. 184, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

"5778 improvements were made by the whole (Revision) committee in order to correct the *many glaring defects* of Erasmus' hastily assembled text, so obsequiously followed by Stephens and the Elzevirs in later editions." III Summary, 7. (Emphasis mine) p. 184, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Surely Stephens, the Elzevirs and Beza, one working in England, another on the continent and the third in Geneva, years later, must have been strangely deficient in scholarship not to notice Erasmus' glaring defects. Surely 350 years of Protestant scholarship down to 1881 must have been nothing but continued stupidity to accept all that time Erasmus' *glaring defects.* p. 184, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

In view of the misrepresentations continually pouring from the modernistic presses against Erasmus, the Received Text and the AV, I think it is a good thing for the public to have a book which will answer these misrepresentations and give them facts. p. 185, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

When the time would come for the third angel's message to be given in its greatest power -- then, Sister White declares: "The stealthy, but rapid growth of the papal power all will be unmasked." "Great Controversy", page 606. p. 185, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Sub-Chapter III. *They Discredit the Spirit of Prophecy.* p. 185, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

My Reviewers agree with or defend the Revisers, and higher critics and textual critics against Sister White on more than 30 scripture passages, considered in my book: p. 185, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

(1) Matt. 6:13, The Lord's Prayer. (2) Matt. 5:44, Praying for enemies. (3) Luke 4:8, Get thee behind me Satan. (4) Luke 11:2-4, Secondary account of Lord's Prayer. (5) Rom. 5:1 (margin), Let us have peace. (6) 1 Cor. 5:7, For us. (7) Col. 1:14, His blood. (8) 1 Tim. 3:16, God manifest in the flesh. (9) 2 Tim. 4:1, His appearing and Kingdom. (10) Rev. 22:14, Blessed are they that do His commandments. (11) John 2:11, Beginning of miracles. (12) Matt. 18:2, 3, Conversion. (13) Heb. 11:3, The worlds were framed (margin). (14) Col. 1:15, 16, In Him or by Him. (15) Acts 24:15, The resurrection. (16) Matt. 24:3, The second coming (margin) of Christ. (17) Titus 2:13, The glorious appearing. (18) Rev. 1:7, Shall wail because of Him. (19) Acts 3:19, Times of Refreshing. (20) Mark. 16:9-20, The last twelve verses of Mark. (21) Matt. 17:21, Fasting. (22) John 8:1-11, Woman taken in adultery. (23) Luke 9:55, 56, What manner of spirit. (24) Acts 8:37, The Eunuch's confession. (25) Rev. 13:10, on captivity. (26) 1 Cor. 11:29, The Lord's Supper. (27) James 5:16, Confess your faults. (28) Heb. 10:21, A high priest. (29) 1 Cor. 15:3, 4, He rose again. (30) Matt. 27:46, A great crises of Christian life. (31) 1 Cor. 11:24, My body which is broken. p. 185, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Is it not astonishing how often the Revised Version disagrees with Sister White even in the limited number of texts considered in my book; and still more astonishing that my Reviewers agreed with the Revisers and defended them and disagreed with the Spirit of Prophecy. p. 185, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Sub-Chapter IV. *How This Review Treats the AV and the ARV.* p. 185, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

I have heard that the Minority Quorum of the General Conference has passed a vote to the effect that "they recognized the equal value of the Authorized and the American Revised Version". In the light of this fact I wish to bring into relief some statements found in this document of the Reviewers which was written, I believe, by some member of the Minority Committee. To my mind they do NOT

express an equal appreciation of these two versions. Please listen: p. 185, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

(Against AV) The many glaring defect of Erasmus' hastily assembled text, so obsequiously followed the Stephens and the Elzevirs in later editions. III-Sum. 7. p. 186, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

(For RV) "Those English divines (Westcott and Hort) are considered by many scholars as the highest and latest authority on the Greek text." I-8 (Quotation) p. 186, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

(Against AV) That the Received Text is the pure, uncorrupted, apostolic scripture transmitted without substantial change through the centuries is clearly overthrown. I-42. p. 186, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

(For RV) "This Vatican manuscript is considered by a great many scholars to be the best of all the New Testament manuscripts. The Sinaitic and the Vatican are here, from the standpoint of the history of the text as thus far known, by far the two best witnesses for the oldest text... If the given view be correct, they represent not the current, rewrought, worked over manuscripts of the second century, but such as retained in and eminent degree the text which has come to that century from the hands of the original writers." (Quotation) II-13. p. 186, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

(Against AV) There is no historical proof that any Greek text was more definitely influenced by Catholic hands, a Catholic version, and Catholic approval than was that of Erasmus, yet the text of Erasmus was the basis of what has since been called the Textus Receptus, which the author lauds so highly as a pure, uncorrupted text. III-6-6. p. 186, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

(For RV) "If B and S agree there is usually strong evidence for the genuineness of a reading; if it is supported by ante-Nicene testimony it is conclusive. Such concurrent testimony gives us the most ancient readings, that may be traced to within a century of the time when the original autographs were penned." (Quotation) II-12. p. 186, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

(Against AV) "The edition of Erasmus consequently has

little critical value." (Quotations) II-9. p. 186, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

(For RV) "It will be seen that the Greek text underlying the Revised Version has very strong claims on our acceptance." (Quotations) I-10. p. 186, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

(Against AV) "If however, some of the personal views of the committee of 1611 were disclosed, what a contrast might appear to the extravagant eulogium of the members of this committee by the author! I-18. p. 187, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

(For RV) "B gives us as does S, (Sinaiticus)'the simplest, shortest and concisest text.' The charge that many important words are omitted is imaginary, say Westcott and Hort, (page 557)." (Quotation) II-12. p. 187, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

(Against AV) "And the general result of these generations of study is to show that the text used by the translators of 1611 is far from perfect." (Quotation) I-10. p. 187, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

(For RV) "Vatican MS unquestionably superior in accuracy and authenticity. (A quotation is given to prove that the Vatican MS is superior.) 11-13. p. 187, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

(Against AV) "Such was the fourth edition of Erasmus, the mother-edition of the Textus Receptus and of our own Authorized Version. It was based, as we have seen, on scanty evidence and late manuscripts." (Quotation) II-9. p. 187, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

(For RV) The ARV shows its fidelity to authenticated texts and its freedom from the charge of mutilation. III-6-6. p. 187, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

(Against AV) "The version of 1611 was made from a Greek text formed by a comparison of very few manuscripts, and those, for the most part, late. The version of 1881, on the other hand, was made from a Greek text based upon an exhaustive examination, extending over some two centuries, of all the best manuscripts in existence." (Quotation) I-10. p. 187, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

(For RV) Complete and better attested MSS and many more in number, that have come to light and been critically studied by a large number of expert scholars since the one man, Erasmus, made up his hasty text from a few MSS under pressure of competition with another printer than his employer, but which the author calls "a pure Greek text." Sum. 2. p. 187, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

(Against AV) The faulty character of the Textus Receptus. I-38. p. 187, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

(For RV) "Scholars in general believe B (The Vatican Manuscript) to be the chief evidence for the most ancient form of the New Testament text, and it is clear that the Revisers of our English Bible attached the greatest weight to its authority." (Quotation) 1-21. p. 188, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

(Against AV) 1611 manuscripts of late date and few in number. (Followed by quotation to that effect.) II-18. p. 188, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

For RV) These noted MSS (The Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) I-27. The Vatican MS equal to the best. II-11. Vatican MS on the whole the best and oldest. II-12. Vatican MS most valuable of all. II-12. p. 188, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

(Against AV) "The early uncritical editions." (Quotation) II-5. p. 188, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

(For RV) "Vatican MS most ancient and of incalculable value. "Codes Vaticanus. This is regarded as probably the most ancient of all the Greek MSS now known to exist." (Quotation) II-13. He fails to inform his readers that the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus MSS are listed as first and third among the major MSS by all scholars up to date. p. 188, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

(Against AV) Science of textual criticism sprung up since 1611. "He (the reader) will have seen also (to recapitulate here for greater clearness) (1) that in the present day we have access to a treasury of ancient manuscripts, versions and quotations such as the scholars of King James day had never dreamed of; (2) that the science of textual criticism which teaches the value and the best methods of dealing with these documents, has entirely sprung up since: (3) that our scholars are better acquainted with the sacred

languages, and able to distinguish delicate shades of meaning which were quite lost on their predecessors; and (4) lastly, that owing to the natural growth of the English language itself many words in the Authorized Version have become obsolete, and several have completely changed their meaning during the past 300 years." (Quotations) II-19. p. 188, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

(For RV) The Sinaiticus and Vaticanus respectively, are the two oldest MSS among all that have been collected by scholars over the centuries. III-6-5. p. 189, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

(Against AV) Obvious errors in AV. III-Sum.-4. p. 189, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

(For RV) More literal renderings, and greater fidelity to authenticated Greek MSS. Conclusion-7. p. 189, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

In the light of the foregoing statements it is clearly evident that the writers of this document endeavored continually to cast discredit on the AV and its underlying Greek N.T. and to exalt the ARV and its underlying Greek N.T. p. 189, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

In fact it is perfectly clear to all of you, I think, that the Reviewers were not seeking equality for the AV and the ARV, but supremacy for the ARV. In fact so great was their bias for the ARV that all their argument for the Revised and all of their disparagement of the AV was in their own estimation *appreciation* for the Revised; whereas my argument for the AV and disparagement of the ARV was in their estimation *attack;* in fact, "attack upon the Word itself". How can any one explain that what they have done is *appreciation;* but what I have done is *attack?* p. 189, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Sub-Chapter V. *That I discredit all Versions.* p. 189, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Who is it that is discrediting all Versions? A very peculiar charge has been made against me that my treatment of the Versions discredits all Versions. This charge has been made from time to time, and from various sources. Let us examine the facts, and be absolutely fair to one another. p. 189, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

First, the Authorized Version is in general usage among all Protestant peoples, as well as among Seventh-day Adventists, to the extent of about 99%. p. 189, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Now it must be evident that my book shows the source and authorities which stand out pre-eminently in the establishment of the Authorized Version as the authoritative Word of God. Therefore, its influence must be to confirm the faith of 99% out of 100%. I would very much regret to think that it would unsettle the faith of even the remaining one per cent in the true Word of God. But the most peculiar thing about the whole charge is, that when I establish the authoritative foundations of the Authorized Version and showed the origin of the Revised Version, I am held up as unsettling the faith of the people in the Word of God. p. 189, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

But when the devotees of the Revised Version exalt the Revised Version and point out the inferiority of the Authorized Version, derived from faulty and inferior MSS, its Textus Receptus containing glaring defects, 120,000 errors, etc. they seem not to be able to see that this would tend to unsettle the faith of 99% of all the people in the Word of God just as truly and really and actually and fully as mine could unsettle the faith of the one per cent. Is there anyone who cannot see the unreasonableness and unfairness of the charge about my unsettling the faith of the people in the Word of God, in view of the foregoing facts I have stated. p. 189, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Sub-Chapter VI -- *Who is it Who Thrusts Intolerable Odium?* p. 190, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

I wish to bring some more expressions from my Reviewers' document into relief at this point, and ask you to consider whether these expressions represent a Christian and brotherly spirit. p. 190, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"Hidden identity of printer" I-1 -- "Unauthorized character of this volume" I-1 -- "Violates primal laws of evidence" I-1 -- "Unwarranted impressions" I-4 -- "Unsound and unscholarly procedure" I-4 -- "Unnecessary issue is distressing indeed" I-5 --"Borders perilously on sacrilege" I-6 -- "Intolerable odium" I-6 -- "Utter unsoundness of this argument" I-12 -- "Unfair and untrustworthy criticism"

I-17 -- "Appeal to religious prejudice" I-17 -- "Unworthy of a fair, Christian scholar" I-17 -- "Strained quotations" I-17 -- "An unfair deduction" I-17 -- "As silly" I-19 -- "A distinct bias" I-21 -- "Unreliable character of the work the more deplorable" I-21 -- "Specious and unwarranted positions" I-21 --"Prejudged his case before looking for his testimony" I-21 -- "Misuse of authorities" I-24 --"It is perverted use of authority? I-24 -- "Another glaring exhibition" I-24 -- "Has perverted in a threefold manner" I-26 -- "His efforts to slur" I-29 -- "Misquotation of authorities" I-28 -- "A flagrant example" I-28 -- "Using in an absolutely unwarranted way" I-30 -- "As striking a perversion of an authority as is found in this book" I-30 -- "Inaccuracies and misstatements that abound" I-30 -- Utterly contrary to the patent facts" I-33 -- "A grandiloquent style to dazzle and impress forgetting that assertion of inference is not proof." I-40 -- "The Volume abounds in illogical conclusions clothed in oratorical garb." I-40 -- "Constructive textual criticism is confused with destructive higher criticism in unwarranted and fantastic ways." I-40 -- "Uncompromising position of author" I-38 -- "Hopeless confusion of fact, conjecture and assertion". I-40 -- "In many places the argument is plainly built upon an appeal to religious and denominational prejudice rather than upon solid facts or a legitimate appeal to reason". I-40 -- "Operating principles are not sound." I-40. p. 190, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

"Intensified study of this character can easily become an obsession" I-40 -- "Perverted to support such claims" I-40 -- "Systematic misuse of evidence by the author" I-41 -- "Constantly violates primal laws of evidence in his misuse of authorities" I-41 -- "Unjustifiable aspersions" I-41 -- "Gross misrepresentation" I-41 -- "Frequent misuse and misquotation of authorities are exposed" I-41 -- "Misstatements of the author exposed" I-42 -- "Unfair allegation... masked" I-42 -- "Basically fallacious argument' I-42 -- "Fallacy of the author's unreasonable contention" II-4 -- "Preposterous" II-4 -- "Rest wholly upon his own unsupported authority" II-6 -- "A slurring manner" II-11 -- "Appeal to religious prejudiced" II-11 -- "Unsupported assertions" II-11 -- "A prejudiced view" II-14 -- "No basis worthy of confidence" II-14 -- "It is nothing short of amazing to find the one who apparently feels competent to enter the field of Biblical criticism" II-14 -- "Includes only a part of the sentence or paragraph that suits his one-sided argument" II-16 -- "Statements are all

entirely unwarranted" II-18 -- "Unfairest methods" III-6-2 -- "Far-fetched inferences" III-6-3 -- "Quotations from questionable sources and of questionable kind" III-6-3 -- "Strained interpretation" III-6-3 -- "Wanders off into a digression on limbo and purgatory" III-6-3 -- "Seem utter folly in the light of the original forms used in the text" III-12 -- "But goes off on another tirade on revision changes in general, and theological views concerning them." III-12-12 -- "Labored contention of the entire book" III-Sum.-3 -- "He employs unfair and illogical methods of weighing evidence such as these: He prejudges his case before he tries it. He draws material from a number of authorities without any standing in textual or historical criticism" Conclusion-2 -- "Draws frequently unwarranted and illogical conclusions." Conclusions-3 -- "Strained interpretations" Conclusion-3 -- "When it serves his purpose he disregards an alternative reading or an informative note in the margin" Conclusion-7 -- "Our laity should be protected from such imposition" I-6 -- "Untrustworthy manipulation" I-21 -- "Such deliberate perversion of fact is without excuse, and could only be made through gross carelessness, or under the pressure of the need of further authority to establish the claims of the author concerning the Received Text? I-29. p. 191, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

In the light of the accusations made against me by my Reviewers that I was "casting odium," and in view of this formidable list of things they said, may I humbly inquire who is casting odium? Do you brethren approve of this list of epithets, as representing the style of literary writing employed by members of the General Conference Minority Committee? p. 191, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Sub-Chapter VII. *Starting with Distinct Bias.* p. 192, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

I admit that I started out to write my book with a bias, a Christian bias, a Protestant bias, a Seventh-day Adventist bias. My Reviewers, professedly starting with no bias, arrive at conclusions at variance with the Spirit of Prophecy, and admit the doubtful authority, even spuriousness of text quoted by Sister White. p. 192, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

How far would a Seventh-day Adventist get in browsing around among all the modern theories of evolution if he did

not have a distinct bias to start with? My Reviewers apparently unhampered by any bias of any kind have cast their lot among modern textual critics and there they seem bound to stay. They have already been led astoundingly far afield. How much farther they are willing to go we can only conjecture. p. 192, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

We will soon have a new revision of the Revised Version by modern textual scholars. We will soon have a new version of the Vulgate issued from the Vatican made by the greatest intellectual scholars that the wealth of the Roman Catholic Church can get together. My unbiased Reviewers will no doubt be consistent and accept these latest products of the best modern scholars. I believe with all my heart that we have now a translation of the Bible that was given us by men of unequalled scholarship led by the Spirit of God in their work, at the time when the world movement of reform was starting. This Bible as a whole has been attested to by the Spirit of Prophecy. I accept it as my supreme authority. I am not waiting for the latest product of modern textual criticism to come along to give me another version by which I can revise my faith. My faith is founded and grounded on the Textus Receptus, the Authorized Bible. All true Adventists will finally have to take it as their anchor or be buffeted about by doubts and questions unavoidably confronted in these products of modern textual criticism that threaten to destroy faith. p. 192, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Sub-Chapter VIII. *Discrediting the Waldenses.* p. 192, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

I quote from the document of the Revisers, Section I, pages 16, 17: p. 192, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"The claim of the author is that the Waldenses had a pure text of the Bible, transmitted direct to them from Palestine, and that this text was the foundation of the Textus Receptus. But the testimony here submitted shows that the Waldensian Bible was in all likelihood a revision of the Old Latin text originating in northern Africa, and that it was doubtless the last revision of the Old Latin text previous to, and leading up to the Vulgate, and that the Bible of the Waldenses was the Vulgate itself. Therefore the effort to establish the claim that the Waldensian Church possessed manuscripts directly descended from the apostolic originals, collapses. Neither Mr. Nolan

in 1815, nor the author of the book under review in 1930, is able to convince any textual critic that this claim is a sound one. But when this claim is overthrown, the very foundation of the book under review is removed, and the conclusions which are based upon it are rendered untenable." (Emphasis mine) p. 192, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

I accept this challenge. It is a question of authority, textual critics or the Spirit of Prophecy. My Reviewers seem to accept the assertions of higher critics rather than the positive statements of the Spirit of Prophecy, in the chapter on the Waldenses in GREAT CONTROVERSY. We must all make our choice. I quote from the statements of the Spirit of Prophecy, p. 193, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"The faith which for many centuries was held and taught by the Waldensian Christians, was in marked contrast to the false doctrines put forth from Rome. Their religious belief was founded upon the *written word of God,* the true system of Christianity... Theirs was not a faith newly received. Their religious belief was their inheritance from their fathers. They contended for the faith of the apostolic church.... 'the faith that was once delivered unto the saints.' p. 193, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

"'The church in the wilderness,' and not the proud hierarchy enthroned in the world's great capital was the true church of Christ, the guardian of the treasures of truth, which God has committed to his people to be given to the world." Mrs. E. G. White, "Great Controversy," page 64. (Emphasis mine) p. 193, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

They had the true apostolic faith. They possessed the genuine word of God. Jesus said to his disciples, "The flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." John 6:55, 63. I claimed for the Waldenses a pure apostolic Bible, not one received from Rome. So did Sister White. My Reviewers say that the claim collapses. On the other hand they claim that the Waldenses had only the Vulgate, the Bible of Rome. (See quotation heading Section I, page 16) p. 193, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

To the Waldenses, Sister White says, were committed the treasures of truth. They did not preserve the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus; nor substantially their equivalents; therefore the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are not the treasures of

Truth. Moreover if the Church fled into the wilderness to preserve the Word of Truth surely the power pursuing her, Rome, was not, as her authority, guarding the Word. p. 193, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

I will quote again from "Great Controversy": p. 193, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"Behind the lofty bulwarks of the mountains... the Waldenses found a hiding place. Here the light of truth was kept burning amid the darkness of the Middle Ages. Here, for 1,000 years witnesses for the truth maintained the ancient faith." pages 65, 66. p. 193, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

"Hundreds of years before the Reformation, they possessed the Bible in manuscript in their native tongue. They had the truth UNADULTERATED." "Great Controversy", page 65 (Emphasis mine) p. 193, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Isaiah the Prophet promised the perpetual preservation of the Word. He said: p. 194, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"And the Redeemer shall come to Zion... As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in they mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and forever." Isa. 59:20-21. p. 194, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

God promised that his Word would not be taken from His people down to the very end of time. The miracle of preservation of the Word of God is as great as the miracle of its inspiration. "The word of the Lord endureth forever." (1 Peter 1:25). "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." (Matt. 24:35). p. 194, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

This promise that God would preserve his Word perfect and uncorrupted was fulfilled as we have seen by the Waldenses. Here are the words of the Holy Spirit as given in GREAT CONTROVERSY: p. 194, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

"Satan had urged on the papal priests and prelates to bury the Word of truth beneath the rubbish of error, heresy, and superstition but in a most wonderful manner it was preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness. It

bore not the stamp of man, but the impress of God. Men have been unwearied in their efforts to obscure the plain, simple meaning of the Scriptures, and to make them contradict their own testimony; but like the ark on the billowy deep, the word of God outrides the storms that threaten it with destruction." page 69. p. 194, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

"They were employed also in copying the scriptures. SOME MANUSCRIPTS CONTAINED THE WHOLE BIBLE." Idem, page 68. p. 194, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

From apostolic times, by the Waldenses and their ancestors, the word of God *UNADULTERATED, UNCORRUPTED* was handed down to the reformers and on to the church that keeps the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ. (Rev. 12:17). p. 194, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

What was the use of Sister White writing all these astounding descriptions, if, the papacy had the true Bible? What point is there in that which she says, if the anti-Christ had the same Bible as the Waldenses, and if all Bibles were alike wherever found? These clear statements of the Spirit of God above all the writings of textual critics must settle the question of the true Word of God with those who believe in the third angel's message. p. 194, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

In disagreement with these prophecies of the Bible and the positive statements of the Spirit of Prophecy, recording their fulfillment, the Reviewers say, p. 194, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

"The effort to establish the claim that the Waldensian church possessed manuscripts directly descended from the apostolic originals, collapses. Neither Mr. Nolan in 1215, nor the author of the book under review in 1930, is able to convince any textual critic that this claim is a sound one." (Section I, page 17) p. 194, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Thus do my Reviewers build upon the drifting sands of textual criticism, rather than upon the testimony of God's servant. They choose the opinions of critics in disagreement with the Word of God, which shall endure, though heaven and earth pass away, and in disagreement with the words of God's prophet for the remnant church. I cannot believe that the Minority Committee or the officers of the

General Conference will choose to stand with my Reviewers in disagreement with the Spirit of Prophecy. The reviewers further state: p. 195, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

"When this claim (viz. that the Waldenses preserved the word of God uncorrupted) is overthrown, the very foundation of the book under review is removed and the conclusions which are based upon it are rendered untenable." (Section I, page 17) p. 195, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Then if the Waldenses, the church in the Wilderness, did not preserve manuscripts directly descended from the apostolic originals", either the Church of Rome preserved them, or there were none. p. 195, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

But this claim cannot be overthrown as long as the Spirit of God is authority. I am perfectly willing that my book should stand or fall with the Spirit of Prophecy. But I am startled beyond measure that my Reviewers should so openly and directly contradict the inspired statements of the prophet of God who has never taught out of harmony with the words of the Bible, or the facts of history. p. 195, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

My book is in harmony with the statements of the Spirit of Prophecy and brings forward this textual and historical proof to support this position and strengthen our faith in God's Word and the Spirit of Prophecy. p. 195, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

The position of the Reviewers can never be reconciled with the statements of Sister White who says that the Waldenses had the doctrine of the apostles and the manuscripts of the word of God uncorrupted. Her statement they claim is overthrown. What do my Reviewers intend by this logic? Has the Spirit of Prophecy passed away as authority in this denomination? Is this the ground upon which they oppose my book? p. 195, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

We must either deny the inspiration of the Prophet appointed by the Lord for the church of this day and message; that the Waldenses were the guardian of the true Word of God, or deny the claims of my Reviewers that the best manuscripts came to us through the Roman Catholic Church. p. 195, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

My brethren, contemplate the centuries of awful suffering

endured by the Waldenses, that the Word of God might live. For this, they were faithful unto death. Alone in the wilderness, on the island, surrounded by a furious sea of hate and persecution, they suffered that they might pass on to us their testimony in favor of their sacrifice, their sufferings and their privations. Shall we be ungrateful to them for what they did? Shall we allow their memory to pale and wane before glorious tributes paid to the power which made them suffer? My brethren, we must stand by the Waldenses. p. 195, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

CONCLUSION. p. 196, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

1. This document to which I am replying is not a "review" as the title claims, but an attack on the Authorized Version and a plea for the Revised Version. p. 196, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

2. The reviewers failed in this document to notice, much less to justify the apostate, Romanizing, and Unitarian character of Westcott and Hort, as presented in my book. p. 196, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

3. They likewise failed even to notice, much less to answer, the grave charges my book brought against Philip Schaff, President of both American theological colleges. p. 196, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

4. Their document, likewise, ignored and failed to meet the argument drawn from the Oxford movement which Jesuitized England, revised her Protestant prayer book and articles of faith, and created the men and measures which could produce the Revised Version. p. 196, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

5. They failed to notice, much less to answer my argument drawn from the fact that five great churches which never bowed the knee to Rome -- the Celtic, the Gallic and Italic, the Syriac and Byzantine early possessed a Bible of the Textus Receptus type. p. 196, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

6. They failed to notice or to meet the arguments drawn from the Council of Trent, which voted as its first four articles: (1) Putting the Vulgate on its feet; (2) Establishing the Apocryphal books; (3) Establishing tradition, and (4) Taking the interpretation of the Bible out of the hands of the laity; all of which split the world

into Protestantism and Catholicism. p. 196, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

They failed to meet the indisputable testimony which I brought forth from Catholic scholars, that in the Revised Version were restored the Catholic readings denounced in Reformation and post-Reformation times. p. 196, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

7. They made no attempt to handle the argument drawn from the chapter, "The Reformers Reject the Bible of the Papacy." p. 196, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

8. They failed completely to meet, or even to notice, the tremendous argument drawn from the great struggle over the Jesuit Bible of 1582. p. 196, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

9. They failed to notice, much less to answer the tremendous argument drawn from my chapter which gave the history of the men, the documents and the methods under which the Authorized Version was born. p. 196, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

10. They paid absolutely no attention to my chapter. "Three Hundred Years of Attack on the King James Version", which showed the monumental work done by Jesuits, higher critics, and pantheistic German scholars in undermining the inspired evidences laid by the prophets of God for His divine Word, which evidences lead all men to see that the miracle of inspiration. These higher critics substituted for these evidences their subtle, pantheistic, Romanizing, Unitarianistic figments of imagination under the dignified title of critical intuition. p. 196, Para. 12, [ANSWERS].

11. When my book found that the text of the Revised Version was wrong in the margin they fell back on the manuscripts; when they could find no refuge in the manuscripts they plead parallel passages in other places; when there was no help in parallel passages, they sought refuge in tearing up the established usage of words, they resorted to theological argument. p. 197, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

12. They failed in their argument on MSS because they grouped together two thousand noble cursives as one witness and called them the Textus Receptus, even though they ranged over a thousand years, representing many different

countries and representing many different churches. p. 197, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

13. In this reply I have completely vindicated myself from the severe charge brought by the review of "untrustworthy manipulation"... "deliberate perversion of facts", "splitting sentences", and other like charges. I have shown that these accusations were based largely on my reviewers mistakes. p. 197, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

14. In section 11 I sustained the MSS on which the Textus Receptus was based against the unjust charges of being late, faulty and unreliable. I brought the testimony of even the *Revisers* that it was as ancient as any other text, and represented by thousands of manuscripts. I vindicated Erasmus from the charge of being a Catholic, subservient to the papacy and of bringing out a Catholic text. These charges were made in the face of the Spirit of Prophecy, crediting him with (1) correcting errors or former versions; (2) of giving a great impetus to the work of reform and (3) of completing through Tyndale the work of giving the Bible in England. p. 197, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

15. On the other hand my reviewers failed to show why the world in general and our people in particular should not have at least one book which tells them the real truth against the misrepresentations appearing everywhere, cast upon Erasmus, upon the Authorized Version and upon the Waldenses. p. 197, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

16. In Section V, I vindicated the AV against the charge that it was out of date because it was not based upon the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS. I prove these MSS to be corrupt documents and would render questionable a version based upon them. p. 197, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

17. My reviewers failed to prove why God, as their arguments indicate, left his people fifteen hundred years or more exposed to that faulty Textus Receptus (As they say) until the excellencies of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus were revealed; the one through the courtesy of the pope, the other through the courtesy of a Catholic convent. p. 197, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

18. My reviewers did not tell why we should endorse the most marked and deplorable departures of the Revised Greek N.T. from the Textus Receptus, when those were supported by

less than one per cent of all available witnesses. p. 197, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

19. In section III, I cleared the Waldenses from the charges that they did not possess manuscripts directly descended from the apostolic originals. My Reviewers denied this fact notwithstanding the opposite statements of the Spirit of Prophecy, and other authorities. p. 198, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

20. In section IV, I vindicated my book and my conclusions as being in harmony with the Spirit of Prophecy, which according to the Index, makes 15,117 references to the Bible. Of these, more than ninety-five out of every one hundred are from the Authorized Version. On the other hand Sister White endorsed over thirty of the AV texts considered in my book, but which were changed or omitted in the Revised Version. These changes were endorsed by my reviewers, placing themselves here, with the textual critics against Sr. White. p. 198, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

21. They failed to show how my book could have any detrimental influence, since it represents the position of Sister White and fundamentalists in general, and the vast majority of the lay members of this denomination. p. 198, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

22. In section VI, I vindicated the sacred origin given to words when Tyndale, as Sr. White says, was impelled by the Spirit of God to open a closed Bible to the people of England. I further vindicated the established usage of those words such as "miracle", "be converted"; "world", etc., against modernistic, pantheistic and Romanist substitution therefore. p. 198, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

23. My reviewers failed to justify those changes. They attempted to do it on the ground of textual criticism and took their stand with modern textual critics. p. 198, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

24. A very significant fact which my reviewers overlooked is that the General Convention of the American Episcopal Church formally refused, in 1892, to give the clergy liberty to use the English Revised Version and they took similar action in 1904 regarding the American Edition. p. 198, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

25. They also overlooked the fact that the Revised Version was not accepted by the northern half of the Church of England. p. 198, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

26. They failed to inform us that a committee of 34 Hebrew and Greek scholars appointed to investigate for the Tercentary Celebration of the Authorized in 1911, the Validity of its original texts in the light of 300 years of history, in its report rejected 98% of the changes made by the Revisers. p. 198, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

27. I also sustained the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus Christ against the license taken with such texts as 1 Tim. 3:16 in the ARV. p. 198, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

28. I also vindicated our great truth, special to Seventh-day Adventists, of the cleansing of the sanctuary against the modernistic translation of Acts 3:19 in the ARV. p. 198, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

29. I also sustained the AV rendering of the texts on the law, 1 John 3:4, Col. 2:16; Rev. 22:14, supported by the Spirit of Prophecy against the damaging change in the ARV. p. 198, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

30. I also sustained good old Protestant and Adventist texts on the Second Coming of the Lord against the vague, and modernistic renderings in the ARV. p. 199, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

31. I also sustained those texts on the state of the dead which were changed by the Revisers to favor the intermediate state, purgatory, and spiritualism. p. 199, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

32. I also sustained the AV in its rendering of the texts on the Sabbath against such damaging changes as opened the way for Sunday keepers to defend the abolition of the Sabbath. p. 199, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

33. My reviewers failed to show that in my book I said anything against any article of faith of the Seventh-day Adventists or that I was in any way guilty of heresy. p. 199, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

34. They gave no reason why all the different versions which contain dangerous readings should not be checked up

and their dangers as well as their advantages be made known to the people. p. 199, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

35. They failed to show why the people shouldn't have a book to tell them the story of how the Bible has come to us, not according to the vagaries and varied whims of textual critics, but in accordance with the Spirit of Prophecy. p. 199, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

36. They failed in the way they wrote this "review" to show any just cause for the document. It is highly controversial. By their exaltation of the Revisers and the Revised Version, and their disparagements of the Waldenses, or Erasmus, the Textus Receptus, and the AV, they have vindicated more than ever the need of just such a book as I have written. p. 199, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

37. They failed to show why, when the modernistic press is pouring forth books belittling the Waldenses, Erasmus, the Textus Receptus and the AV., it is not only highly desirable, but positively necessary that a book such as mine should give the public the viral facts. p. 199, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

38. When I published my book I did not know of the action of the Minority Quorum of the General Conference voting to consider the AV and the RV on an equality. But when my reviewers published their document, they knew of this action. Nevertheless in their document they plainly violated this action, for any one who reads their document can not help but see that they uniformly argue for the superiority of the Revised over the Authorized. p. 199, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

39. Plain evidence of the bias and unfairness of the situation is the fact that although the Authorized holds, and always has held, the field about ninety-nine per cent strong, the insistent effort to exalt the Revised bring it into public notice, and even disparage the Authorized, is accepted without protest. But whenever someone raises his voice and pen to defend the Authorized, he is regarded as raising an issue, starting a controversy and being the instigator. According to such logic a man may be living peaceably and quietly in his own home, when an intruder comes into his home, attacks the members of his family, breaks up the furniture; this is not a controversy or an issue; but if the head of the house defends his property

and family he is raising the issue and causing controversy. p. 199, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

I absolutely plead "not guilty" to starting a controversy over the Versions, and raising this issue. All I did was to come to the defense of the Authorized Version when it was attacked; and immediately there was a cry; "Let us have no controversy". p. 200, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

I submit that about ninety-nine per cent of our people read the AV and that one per cent has no right to upset the faith of the ninety-nine per cent. I submit further that anything said in behalf of the AV will confirm the faith of these ninety-nine per cent, whereas anything said to disparage the AV has in it the danger of unsettling the faith of ninety-nine per cent. p. 200, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

40. Inasmuch as in at least three of our leading Colleges, a course in the origin of the Bible is given in which pro-Revised Version text books such as "The ancestry of Our English Bible" by Ira M. Price is used, my reviewers failed to show why there is no need for a book to correct and counteract the misleading influence and teachings of such books. p. 200, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

41. My reviewers failed to show why *they* should have liberty to use the Versions of their choice, and to tell the people why they are their choice, which liberty no one has denied them, and at the same time to take away from the people their liberty to read the reasons for the superiority of the AV which is used by over ninety-nine per cent of our people. p. 200, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

42. There are five, if not six reasons why I, from the Spirit of Prophecy, believe that the AV is the authoritative Word of God in English: p. 200, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

(1) Because Sister White says that the Waldenses, not the proud hierarchy of Rome, were the guardians of the Word of Truth. Since Rome, and Rome only, was the guardian of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, this statement rules out the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus or the Greek Bible guarded by the Papacy. p. 200, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

(2) She says that the Latin Bible (the Vulgate contained many errors. This rules out the Latin Bible of the Papacy.

p. 200, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

(3) She further says that the Bible of the Waldenses was entire, was of apostolic origin, and kept uncorrupted through the ages. We know that this must be the Old Latin, which never bowed the knee to Rome, or to the Vulgate. Since the Textus Receptus type of Latin and the Vaticanus type were rivals, the Bible of the Waldenses was the Textus Receptus. p. 200, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

(4) Sister White endorsed the Textus Receptus or Erasmus as... p. 200, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

(a) Correcting errors of Vulgate. p. 200, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

(b) Giving us a Bible that had clearer sense. p. 200, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

(c) Giving new impetus to the work of reform (the reformation). p. 200, Para. 12, [ANSWERS].

(d) As completing, through Tyndale, the giving of the Bible to England. (Great Controversy) page 245. p. 200, Para. 13, [ANSWERS].

(5) She said that the gospel received by the Britons in the first centuries was then uncorrupted by Romish apostasy. This again was the Old Latin or Textus Receptus type. p. 200, Para. 14, [ANSWERS].

(6) Sister White in her writings said "no" to over 30 of the texts of the Revised Version; that is, over 30 passages compared in my book; of course there were many more that I did not cite in my book. p. 200, Para. 15, [ANSWERS].

RESUME OF TEXTS CHANGED IN ARV. p. 201, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

OLD TESTAMENT **p. 201, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].**

Sr. White used in AV.... 2 Sam. 21:19 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Job 19:25,26 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Job 26:5 changed in *text* and (margin) in ARV. p. 201, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Isa. 7;14 changed (margin) in ARV p. 201, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

NEW TESTAMENT **p. 201, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].**

Sr. White used in AV.... Matt. 2:15 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Matt. 5:44 omission of part in ARV. p. 201, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Matt. 6:13 end of the Lord's Prayer omitted in ARV. p. 201, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Matt. 17:21 entirely omitted in ARV. p. 201, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Matt. 18:2,3 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 12, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Matt. 24:3 changed in (margin) in ARV. p. 201, Para. 13, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Matt. 27:46 changed in (margin) in ARV. p. 201, Para. 14, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Mark 7:19 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 15, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Mark 16:8-20 branded with suspicion in ARV. p. 201, Para. 16, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Luke 1:72 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 17, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Luke 2:33 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 18, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Luke 4:8 omission of part ARV. p. 201, Para. 19, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Luke 9:55, 56 omissions in ARV. p. 201, Para. 20, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Luke 11:2-4 omissions in ARV. p. 201, Para. 21, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Luke 23:44,45 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 22, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... John 1:3, 4 changed (margin) in ARV. p. 201, Para. 23, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... John 2:11 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 24, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... John 8:1-11 branded with suspicion in ARV. p. 201, Para. 25, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... John 14:2 changed (margin) in ARV. p. 201, Para. 26, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Acts 3:19 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 27, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Acts 8:37 entirely omitted in ARV. p. 201, Para. 28, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Acts 13:42 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 29, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Acts 15:23 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 30, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Acts 16:7 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 31, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Acts 24:15 omission in ARV. p. 201, Para. 32, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Romans 5:1 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 33, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... 1 Cor. 5:7 omission in ARV. p. 201, Para. 34, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... 1 Cor. 11:24 omission in ARV. p. 201, Para. 35, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... 1 Cor. 11:29 omission in ARV. p. 201, Para. 36, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... 1 Cor. 15:3,4 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 37, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... 1 Cor. 15:47 omission in ARV. p. 201, Para. 38, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Eph. 3:9 omission in ARV. p. 201, Para. 39, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Eph. 5:30 omission in ARV. p. 201, Para. 40, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Phil. 3:20,21 changed in ARV. p. 201, Para. 41, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Col. 1:14 omission in ARV. p. 202, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Col. 2:15,16 changed in ARV. p. 202, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... 2 Thess. 2:2 changed in ARV. p. 202, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... 1 Tim. 3:16 changed in ARV. p. 202, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... 2 Tim. 4:1 changed in ARV. p. 202, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Titus 2:13 changed in ARV. p. 202, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Heb. 1:2 changed (margin) in ARV. p. 202, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Heb. 7:21 omission in ARV. p. 202, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Heb. 9:27 changed in ARV. p. 202, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Heb. 10:21 changed in ARV. p. 202, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Heb. 11:3 changed in (margin) in

ARV. p. 202, Para. 11, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... James 5:16 changed in ARV. p. 202, Para. 12, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... 1 Peter 4:6 changed in ARV. p. 202, Para. 13, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... 2 Peter 2:9 changed in ARV. p. 202, Para. 14, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Rev. 1:7 change in ARV. p. 202, Para. 15, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Rev. 13:8 changed in ARV. p. 202, Para. 16, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Rev. 13:10 changed in ARV. p. 202, Para. 17, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Rev. 13:18 change in ARV. p. 202, Para. 18, [ANSWERS].

Sr. White used in AV.... Rev. 22:14 changed in ARV. p. 202, Para. 19, [ANSWERS].

RE-GENERAL CONFERENCE INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT. p. 203, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

I think it is proper that I should state to this Committee the facts as I see them relative to the introductory statement read by your Secretary, Monday, April 20 since this places squarely before me the case as your Committee view it. p. 203, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

I should first like to call your attention to the chronological order of events connected with the Version controversy. p. 203, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

The correspondence with the parties involved, as mentioned in the statement read by the Secretary, was not really a correspondence, but simply a letter from Elder Spicer, dated November 18, 1928. After this letter the public utterances, so far as I know, occurred in the following order: p. 203, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

1. An article in the SIGNS, November 12, 1929, by

Professor Wirth. p. 203, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

2. A series of articles in the SIGNS, beginning December 3, 1929, by Elder Prescott. p. 203, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

3. The World's Best Book published by the Pacific Press Publishing Association, early in 1930. p. 203, Para. 7, [ANSWERS].

4. "Our Authorized Bible Vindicated" by me, June 1930. I did not publish my book until after the foregoing responsible agents of the Denomination had published the other side of the question. p. 203, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

5. A letter from Elder Mcelhany to the field July 27, 1930. A copy of this was *not* sent to me and I learned of it later only incidentally. His state in this letter was the first knowledge I had of the action passed by the Minority Committee of the General Conference, March 20, 1930. I did not know that I was going contrary to this action when I published my book; for I did not know that any action of any kind pertaining to the Versions had been passed by this body. p. 203, Para. 9, [ANSWERS].

In regard to item "4" of your statement, that many workers fear that a general reading of this book will tend to imperial confidence in all Versions: so far as I am informed, only one person besides the reviewers who have read my book have adversely criticized it, or have seen anything harmful in it. On the other hand I have letters from many presidents and union presidents from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from brethren in good standing in the work, some of the veterans in the cause, from Australia, from Europe, from Africa, from Asia, from Canada, and from South America, from every part of the globe. These letters speak in the highest terms of appreciation of the book and many believe it was written in the providence of God. I am sure that if all the testimony from the field were considered, it would overwhelmingly favor the book. Those who have not read it, are its chief opponents. Ninety-nine out of every one hundred of our people read the King James. I am told on every hand that my book confirms the faith of this ninety-nine per cent in the Word of God. I know it does this for those who read the AV. p. 203, Para. 10, [ANSWERS].

CLOSING BROTHERLY WORDS. p. 204, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

I wish, again, in closing, to thank the Committee for their kindness in giving me this full, free, uninterrupted hearing. I greatly appreciate this, and also the effort made to be present, (all or part of the time) by brethren as busy as you are. p. 204, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

I have endeavored to be kind throughout, and to use no expression or turn of thought which would be otherwise. If, in the vigor of expression, or the irresistible force of the logic involved I have seemed to be otherwise, I ask you to forgive me. I love you all, I believe, with a true and sincere Christian affection. I know all of you are carrying heavy burdens and to each one comes the deeper insight of the responsibilities and possibilities of the task laid upon you. I would lighten, if I could, your work and responsibility. p. 204, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Our dear Lord knows, that I have given and do constantly give to our great common cause the full measure of my devotion. p. 204, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

As I close, I full declare that I have not the slightest feeling towards anyone, except that of Christian love. p. 204, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

I READ FROM Ephesians VI: 10-18: p. 204, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].

"Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with the truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God: Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints;" p. 204, Para. 7,

[ANSWERS].

Dr. Wilkinson closed his Reply with prayer. p. 204, Para. 8, [ANSWERS].

ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS -- TO -- OUR AUTHORIZED BIBLE. p. 205, Para. 1, [ANSWERS].

From 1611 to 1881 the King James Version reigned supreme. Then came the first "Revised Version" which opened the lid to Pandora's Box. From that time on there has been a steady stream of new translations into English, each purporting to be better than all others. p. 205, Para. 2, [ANSWERS].

Excuses for these numerous "perversions" ran from updating archaic language of 1611 KJV, to including latest findings in ancient manuscripts and archaeological digs. Sounds great if that was all they did! But what actually happened was a gradual changing of doctrine as found in the Received Text. p. 205, Para. 3, [ANSWERS].

Fundamentalists are becoming confused by the texts being quoted from the pulpit nowdays and from the quotes in various periodicals and current religious books. p. 205, Para. 4, [ANSWERS].

Is there a real problem with the King James Version's doctrines as compared to the message given the prophets? Have we been led (in spite of the Holy Spirit's guidance) to hold false doctrines within our church? p. 205, Para. 5, [ANSWERS].

One of the most serious problems facing the Seventh-day Adventist Church today is the insistence of our leadership and school system in adopting in particular the New International Version for use in our pulpits and schools. Our doctrine of the Investigative Judgment and 2300 Year Prophecy cannot be substantiated with the NIV. Those doctrines came from God, in spite of so-called modern theology, and a study in this book will help you discern where and when these texts came into being. And when and where the false modern ones came on the scene. p. 205, Para. 6, [ANSWERS].