

WHICH VERSION IS THE BIBLE?

**Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me
and of my words
in this adulterous and sinful generation;
of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed
when he cometh in the glory of his Father
with the holy angels.**

Mark 8:38

1999

Seventeenth Edition
Revised and Enlarged
(First Edition 1989)

FLOYD NOLEN JONES, Th.D., Ph.D.

KingsWord Press

P. O. Box 130220
The Woodlands, Texas 77393-0220

III. THE 1881 REVISION

A BRIEF HISTORICAL SYNOPSIS

In 1881 A.D., part of the Church of England (Anglican) decided to revise the King James Bible (the Authorized Version).¹ The Greek New Testament upon which this translation had been based was the result of years of study and work by the brilliant scholar, Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536 A.D.). Being satisfied with the King James Bible, the northern convocation of the Church of England did not want a revision. However, the southern convocation favored a change and proceeded alone. A committee of Hebrew and Greek scholars was selected and charged to change the obsolete spelling, update punctuations, change archaic words like "concupiscence" to "unholy desires", etc. and thus update the language. As the Southern convocation was content with the text itself, no real overhaul of the version was intended. All changes were to be of minor significance.

That is not what the committee did. The men composing the revision committee went against the directive which the Anglican Church had given them. Without authorization and in total direct insubordination, rather than merely improve the *English* they produced a *radically different Greek text* – a very different New Testament! They did not even use the Greek text upon which the King James was based. Cast aside as worthless were the Greek manuscripts upon which the King James had been founded, yet these very mss were the basis for the many other English bibles which had preceded the King James (Great Bible, Bishops', Matthew's, Geneva etc.). The committee thus produced an entirely different "Bible". This is one of the least known facts and greatest guarded secrets within the confines of Christendom. Few people, laymen or pastors, are aware of these happenings.

We must understand that if we have a version other than the King James, it has been based upon a Greek text different from the one used to produce the King James Bible. Although it was misleadingly named the "Revised" Version, it was not a revision. Instead, the committee altered the *original* Greek and *substituted a radically different Greek text* – introducing c.5,337 alterations – yet almost no one is cognizant of this!

¹ Jasper J. Ray, *God Wrote Only One Bible*, (Junction City, OR: Eye Opener Pub., 1980), pp. 23-24.

From whence came this new Greek text? To answer and unravel this calls for a look into the past. Several diverse paths must be followed and examined. Strengthen yourself gentle reader. That which follows is a dreadful account of compromise, deception, and betrayal – all directed against the Living God, His Word, and His people.

WHAT ARE THE MATERIALS AVAILABLE TODAY?¹

It might be well to begin by considering what manuscript evidence is available today as to the true text of the New Testament. We have **no** New Testament manuscripts which are complete. We only have pieces, fragments, chapters, books etc. Until 1995, no first century manuscripts of the New Testament had been discovered (see p. 207). We have 88 Greek papyri manuscripts. The papyri are of newspaper type quality, usually rolled but sometimes in book form. Most papyri consist of small fragments and thus do not exhibit much text. Of the 88, only an estimated thirteen (15%) support Vaticanus B and Sinaiticus Aleph which are the two foremost manuscripts supporting the above mentioned radical new Greek text; about seventy-five (c.85%) support the Greek Received Text upon which the King James was founded (hereafter designated "TR").²

We have 267 Greek Uncials (text written in capital letters, also called "majuscules", designated by "MSS"), none of which is complete. Pages, chapters, and even books are missing. Of course some are in much better condition than others. Only nine of these support the Westcott-Hort critical text upon which the new radical Greek text was based (merely 3%) whereas 258 (97%) support the Greek Received Text.³

There are 2,764 Greek cursive manuscripts (written in small letters, designated by "mss"), often called "minuscules". Thus most of the Greek witnesses to the true text of the New Testament are the Greek cursives. Merely twenty-three (1%) sustain the W-H readings which are the Greek

¹ Kurt Aland, "The Greek New Testament: Its Present and Future Editions", *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVII (June, 1968), p. 184. Aland is Europe's leading textual critic and director of the center at Munster, West Germany where c.80% of the extant Greek MSS, mss and papyri are stored on microfilm. At the writing of his book, Aland listed 81 papyri; however, a few more have been located since the 1968 publication cited here, bringing the total to 88.

² D.A. Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, (Collingswood, NJ: The Bible For Today Press, 1992), p. 54.

³ *Ibid*, p. 55.

foundation of nearly all the modern translations while 2,741 (99%) uphold the Received Text.¹

We also have 2,143 Greek lectionaries (from a Latin root meaning "to read", manuscripts containing Scripture lessons which were read publicly in the churches from at least A.D. 400 until the time of the invention of printing).² All (100%) of them support the Received Text which underlies the King James Bible.³ This gives us a total of 5,262 Greek witnesses to the true text of the New Testament of which 5,217 or ninety-nine percent are in agreement. This group dates from the fifth century on. The remainder not only disagree with the 99% majority – but disagree among themselves. Nevertheless, these few have controlled the camp of academia for the past one hundred years. The question, of course, is how can this be – how did such come to happen? This will be answered in the following chapters, but first a proper foundation must be laid.

BASIC DEFINITIONS

It is important to understand the meaning of "lower" and "higher" textual criticism with regard to the Bible. In Biblical studies the word "criticism" is not faultfinding, but in the etymological sense it refers to distinguishing, deciding, judging or forming a judgment.

- Higher criticism is a study of the origin and character of the individual books of the Bible which seeks to determine by whom, under what circumstances, at what time, and with what design and/or purpose they were written. By a study of historical facts and the internal evidence of the various books, the higher critic seeks to find the circumstances of their origin or source. Higher criticism can readily go wrong if the critic is purely subjective or governed solely by his imagination.
- Lower criticism (or textual criticism) means that we attempt to determine **the text** itself from a study of the various Greek manuscripts, old versions, lectionaries etc. currently available, and their history. Because it is the foundation, it is referred to as "lower criticism". It is the first task. With the aid of these ancient manuscripts and versions, the textual critic seeks to bring the text to the highest possible level of accuracy. In sharp contrast to higher criticism, lower criticism deals with the concrete phenomena of actual readings found in manuscripts.

¹ Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

² John W. Burgon, *The London Quarterly Review*, (October): 1881.

³ Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

ERASMUS RESTORES THE RECEIVED TEXT (GREEK)

The Greek upon which the King James translation was based was first printed in A.D. 1516 at Basle, Switzerland, under the editorship of the famous Dutchman, Desiderius Erasmus. As a Scholar, Erasmus was without peer – the intellectual giant of Europe in his day. Erasmus was ever at work, visiting libraries, collecting, comparing, writing and publishing.¹ Europe was rocked by his works which exposed the ignorance of the monks, the superstitions of the priesthood, and the general bigotry and wickedness within the Roman church.

He classified the Greek manuscripts and read the "Fathers" (letters etc. written by the early Church pastors which taken as a whole contain almost the entire New Testament). Today, many who deprecate the pure teachings of the Received Text sneer at Erasmus and pervert the facts in order to belittle his work. All this by men who could never have intellectually tied Erasmus' boot straps. While he lived, Europe was at his feet. Several times the King of England offered him any position in the kingdom, at his own price! The Emperor of Germany likewise. Indeed, the Pope offered him the position of Cardinal. Not being willing to compromise his beliefs or conscience, Erasmus resolutely declined. France and Spain beckoned him to their realm while Holland proudly claimed him as her most distinguished son.

Book after book came from his labors. The demand for them was overwhelming. His crowning work was the New Testament in Greek. At last, after one thousand years, the New Testament was printed in its original tongue (A.D.1516). Astonished and confounded, Europe – the intellectual, civilized cradle of the world – deluged by superstitions, coarse traditions, and monkeries, read the pure story of the Gospel. In a letter dated 13 August, 1521 to Peter Barbirius, Erasmus wrote:²

"I did my best with the New Testament, but it provoked endless quarrels. Edward Lee pretended to have discovered 300 errors. They appointed a commission, which professed to have found bushels of them. Every dinner-table rang with the blunders of Erasmus. I required particulars, and could not have them."
(Lee afterwards became Archbishop of York)

¹ D.O. Fuller (ed.), *Which Bible?*, 3rd ed., (Grand Rapids, MI: International Pub., 1972), pp. 225-226. The material in the next two paragraphs are also derived from these same pages of Dr. Fuller's classic exposure.

² James Anthony Froude, *Life and Letters of Erasmus*, (London: Longman's, Green and Co., 1906; rpt. of 1894 orig.), p. 294.

Consider and reflect upon this – the foremost scholar in the entire civilized world said the work was his "best". Such men have both egos and detractors. Erasmus would never have put his name on an undertaking which would have left him exposed and defenseless before his enemies and critics.

When Erasmus came to Basle in A.D. 1515 for the purpose of assembling a complete Greek New Testament, he had only five Greek cursive minuscules of the New Testament at his disposal.¹ For the most part, he utilized a 15th century manuscript for the Gospels but used an 11th or 12th century manuscript on occasion. He used a 12th or 13th century manuscript for the Acts and the Epistles. Erasmus had a 15th century manuscript of the Acts and the Epistles which he also used occasionally, and he had a 12th century manuscript of Revelation. The last six verses of the Revelation manuscript were missing so he used the Latin Vulgate version to complete the chapter.

Erasmus' Greek New Testament has been often criticized on the grounds that he had so little data at his command from which to draw and that they were "late" copies. However, Erasmus did not go to the task unprepared. Although he had only five late minuscules, he had already translated a Latin New Testament and in preparation for this labor had collected and gathered variant readings from many Greek manuscripts. He journeyed all over Europe to libraries and to anyone from whom he could gather readings from manuscripts.² Erasmus organized his findings and made notes for himself concerning the different readings. These travels brought him into contact with several hundred manuscripts and Erasmus divided them into two camps, i.e., those he considered spurious and those he deemed genuine and trustworthy.³ The spurious group was a small percentage of the whole and mainly agreed with the Latin Vulgate readings. Of the several hundred, between 90 to 95% had the same text. This group Erasmus judged to contain the true God given text.

¹ Hills, *The King James Version Defended*, *op. cit.*, p. 198. Dr. E.F. Hills, a distinguished Latin major and Phi Beta Kappa graduate from Yale, completed his Th.D program in New Testament text criticism at Harvard. A conservative Presbyterian Christian scholar, he was called home by the Lord in 1981.

² *Ibid.*

³ Frederick Nolan, *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate or Received Text of the New Testament*, (London, England: F.C. and J. Rivington Pub., 1815), p. 413.

Naturalistic critics think that the presence and availability for Erasmus' use of these five Basle minuscules was merely an unhappy accident. But these men do not reckon sufficiently with the *providence* of God – that God has *promised* to overlook His Word. The text which Erasmus published was really not his own. It was taken virtually without change from these few manuscripts which God providentially placed at his disposal. The text contained in these manuscripts eventually came to be known as the "***Textus Receptus***" (the Received Text).

To emphasize and demonstrate the above, we quote the late Herman C. Hoskier. Hoskier gave thirty years to the task of collating a majority of the available manuscripts containing the text of Revelation. Based upon the 200 plus extant manuscripts he examined, Hoskier concluded:¹

"I may state that if Erasmus had striven to found a text on the *largest number* of existing MSS in the world of one type, he could not have succeeded better ... "

As Moorman relates, this is truly a powerful example of God's guiding providence in preserving the true text though but one late mss containing the Revelation was available to Erasmus at Basle.²

AN ASSESSMENT OF WESTCOTT AND HORT - THEIR CHARACTERS

The naturalistic critics say that Erasmus could not have been providentially guided in the editing of the *Textus Receptus* because he was a humanist and a Roman Catholic. They purport that Westcott and Hort were epoch making scholars directly guided by God's providence to restore the New Testament, having completed their assignment in 1881. However, if we compare the character of Erasmus to those of Westcott and Hort, we shall see that such a declaration is vacuous and specious. It thus becomes necessary to draw a contrast between the lives of Messers B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort with Erasmus in order to evaluate these charges and claims of the critics as well as to grasp the full impact of this exposé.

¹ Herman C. Hoskier, *The John Rylands Bullentin*, 19-1922/23, p. 118. Hoskier stood with Burgon & Scrivener against the Revised text. He produced the two famous comprehensive works *Codex B and its Allies* and *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*.

² Jack A. Moorman, *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text*, (Collingswood, NJ: Bible For Today Press, #1617, 1988), p. 26.

Westcott, an Anglican Bishop and professor at Cambridge University, and Hort – also an ordained Anglican priest and professor at Cambridge – came to participate on the 1881 Revision Committee of the King James Bible under the guise of being Protestant scholars. Actually, they were very Roman Catholic in doctrine, belief, and practice. Both conservative and liberal branches of Christendom hold Westcott and Hort in high esteem as if God had greatly used these men to reestablish and restore the text of the Bible. However, it is most difficult to believe that God would use two men to perform such a task who did not believe that the Bible was the verbal Word of God.

Westcott and Hort maintained that they had raised New Testament textual criticism to the level of an exact science. Thus when they concluded that the Traditional Text was late and a composite reading resulting from combining older text-types, they affirmed that this should be regarded as the true explanation with the same degree of reliance as one would esteem a Newtonian theorem.¹ Indeed, they asserted that their work had been so scientifically and carefully executed that there could never be more than one change per thousand words.² Nevertheless, today most liberal (or lost) modern scholars say that they no longer agree completely with the Westcott-Hort theory. Kurt Aland, a foremost leader of the modern school, is representative when he admits to this in saying:³

"We still live in the world of Westcott and Hort with our conception of different recensions and text-types although this conception has lost its *raison d' être*, or, it needs at least to be newly and convincingly demonstrated. For the increase of the documentary evidence and the entirely new areas of research which were opened to us on the discovery of the papyri, mean the end of Westcott and Hort's conception."

Still, these same liberals always begin their own investigations with the acceptance of most of the basic W-H tenants. Sadly, most conservative scholars have accepted the W-H theory of textual history – largely because most Christian scholars fear scholastic and intellectual ridicule.

¹ Westcott, B.F. & F.J.A. Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek*, (NY: Harper & Bros., 1882), p. 107.

² *Ibid.*, p. 2.

³ Kurt Aland, "The Significance of the Papyri for Progress in New Testament Research", *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, J.P. Hyatt ed., (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1965), p. 337.

To stand against the tide carries with it the stigma of appearing uninformed and non-progressive, resulting in the loss of credibility and status among one's peers. The man of God should never allow his faith to be intimidated by so-called "scholarship" – for God promised to preserve His Word.

From published letters written by Westcott and Hort, either to each other or to family members, the following has been gleaned. On one occasion, Mr. Westcott was near a monastery and, upon going into the chapel, found a pieta.¹ In writing from France to his fiancée in 1847 concerning the event he wrote: "Had I been alone, I could have knelt there for hours." As he was not alone, he had to refrain for to have so done would have revealed just how Roman his beliefs actually were. On November 17, 1865 he wrote to Archbishop Benson remarking, "I wish I could see to what forgotten truth Mariolatry bears witness."² He stated that the fall of man was an allegory covering a long succession of evolutions. He rejected Genesis 1-3 as a literal history and also denied the fall of man. Westcott felt all women should be named "Mary" so that his wife Sarah, at his request, added "Mary" to her name and he ever so addressed her.³ Does that sound like a Protestant?

With regard to spiritual authority in general and especially the Bible's being the final authority, Mr. Hort said: "Evangelicals seem to me perverted rather than untrue."⁴ On October 17, 1865 Hort wrote "I have been persuaded for many years that Mary-worship and 'Jesus-worship' have very much in common in their causes and their results".⁵ Hort praised his "prayer boxes" which he carried about with him. These

¹ Arthur Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, (London: Macmillan, 1903) Vol. I, p. 81. The Pieta was a life sized statue of Mary holding Jesus' dead body. For a detailed documentation of W-H's beliefs see: George H. Coy, *The Inside Story of the Anglo-American Revised New Testament* (Dallas, OR: Itemizer- Observer, 1973), pp. 79-88.

² *Ibid.*, Vol.I, p. 251. Mariolatry is the Catholic doctrines concerning Mary and her veneration.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 8, cp. 81.

⁴ A.F. Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, 2 Vols. (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1896), Vol. I, p. 400. This is from an October 21, 1858 correspondence to Rev. Rowland Williams.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 50.

contained statues (idols) to which he prayed.¹ Confessing in a 26 October, 1867 letter to Dr. Lightfoot that he was a staunch sacerdotalist,² Hort wrote to Westcott regarding the Protestant's teaching of the "priesthood of the believer" as being a "crazy horror!"³ He believed neither in a literal Garden of Eden nor that Adam's fall differed in any degree from that of any of his descendants.⁴ In a March 4, 1890 letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury on Old Testament Criticism, Westcott gave his "amen" to Hort's last sentiment by penning: "No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history – I could never understand how any one reading them with open eyes could think they did."⁵

Although not wishing to be under the dominion of the Pope, in writing to Rev. John Ellerton on July 6, 1848, Hort said: "the pure Romanish view seems to me nearer, and more likely to lead to, the truth than the evangelical view. ... We dare not forsake the sacraments or God will forsake us."⁶ In a December 14, 1846 letter to his father, Hort wrote " ... Methodism ... is worse than popery ... being more insidious",⁷ and in an 1864 correspondence to Bishop Westcott he stated his conviction that "Protestantism is only parenthetical and temporary".⁸ Indeed, Hort wrote Westcott (December 4, 1861) of preferring Greek philosophy and "its precious truth" to the Christian revelation in which he said he found "... nothing, and should be very much astonished and perplexed to find anything".⁹

¹ Ruckman, *The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence, op.cit.*, p. 39. In his fns. on page 186, Dr. Ruckman cites *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 50; yet the material is not there. He adds that he is referencing Dr. Edward F. Hills lecture in March of 1969. Although the above statement attributed to Hort by Ruckman is considered accurate, I have thus far been unable to independently confirm the citation in any of Hort's work at my disposal.

² A.F. Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 86. Belief that by virtue of ordination into the priesthood, one is given supernatural powers.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 51.

⁴ A.F. Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 78.

⁵ A. Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 69.

⁶ A.F. Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 76-77.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 49.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 31.

⁹ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 449.

Both W&H came under the influence of J.H. Newman, an Anglican Bishop who returned to the Roman church and was made Cardinal. Newman held a doctrine of angelology in which he taught the gnostic view that there were many intermediates between God and His creation. Westcott and Hort also fell under the spell of Coleridge and Maurice, two Unitarians who were pantheistic and metaphysical, holding low estimates of "inspiration of Scripture". Coleridge said "Reason was the divine logos." Frederick Maurice was the son of a Unitarian minister and a brilliant student of Oxford and Cambridge. Having become a clergyman in the Church of England, he was dismissed as principal of King's College, London, on charges of heresy. Maurice had a commanding influence on many of the leaders of his day, especially Dr. Hort who wrote of him November 8, 1871: "... Mr. Maurice has been a dear friend of mine for twenty-three years, and I have been deeply influenced by his books".¹ Westcott also admitted he owed much to the writings of Maurice,² and Hort's son wrote of his father: "In undergraduate days, if not before, he came under the spell of Coleridge".³

Thus we have two Anglican priests whose stated beliefs were strongly Roman. Both accepted Darwin's theory of evolution. Writing to Rev. John Ellerton, April 3, 1860, Hort declared: "But the book that has engaged me most is Darwin. ... it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with. ... My feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable."⁴

Denying that the death of Christ Jesus made the once for all vicarious atonement for the sinner, W&H choose instead to emphasize atonement through the **incarnation** rather than through the **crucifixion**. This view was an attempt to exalt Mary's position as, of course, she was prominent at the conception and birth of Jesus. Such posture upholds the Roman Catholic Mass. So their view was that of atonement through Jesus' conception and birth rather than his shed blood!

Further, Westcott doubted the Biblical account of miracles. Writing in his diary, August 11, 1847, Bishop Westcott penned:⁵

¹ A.F. Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 155.

² A. Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 11.

³ A.F. Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 42.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 416, also p. 414.

⁵ A. Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 52.

"I never read an account of a miracle but I seem instinctively to feel its improbability, and discover some want of evidence in the account of it."

Indeed, Westcott and Hort did not even believe the original autographs of the Scriptures were God inspired! Writing in their "*Introduction*", they impiously stated:¹

"Little is gained by speculating as to the precise point at which such **corruptions** came in. **They may be due to the original writer, or to his amanuensis** if he wrote from dictation, or they may be due to one of the earliest transcribers." (emphasis author's)

WESTCOTT AND HORT'S INVOLVEMENT IN SPIRITISM

Westcott and Hort belonged to what Westcott's son referred to as "The Ghostly Guild." Westcott took a leading role in this society and its proceedings, the purpose of which was the investigation of ghosts and other supernatural appearances.² They believed that such things existed. Concerning this society, Hort wrote to Rev. John Ellerton on December 29, 1851:³

"Westcott, Gorham, C.B. Scott, Benson, Bradshaw, Lauard, etc., and I have started a society for the investigation of ghosts and all supernatural appearances and effects, being all disposed to believe that such things really exist, and ought to be discriminated from hoaxes and mere subjective disillusions."

Such is spiritism and is absolutely forbidden by Scripture.

Westcott's son wrote of his father's communing with "saints" especially at a great cathedral at Petersburg where "there was much company."⁴ On that same page he wrote that his father said, in speaking of the chapel at Auckland Castle, it was "full" and that he was "not alone" in the darkness. He was, of course, communing with demonic spirits supposing

¹ Westcott and Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek*, op. cit., p. 280.

² A. Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 117.

³ A.F. Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 211.

⁴ A. Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 312-313.

that they were ghosts (the souls of men who had lived formerly). However, the Word of God clearly teaches that "familiar spirits" are demons impersonating people. They are not the spirits and/or souls of people who have lived previously.

Both of these men denied the deity of Christ Jesus and they denied the verbal plenary inspiration of Scripture. Moreover, Hort spent the last eight years of his life working with Westcott in translating the Books of Wisdom and Maccabees, two uninspired writings.

AN ASSESSMENT OF ERASMUS¹

Erasmus was a "Christian" humanist, the illegitimate son of a Roman Catholic priest, and was himself an ordained priest. He taught Greek at Cambridge University from A.D. 1510 to 1514. He was not a "great" man of faith – but he was completely committed to the truth and reality of the Christian faith. Moreover, compared to Westcott and Hort (and a few others to be mentioned later) Erasmus was a giant of faith in that he humbled himself and his intellect, professing that the Bible was the absolute Word of God.

As to the criticism that Erasmus was a Roman Catholic – in his day, almost all of Christendom was Roman. He flourished before and at the onset of the Reformation. He did not oppose the teachings of the Roman Church, but he vehemently protested the abuses within the Church. Erasmus decried the emphasis on ritual as opposed to a simple godly life as wrong and believed that such could be corrected by placing into every man's hand the Bible in his own language. He did not want to do away with the ritual of Rome, but he wanted a genuine spirituality to accompany it. He disapproved of Protestantism, viewing it as an evil because of all the division it brought.

The Christian humanistic elements in Erasmus' thought were completely dissimilar from the contemporary connotation of "humanism", meaning instead "men eminent for human learning" – especially in relation to the revival of learning in literature and language (notably Latin and Greek). In his day the term "humanist" designated a member of a distinct 'international intellectual club' that was dedicated to studying the humanities or liberal arts. Due to his great erudition, depth of thought,

¹ Edward Freer Hills, *Believing Bible Study*, (2nd ed., Des Moines, IO: Christian Research Press, 1977), pp. 189-194.

elegance of style and biting irony, Desiderius Erasmus stood forth among these intellectuals as the unrivaled "prince of humanist". Erasmus' humanism found expression in his insistence to return to the original sources in order to uncover truth. Thus, his edition of the Greek N.T. was a natural manifestation of his Christian humanistic bent. By means of this text he hoped to see the Roman Church renewed from within.¹

As a Christian humanist, Erasmus was naturally not always consistently Christian in his thinking, nevertheless, we maintain that God providentially used Erasmus – much as God used Erasmus' contemporary Martin Luther even though Luther became bitterly anti-Semitic in his latter years.² At least Erasmus was not untrue to his ordination vows as were Westcott and Hort.³ They neither believed nor held to the thirty nine articles of the Anglican church in which they had been ordained. They actually espoused the cause of Romanism and modernism.

Moreover, neither Erasmus' theology nor his being a Roman Catholic has anything whatsoever to do with his Greek text. In producing it, he merely followed the manuscripts which had been preserved by the usage within the Greek Orthodox Church. Thus, Erasmus did not create the *Textus Receptus*. He only recovered it from within a Roman Catholic setting after years of neglect imposed upon it by that cult. Before this, throughout Europe the true text had been preserved intact primarily in Latin, and it circulated outside the Roman Church among small groups of true believers (see p. 167 ff.). Erasmus knew the Vulgate was a corrupted

¹ I am indebted to a 2-11-1991 personal correspondence from Dr. Theodore P. Letis for many of these insights on Erasmus, especially with regard to his "humanism". Letis taught a course on Erasmus at New College, Edinburgh University in 1990. This view on Erasmus' humanism also comes across clearly throughout Froude, *Life and Letters of Erasmus*, *op. cit.*

² David Rauch, *A Legacy of Hatred*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1990), pp. 28-29. As early as 1523 Luther spoke well of the Jews, expecting them to convert en masse when they heard the gospel message free from "papal paganism", but by the 1530's he had become irritated over their continued resistance against conversion. By 1543, near the end of his life (1546), he wrote 3 derogatory treatises against them. In *On The Jews And Their Lies*, Luther referred to the Jews as "venomous", "bitter worms", and "disgusting vermin" – that they all were thieves and should have their synagogues, schools and homes burned while deporting them to Palestine. He added that the Talmudic writings should be taken from them, their rabbis forbidden to teach "on pain of loss of life and limb", safe conduct be disallowed them on the highways, and that they no longer be able to charge interest on money. Also see *Luther The Reformer* by James Kittelson, (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House), pp. 273-274.

³ Hills, *Believing Bible Study*, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

version of this original older Latin translation, and his humanist values led him to believe that he was getting to the source of God's truth by turning to the manuscripts of the Greek Church.

One of Erasmus' greatest mistakes was his belief that the Roman Catholic Church could be reformed from within. The Lord Jesus said that you cannot put new wine into old wine skins. If Jesus the Christ could not reform the religion of Israel which originally had been the only God-ordained religion on the earth, who are we to think we can change for the better the traditions of any denomination or religious organization? By the power of the Holy Spirit we can influence and cause a positive change in the hearts of individuals be they priests, preachers or laymen – but *organizations* – organizations are married to their doctrines and traditions!

One recent example of such a change of heart is that of Dr. Frank Logsdon, Co-founder of the New American Standard Version (NASV), who stated before his recent death:¹

"I must under God renounce every attachment to the New American Standard Version. I'm afraid I'm in trouble with the Lord...I wrote the format; I helped interview some of the translators; I sat with the translator; I wrote the preface. When questions began to reach me, at first I was quite offended...I used to laugh with others...However, in attempting to answer, I began to sense that something was not right about the New American Standard Version. I can no longer ignore these criticisms I am hearing and I can't refute them...The deletions are absolutely frightening...there are so many...I wrote my very dear friend, Mr. Lockman, explaining that I was forced to renounce all attachment to the NASV. The product is grievous to my heart...I don't want anything to do with it. [T]he finest leaders that we have today...haven't gone into it [the new version's use of a corrupted Greek text], just as I hadn't gone into it...that's how easily one can be deceived. [Y]ou can say the Authorized Version [KJB] is absolutely correct. How correct? 100% correct!...I believe the Spirit of God led the translators of the Authorized Version. If you must stand against everyone else, stand..."

¹ D.W. Cloud (ed.), "From the NASV to the KJV", *O Timothy Magazine*, Vol. 9 Issue 1, (Oak Harbor, WA: 1992): pp. 1-14.. Also see G.A. Riplinger, *New Age Bible Versions*, (Munroe Falls, OH: A.V. Publications, 1993), on the un-numbered endorsement page at the beginning and immediately before the Table of Contents.

Standard Bearers Browser

Vision

It is the [mission](#) of [Standard Bearers](#) to present the Biblical and Historical doctrine of Inerrancy; teaching the Bible is 100% pure; inerrant in the *copy* which we hold in our hands today. Our goal is to strengthen the faith of Pastors, Teachers and Laymen in the authenticity and authority of the 100% pure, inerrant Word of God, knowing ~ “So then faith cometh by hearing, hearing by the word of God” ([Roman 10:17](#)).

Share

Prayerful consider using the resources contained in the [Standard Bearers Browser](#) (next two pages) for: your Sermon preparation, Bible Study class, to forward to others and post to your Social media. For more, go to the [Standard Bearers](#) home page (www.standardbearers.net) for an overview of the Biblical and Historical Doctrine of Inerrancy. For another quick read see, [Retaking the Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation~ The Westminster Confession Rejection of the Chicago Statement](#).

Conference

For a group presentation by [Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones, Ph.D, Th.D.](#) on: The Biblical & Historical Doctrine of Inerrancy; The Identity of the Text of the New Testament; Chronology of the Old Testament; Creation & Evolution or [Science & the Bible](#), please contact me, Louis Kole at, kolelm@gmail.com.

Exhort

You *can* know for yourself the identity of the 100% pure; inerrant, preserved *copy* of the Word of God by the aid of the Holy Spirit; the *Author, Superintendent and Teacher* of the Word of God. This is the promise of God and the witness of the saints.

"Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew [it] unto you." ([John 16:13-14](#))

"But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him." ([1 John 2:27](#))

[Francis Turretin](#)¹ 1623-1687 (brackets and emphasis mine):

*"By **original** texts, we do not mean the **autographs** [originals] written by the hand of Moses, of the prophets and the apostles, which certainly do not now exist. We mean their **apographs** ² [perfect copy; genuine original; 'authentic'] which are so called because they set forth to us the word of God in the **very words** of those who wrote under the **immediate inspiration** of the Holy Spirit."³*

God bless,

Louis M Kole
[Standard Bearers](#)

[Hymn ~ Come, Gracious Spirit- Heavenly Dove!](#)

"Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." ([Revelation 3:11](#))

¹Gerstner, called Turretin, "the most precise theologian in the Calvinistic tradition." *Turretin on Justification* an audio series by John Gerstner (1914-1996) a Professor of Church History at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary and Knox Theological Seminary.

² Apograh means "**a perfect copy, an exact transcript**". This is the same witness of the authors of the Westminster Confession when they described their *copy* of the Word of God as 'authentic', which [Webster's 1828](#) dictionary defines as "**having a genuine original**".

³ Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, (Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1992 reprint), 1:106. See also Robert Barnett, "Francis Turretin on the Holy Scriptures," a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Dean Burgon Society held at Calvary Baptist Church, Ontario, Canada, in 1995.

Resources

Enjoy the following works provided by *Standard Bearers* on the Biblical and Historical doctrine of Inerrancy. **I encourage you to share these documents by using the link, since they're being regularly updated.**

Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones

- [Works of Dr Jones](#)

[Works](#) is a PDF portfolio of *all* the [Works of Dr. Jones](#) listed below (except the charts from his Chronology of the Old Testament). Please allow a moment for this PDF portfolio to open.

- [Analytical Red Letter Harmony of the 4 Gospels: A Return to the Historical Text](#)
- [The Gospel Colophons and the Synoptic Problem Dr Floyd Nolen Jones PhD ThD](#)
- [The Septuagint: A Critical Analysis](#)
- [Chronology of the Old Testament: A Return to the Basics](#)

In this book, [Dr. Jones](#) provides a systematic framework of the chronology of the Bible from Genesis through the life of Christ and it comes with a CD containing 14 chronology charts. In addition, a set of full-size prints can be obtained at: [A&E-The Graphics Complex](#) (713) 621-0022; 4235 Richmond Avenue, Houston, Texas 77027; Reference Quote Number: IQ9209 (Floyd Jones Charts).

Excerpts from Dr. Jones' [Chronology of the Old Testament](#)

- ◇ [The Length of the Sojourn in Egypt](#) ~ Chapter 4 excerpt (p.54)
- ◇ [40 Years after What? The date of Absalom's Rebellion](#) ~ Chapter 5 excerpt (p.105)
- ◇ [Jehoiachin \(Jeconiah\) Age 8 or 18?](#) ~ Chapter 6 excerpt (p.202)

- [Chronology Charts](#) by Dr. Jones

The [Chronology Charts](#) is a PDF portfolio of *all* the Charts by [Dr. Jones](#) from his book, [Chronology of the Old Testament](#). Please allow a moment for the PDF portfolio to open.

Individual Charts by Dr. Jones from, [Chronology of the Old Testament](#)

- ◇ [Chart 1 ~ Creation to Jesus Christ](#)
- ◇ [Chart 2 ~ Jacob's Age Determined](#)
- ◇ [Chart 3 ~ 430 Years Sojourn](#)
- ◇ [Chart 3A ~ The 4 Generations of Genesis](#)
- ◇ [Chart 3B ~ Scenarios for Judah's Family in Egypt](#)
- ◇ [Chart 3CDEF ~ Jacob and Judah](#)
- ◇ [Chart 4 ~ Judges to the First 3 Kings](#)
- ◇ [Chart 4AB ~ Judges Tested by Judah's Lineage](#)
- ◇ [Chart 5 ~ Kings of the Divided Monarchy](#)
- ◇ [Chart 5A ~ Kings of the Divided Monarchy](#)
- ◇ [Chart 5C ~ Kings of the Divided Monarchy](#)
- ◇ [Chart 6 ~ Creation to Creator](#)
- ◇ [Chart 7 ~ 390 Years Confirmed](#)

- [Which Version is the Bible?](#)

Excerpts from Dr. Jones' [Which Version Is The Bible?](#)

- ◇ [Mark 16 last Verses](#) ~ Chapter 2 (p.30)
- ◇ [The 1881 Revision](#) ~ Chapter 3 (p.49)
- ◇ [How Princeton Was Corrupted](#) ~ Chapter 8 (p.186)
- ◇ [How the Conservative Seminaries Were Corrupted](#) ~ Chapter 8 (p.189)
- ◇ [The Criticism Today: The Age of Miniscules](#) ~ Chapter 9 (p.202)
- ◇ [Pericope De Adultera John 8](#) ~ Appendix A (p.219)
- ◇ [The Johannine Comma 1John 5](#) ~ Appendix B (p.231)
- ◇ [Examples of Modern Criticism](#) ~ Appendix C (p.241)
- ◇ [History of Texts Transmission](#) ~ Appendix D (p.247)

Standard Bearers Browser

Louis M Kole

- [Works of Louis M Kole](#)
Works is a PDF portfolio of *all* the papers by Louis Kole listed below. Please allow a moment for this PDF portfolio to open.
- [How We Know The Bible Is True: 100% Pure, Inerrant](#)
~ *The Biblical and Historical Doctrine of Inerrancy* (standard bearers home page)
- [Letter To A Pastor: How Shall They Hear Without A Preacher?](#)
~ *So then Faith Cometh By Hearing, and Hearing By the Word of God* (custodianship of the Word of God)
- [Textual Criticism 101: Theological, Faith-Based versus Naturalistic, Rationalistic](#)
~ *Believing or Neutral to Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification* (textual criticism)
- [Preaching and Loss: Peer Pressure and the Fear of the Lord](#)
~ *Why the Tempest? The Foolishness of Preaching* (the duty of a watchman)
- [Retaking the Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation](#)
~ *The Westminster Confession **Rejection** of the Chicago Statement* (overview in a nutshell)
- [Divine Preservation: How We 'Lost' the Doctrine of the Divine Preservation of the Word of God](#)
~ *3 Centuries of Sound Doctrine ~ Eradicated in 3 Generations of Neglect* (the error)
- [God's Standard Bearers: The Josiah Initiative](#)
~ *Witnesses to the 100% Pure Copy of Word of God* (proof texts & state of our witness)
- [The Fear of The Lord: Restoring the Biblical Doctrine of Inerrancy](#)
~ *The Fear of Man verses the Fear of the Lord* (flagship paper)
- [A Call To Revival: Restoring the Foundations](#)
~ *If the Foundations Be Destroyed What Can the Righteous Do?* ("hath God said?")
- [The Josiah Initiative: Countering The Assault Upon the Inerrancy of the Word of God](#)
~ *How are the Mighty Fallen and the Weapons of War Perished!* (a call to action)
- [The 'Lost' Doctrine: Can A Doctrine 'Die' Which Is a Fundamental Truth of the Faith?](#)
~ *The 1000 Year 'Death and Rebirth' of the Doctrine of Justification by Grace Alone* (lesson from the past)

Dr. Jeffrey Khoo

- [Can Verbal Plenary Inspiration Do Without Verbal Plenary Preservation?: The Achilles' Heel Of Princeton Bibliology \(FEBC\) a must read](#)

Dr. Edward F Hills

- [Scholasticism Versus the Logic of Faith ~ Excerpt from A History of My Defence of the King James Version \(FEBC\)](#)
- [The King James Version Defended](#)

More...

- [Bible audio](#)
- [Songs ~ Hymns of Worship from the Standard Bearers' play list](#)
- [Bible teaching ~ Audio by Dr Floyd Nolen Jones](#)
- [Bible teaching ~ TV by Dr Floyd Nolen Jones from the Standard Bearers' channel](#)
- [Bible teaching ~ TV by Dr Charles Stanley](#)
- [Bible resources ~ Blue Letter Bible digital Bible and study tools](#)
- [Dictionary ~ Noah Webster's 1828 Digital dictionary](#)
- [Devotional ~ Oswald Chamber's My Utmost for His Highest](#)

Hymn ~ *We Rest on Thee, Our Shield and Our Defender!*

"Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." ([Revelation 3:11](#))