

**“THE DRIFT IN BAPTIST MISSIONS,
CHURCHES AND SCHOOLS”**

By Dr. David Bennett

Dean Burgon Society

At Marietta, GA

July 23-24, 2014

2 “The Drift In Baptist Missions, Churches And Schools” By Dr. David Bennett

In this paper I will be taking a portion of my book, *The Drift in Baptist Missions, Churches and Schools*, and combining it with four other papers I have written. The other three are “King James Only? Answers to a Pastor”, “Dear Pastor Fred”, “The King James Bible and USA based Mission Boards” and “Regular Baptist Press, The King James Bible and the Received Text”.

In my book *THE DRIFT IN BAPTIST MISSIONS, CHURCHES AND SCHOOLS* in Chapter twelve I quote Dr. Reginald Matthews, the author of *MISSIONARY ADMINISTRATION IN THE LOCAL CHURCH*. He wrote;

“Advancing the breakdown of doctrinal difference, Pope Paul made a call in November, 1966, for a common Bible which would be acceptable to all. The hour is nearer to the full development of ‘BABYLON THE GREAT’ (Rev. 17:5) and the final apostasy than most people are willing to admit.”

Well, perhaps the Pope’s wish has been answered. In 2010 the New Testament of the Common Bible was first published, and the Old Testament followed in 2011. Of course the Apocrypha is also available so the Pope should be happy.

*“The Common English Bible is the result of collaboration between opposites: scholars working with average readers; conservatives working with liberals; teens working with retirees; men working with women; many denominations and many ethnicities coming together around the common goal of creating **a translation that unites rather than divides**, with the ultimate goal of mutually accomplishing God’s overall work in the world.*

*Combining scholarly accuracy with vivid language, the Common English Bible is the work of 120 biblical scholars from **24 denominations** in American, African, Asian, European, and Latino communities, representing such academic institutions as **Asbury Theological Seminary, Azusa Pacific University, Bethel Seminary, Denver Seminary, Princeton Theological Seminary, Seattle Pacific University, Wheaton College, Yale University, and many others**. They meticulously translated the Bible into English directly from the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts.”¹*

This is truly an ecumenical Bible!

We will have to wait and see if the GARBC approves the use of this Common Bible for Regular Baptist Press.

“In 2009 The GARBC Council of Eighteen added the ESV to the list of translations approved for authors to use in Regular Baptist Press publications. When the council began the policy in 1963, the list included the KJV, ASV, Berkeley Version, and Williams translation. This list was

expanded through the years and now includes ASV, ESV, Holman Christian Standard Bible, NASB, NIV, New Scofield Bible, and Amplified Bible.”²

The GARBC also approves the King James Bible and the New King James Version. Quite a smorgasbord.

What about the gender-neutral NIV11? A professor in a former GARBC-approved school writes:

“Is the NIV11 a viable, usable translation in Regular Baptist churches? My judgement is that the NIV11 is a usable translation in many situations, one that some of our churches will continue to use effectively. It continues the NIV tradition largely unchanged, though improved in many small ways across the breadth of the canon. It is not perfect. No translation is. Overall, however, it is an improvement of an otherwise fine translation.”³

In the early days of the GARBC, the King James Bible was the Bible of the churches. However, the professors in the approved schools often choose to use other English versions. The future pastors and missionaries accepted this without question. Would it not be better for the men who comprise the GARBC’s Council of fourteen, now eighteen, not to approve any version of the Bible but to simply continue to use the King James Bible for its Regular Baptist Press publications? This practice of approving so many versions by the GARBC council of eighteen has opened a Pandora’s box and the churches are not better for it.

Next I will discuss a letter I received from a new pastor in a former supporting church of ours. From his email letter I wrote the paper

KING JAMES ONLY? ANSWERS TO A PASTOR

This paper was written November 21, 2006. The pastor that was previously in this church when it took on our missionary support was a King James, TR man. However with pastoral changes there come other changes.

John 5:47 "But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?"

2

<http://baptistbulletin.org/?p=16799>

3

<http://baptistbulletin.org/?p=18062>

4 "The Drift In Baptist Missions, Churches And Schools" By Dr. David Bennett

The new pastor's email was caustic to say the least. His email communiqué was with reference to with whom I fellowshiped and my belief concerning the Word and Words of God.

The Compromise of Affiliation:

This pastor said he was concerned I had gone with Bible For Today Baptist Church, whose pastor is Dr. D. A. Waite. This pastor said "Dr. Waite used to be a member of IBFNA in years past, an organization of which I am a charter member, but he has long since disaffiliated himself and travelled in different directions. Where are you in your affiliations?" I am sure the DBS is not included in this pastor's accepted affiliation. Does a missionary NEED to affiliate with every person or organization a supporting pastor affiliates with? Of course this matter of affiliation is really a precursor to the Bible issue.

The Compromise of the Bible:

This pastor asked if I had embraced Dr. Waite's "fringe position of KJO?" Fringe? No question where this pastor stands or does not stand. He went on to say that he himself is "KJ Mostly, but not exclusively." Now, I think he is hinting that Dr. Waite is a Ruckmanite. Peter Ruckman believes the King James Bible is inspired as were the originals and that the King James even corrects the Greek Text. I do not believe this and neither does Dr. Waite. Dr. Waite has stated this publicly several times and in print. In spite of this fact some do not hear for they seem to have selective hearing. He that hath ears to hear let him hear!

This pastor continued by saying "Though I admire the TR, I am not critical of those whose positions are other than mine. Though I require speakers to use either the KJV or NKJV in my pulpit, I do not dismiss them if they choose to preach otherwise in their own pulpits." I personally am always suspicious of someone who says they admire something but they have no problem with those who do not have the same admiration. Edwin H. Palmer in THE MAKING OF A CONTEMPORARY TRANSLATION PAGE 196 said "I love the King James Version (KJV)." He went on to say "But today the KJV will not do..." That is exactly what this independent Baptist Pastor is saying as well.

This man is very big-hearted to "those whose positions are other than" his, but is this really true. If this was in actual fact the way this pastor thought I would not have received such an acerbic email. My position and Dr. Waite's position is not as his is and yet he is very critical of our position. Why does he not accept my position? He is not open to my position which says there is one English Bible that is trust worthy, for it and it alone is an accurate translation of the preserved Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words of God.

He further states that he is a Majority Text man and as such he appreciates "being alerted when someone in the audience may have a variance differing from the one I'm preaching from as it may impact my choice of words in that passage. I frequently mention the readings of what I call the 'economy version'."

Is not this pastor gracious? He wants to be alerted to different readings "as it may impact my choice of words in that passage.' With this kind of thinking how does such a Pastor lead his people into a firm belief in the authority of Scripture? The answer is he doesn't. 2Timothy 4:2 "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine." These men such as this pastor are still searching for the Word of God and it just might be in one of these New Greek Texts or English translations!

As to these variants D. A. Waite, Jr. in his excellent book THE DOCTORED NEW TESTAMENT, published by The Bible For Today Press, page iii, in a footnote quotes from John Burgon's book Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels page 35. Burgon says "that the so-called Various Readings' are readings that possess really strong attestation (verification or support). He estimated that more than nineteen-twentieths (over 95%) OF THE Various readings' commonly quoted are only the vagaries (quirks or eccentricities, i.e. mistakes or errors) of scribes, and ought not to be called Readings' at all."

Sadly, the so called fundamental schools are turning out men who are open minded to everything and almost everyone except the one who holds to the King James Bible as being the most accurate translation of the preserved words of its underlying Hebrew and Greek Texts. This belief is just too strong and by their unbelief they will sever fellowship.

Now we will turn our attention to a paper I wrote based on a letter a pastor wrote to me on the Bible issue. His first name was Fred so I just named the paper "Dear Pastor Fred".

Pastor Fred took offense to my writing an article about Regular Baptist press and the issue of the King James Bible and its underlying Greek text. According to Pastor Fred the folk at Regular Baptist Press are doctrinally sound, preach salvation and sanctification, and the authority and sufficiency of Scripture in all issues of life and Godliness. I do not say the people working at RBP are not good Christian people but I encourage the reader to go to the web site and read the entire article but for the sake of this paper a couple of excerpts from the article will be given. In the mid 1980s I was studying for a Masters degree through Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary. By the providence and good hand of the Lord I transferred from Grand Rapids to Bethany Theological Seminary. One of the courses at Bethany required reading books on the Textual issue of the New Testament. The books chosen by the professor for the course were written by Dr. David Otis Fuller and Dean of Chichester John Burgon. Through reading these books my spiritual eyes were opened to the real Bible Textual issue. Therefore I became more conscious of the commentaries I used and the teaching materials we were using in our ministry.

In the very early 1990s the Executive Editor of Regular Baptist Press, Vernon Miller, now retired, visited Sydney, Australia. Mr. Miller had come to conduct a Sunday school conference for the independent Baptist churches in the surrounding Sydney area. At one of the sessions Mr. Miller made the comment that Regular Baptist Press only used the King James Bible. Most of the pastors attending that conference also used only the King James Bible so that assurance from Mr. Miller sounded good to their ears. Now read the following very carefully However, I was at that time teaching the adult Regular Baptist Sunday school material CHOOSING TO BE SPIRITUAL by Dave and Pat Warren. In the Instructors manual page 7 of CHOOSING TO BE SPIRITUAL the Warrens had sought to clarify something in the King James Bible saying that "In 1 Corinthians 3:1 the Greek word for carnal is sarkinos." Then they went on to say that "In 3:3 the term for carnal is sarkikos." This statement prompted me to do a little research concerning the

6 "The Drift In Baptist Missions, Churches And Schools" By Dr. David Bennett

Greek word found in these two verses. This research uncovered the fact that the Warrens consulted the Critical Greek Text, by Westcott and Hort, rather than the Greek text underlying the King James Bible, the Received Greek Text. The Critical Text did use different words than the Received Greek Text and therefore the difference. However, my question then and still is "Why did the Warrens use the Critical Text rather than the Received Text? Then I wondered why, James Dyet, the then editor of youth and adult Sunday school material at RBP did not at least make a note somewhere in the manual informing the teacher that the Critical Greek Text was used rather than the Received Greek Text? Was this a matter of dishonesty and deception by Regular Baptist Press?

I did approach Mr. Miller at the conference concerning this matter and he said I was being too picky. TOO PICKY CONCERNING THE WORDS OF GOD?! Think about it. What if I was to write a Bible study on 1 Timothy using the New American Standard Version (NASV) and when chapter three and verse sixteen is discussed I write Our NASV says And by common confession is the mystery of godliness: He who was revealed in the flesh. Now the Greek word which our NASV translates He who is the word theos which should be properly translated God and not He who. Am I being honest with the student? Yes, in one way I am being honest for the Greek text underlying the King James Bible is theos and should be translated God. However, this is not the Greek text underlying the NASV. Am I half honest? Was RBP half honest?

Pastor Fred then makes a suggestion. He writes Let me suggest to you that the controversy about the "received text" is a matter of philosophy not doctrine or integrity. For all those Pastor Freds out there, CONTROVERSY over the Received Text should not be a controversy for The New Testaments of the King James Bible, William Tyndale's Bible, Luther's German Bible, Olivetan's French Bible, the Geneva Bible (English), as well as many other vernacular versions of the Protestant Reformation were translated from the Greek Text of Stephens, 1550, which (with the Elzevir Text of 1624) is commonly called the Textus Receptus, or the Received Text (TR). It is the "Traditional Text" (T.T.) that has been read and preserved by the Greek Orthodox Church throughout the centuries. From it came the Peshitta, the Italic, Celtic, Gallic, and Gothic Bibles, the medieval versions of the evangelical Waldenses and Albigenses, and other versions suppressed by Rome during the Middle Ages. Though many copies were ruthlessly hunted down and destroyed, the Received Text has been preserved by an Almighty Providence.[1] These people had the Word of God and they were persecuted for it. I for one do not mind being in the line of these dear people.

Also, as to this so-called controversy it is only a controversy to those who refuse to accept the fact that God has preserved His Word. Now, as to accepting the Received Text as God's Word is only ones philosophy, according to my computer thesaurus some synonyms for philosophy are; viewpoint, thinking, way of life, values and beliefs. YES, Pastor Fred, it could be said what one believes concerning the text of Scripture is ones philosophy according to these synonyms.

BUT to say the controversy about the text of Scripture is NOT DOCTRINE is absurd! Again allow this writer to quote Dr. Jones. It is often stated that no matter what Greek text one may use no Christian doctrine is actually affected, hence, the whole controversy is but a "tempest in a teapot". Not so, for although as many as half of the differences between the "majority" and "minority" texts be termed "inconsequential", about 25 pages of significant discrepancies remain and the "minority" omits words from the text that total 10 pages.[2]

TWO EXAMPLES:

WHAT ABOUT THE DOCTRINE OF THE BLOOD OF CHRIST? In the Critical minority Text it is omitted in Colossians 1:14 In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.

WHAT ABOUT THE DOCTRINE OF REPENTENCE? It is omitted in the Critical minority Text in Matthew 9:13 “for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.

To sum it up Dr. D. A. Waite writes that Theology is affected in the Bible versions in two possible ways: (1) Either the PARAPHRASE found in the versions causes doctrinal changes, or (2) The basic TEXT OF GREEK is in error.[3]

WHAT ABOUT INTEGRITY? NOTE some synonyms for integrity are honesty, truth, truthfulness, honour, veracity, reliability, and uprightness. RBP was not honest in not telling the reader they were criticizing, critiquing the King James Bible with a Greek text upon which the King James Bible is not based!

Pastor Fred chastises this writer by saying It seems to me that God has called us to fulfill the great commission -- making disciples of all nations -- not fighting with other fundamentalist believers. So to be true to the great commission Pastor Fred seems to believe it is acceptable for other fundamentalist believers to publish works that criticize or critique the King James Bible with a Greek text upon which the King James Bible is not based and it is not required for the publisher, in this case RBP, to tell the unsuspecting reader this is what they have done! Very strange thinking!

Pastor Fred then reproves this writer by saying It is a shame that someone who is a Bible Believing Christian would be divisive over an issue of philosophy in direct contradiction to the Bible's directives against making an issue of things that are "doubtful disputations". Romans 14: 1 has nothing to do with being honest and open concerning this issue under discussion. However, critiquing the King James Bible with the Critical minority text and not telling the reader, that is divisive!

Pastor Fred then lists six things he believes this writer is guilty or ignorant of and they are:

1. What does the Bible say about the original texts?
2. How did Jesus treat the LXX?
3. What makes the "received" text any different than any of the other Western texts?
4. Actually, what we call the textus receptus today, is not identical to the text that our beloved KJV was translated from.
5. You arrived at your personal conclusions after reading someone else's conclusions -- not by studying the texts yourself.

8 “The Drift In Baptist Missions, Churches And Schools” By Dr. David Bennett

6. I'm not sure, but it appears that you are more concerned about being a man pleaser (saying what pleases those from a sectarian camp) than you are about proclaiming the grace of God to a world desperately in need of the Gospel -- not about what text the Gospel comes from.

This writer will now seek to answer these six points Pastor Fred has made.

1. What does the Bible say about the original texts?

a. Gods Word says the original texts were breathed out by God Himself, 2 Timothy 3: 16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God... This is INSPIRATION! However, inspiration without preservation is useless, nothing. Through the ages the originals were worn out by their continual use so the question is; did God leave His breathed-out Words unprotected and unpreserved? The answer is NO, God did not!

b. Gods Word calls copies Scripture, 2 Timothy 3:15 And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures... Dr. Floyd Jones writes Thus, when Timothy was a child, there was no New Testament collection of Scripture anywhere. Nor was Paul speaking of the "ORIGINALS" of the Old Testament for there was not an original Old Testament piece of paper or vellum extant at that time.

Wrestle with this! Come to grips with it! These are the verses upon which many of us base our faith and say we believe in the "ORIGINALS". Yet these very verses are not speaking of the original manuscripts!

But are the copies inspired? The Bible itself clearly teaches that faithful copies of the originals are also inspired. The word "Scripture" in II Timothy 3:16 is translated from the Greek word "graf-ay'". Graf-ay' occurs 51 times in the Greek New Testament and at every occurrence it means "Scripture" in fact, it usually refers to the Old Testament text.

A perusal of the N.T. reveals that the Lord Jesus read from the "graf-ay'" in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luk.4:21) as did Paul in the synagogue at Thessalonica (Acts 17:2). The Ethiopian eunuch, returning home from worshipping at Jerusalem, was riding in his chariot and reading a passage of graf-ay' (Acts 8:32-33). These were not the autographs that they were reading; they were copies moreover, copies of copies! Yet the Word of God calls them graf-ay' and every graf-ay' is "given by inspiration of God" (II Tim.3:16). Thus, the Holy Writ has testified and that testimony is that faithful copies of the originals are themselves inspired. Selah!

Therefore, it all comes down to a promise given by God that He would preserve the text which He gave us. Timothy never saw an original when he was a child of either the Old or New Testament, yet in verse 16 God says that what Timothy learned as a child was given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Now if God were talking about something which had been lost and/or is no longer true and accurate, why did He give verse 17?^[4] j

This writer agrees with God that a faithful copy of the original inspired words of God is

Scripture! THAT IS WHAT WE HAVE IN THE GREEK TEXTUS RECEPTUS the original words breathed out by God! A few verses speaking of Gods protection and preservation of His ORIGINAL Words are;

Mark 13:31 "Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away". Did Jesus mean what He said?

Isaiah 40:8 "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand for ever". Gods Word is composed of His Words! Did God mean what He said?

Psalm 12:6, 7 "The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shall keep them, O Lord, thou shall preserve them from this generation forever". Did God really mean He would preserve His words or is God a liar?

John 12:48 "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day."

I believe God breathed out His Words (inspiration) and men such as Jeremiah and Paul wrote them down. God then protected and preserved those original words in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek for such men as our King James translators to bring across into our English language and therefore giving us the King James Bible.

The next point Pastor Fred puts forth is:

2. How did Jesus treat the LXX?

The existence of the LXX before the birth of Christ is debated by many learned men but this question leads me to believe that Pastor Fred assumes the LXX existed when Jesus was walking this earth. Again making reference to Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones in his THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, page 15, he writes that ...if the Savior, the apostles and the early church used the Septuagint for their Bible, why would the true believers have ever left it and why did they return to the Hebrew Text? The answer is obvious they would never have done so. Again I emphasize that 2 Timothy 3: 16 is referring to the Hebrew Old Testament Scriptures and not to the LXX!

3. What makes the "received" text any different than any of the other Western texts?

Is there such a text as Western? Neither Dean Burgon nor his close associate, Rev. Edward Miller, believed that there were such things as text families. Textual families were concoctions of Fenton John Anthony Hort and Bishop Brooke Foss Westcott as they expressed it in their Introduction of the Greek New Testament of 1881. They had to devise the so-called text families in order to put down and defeat the Textus Receptus which contains the greatest number of manuscripts in existence today: about 5,210 or over 99% of the 5,255 manuscripts as of 1997.[5]

10 “The Drift In Baptist Missions, Churches And Schools” By Dr. David Bennett

Dr. Jack Moorman in his book FOREVER SETTLED says “the basic idea of textual types or families has its source in the naturalistic viewpoint and we do not believe that it represents the facts concerning the distribution of MSS in the early centuries.[6]

Dr. Moorman further states concerning the Western family that Klijn, speaking of a pure or original Western text affirms that such a text did not exist.[7]

4. Actually, what we call the textus receptus today, is not identical to the text that our beloved KJV was translated from.

Dr. Frederick Scrivener produced a Greek text and is published by the Dean Burgon Society. This edition says this is ...THE EXACT GREEK TEXTUS RECEPTUS THAT UNDERLIES THE KING JAMES BIBLE.[8]

Further reading of this exceptional publication tells us Tyndale himself followed the second and third editions of Erasmuss Greek text (1519, 1522). In the revisions of his translation previous to 1611 a partial use was made of other texts; of which ultimately the most influential were the various editions of Beza from 1560 to 1598, if indeed his Latin version of 1556 should not be included. Between 1598 and 1611 no important edition appeared; so that Bezas fifth and last text of 1598 was more than likely than any other to be in the hands of King Jamess revisers, and to be accepted by them as the best standard within their reach.[9]

We can hold the Greek text of Dr. Scrivener and see those exact God breathed Words given to Paul, Peter, James, John and the other New Testament writers. Then, praise God, we can hold up our precious English Bible, the Authorized King James Bible, and say those King James translators faithfully carried across into English language those God-breathed Hebrew, Greek and Aramaic Words!

The fifth statement of my learned correspondent is,

5. You arrived at your personal conclusions after reading someone else 's conclusions -- not by studying the texts yourself.

I take affront to this from my correspondent. Be assured I think for myself. However, as a matter of fact we are all students and our conclusions are somewhat formed from what we are taught.

Pastor Fred, going back to point #2 NO ONE, and I stress NO ONE, would read the New Testament thinking Jesus was reading and quoting from a source known as the LXX. Why? It is not in the sacred Text as to what source language the Lord was reading. So I ask you how you came about to ask the question if you did not learn it from someone?

Also before the proliferation of all these new English versions a reader of the Bible would not

dare question the last 12 verses of Mark 16. Pastors and others question these verses because of some notes in their Bible or some critical teacher of the Bible taught them this lie.

Oh, Pastor Fred, going back to point #3 how did you know there were supposedly different families of Texts? You didn't by chance read that somewhere or get taught that by someone else did you?

To conclude Pastor Fred's inquiry he says,

“I'm not sure, but it appears that you are more concerned about being a man pleaser (saying what pleases those from a sectarian camp) than you are about proclaiming the grace of God to a world desperately in need of the Gospel -- not about what text the Gospel comes from.”

Undoubtedly you and I are not in the same camp Pastor Fred, or this article would not need to be written. If I belong to any camp it is the camp that holds to the fact that we have an accurate Greek Text in Scriveners Greek New Testament and a faithful and accurate translation of those preserved Words in our King James Bible.

Pastor Fred, you say I am more concerned about being a man pleaser! I do not know how the Lord has led you and undoubtedly you do not know how He has led me.

If I may, may I take just another moment or two of your time and share a little of my life experiences. I left a mission agency, with full support, because of what the Bible teaches concerning ecclesiastical separation and in that departure we lost friends and support. However, obedience to the Word always brings the blessing of God.

I have always used the King James Bible but never fully understood why until I was taught by others that God has preserved in the original Hebrew and Greek languages those inspired Words. These preserved Words are found in the Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament & the Received Greek New Testament. Then I learned God had faithful and scholarly translators in 1611 carry over into our English language those very Words of God and thereby providing us with the King James Bible. Thank the Lord for these teachers! If it had not been for those teachers I may be teaching today that Jesus used the LXX or that the last twelve verses of Mark are not genuine! How sad that would have been!

My position on the King James Bible and its underlying texts has cost us both friends and support. Pastor Fred, if I am trying to please man, or any particular group of men, I am not doing a very good job of it!

As to preaching the Gospel I seek to do all I can through preaching, witnessing and the radio programmes God has allowed us to have in getting out the Gospel. However, in doing this I use those Words God has had faithfully and lovingly carried over into our English language in the King James Bible from those preserved original Hebrew and Greek Words.

It is always good to go back over territory once traversed so thank you Pastor Fred for writing. Your email stirred me to research again those precious teachings concerning the Word and Words of God.

12 “The Drift In Baptist Missions, Churches And Schools” By Dr. David Bennett

In closing, Jeremiah 26:2 says Thus saith the LORD; Stand...and speak unto all...all the words that I command thee to speak unto them; diminish not a word. TODAY THIS IS ACCOMPLISHED IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ONLY BY USING THE RIGHT TEXT AS FOUND IN THE KING JAMES BIBLE!

[1] Floyd Nolen Jones, Which Version is the Bible?, KingsWord Press Five Milan Hwy., Humboldt, TN 38343, p. ix.

[2] Ibid. p. xi

[3] D. A. Waite, Defending the King James Bible, The Bible For Today Press, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ 08108, 1992, p. 133.

[4] Floyd Nolen Jones, WHICH VERSION IS THE BIBLE?, KingsWord Press, Five Milan Hwy., Humboldt, TN 38343, 2010, pp. 7, 8.

[5] D. A. Waite, FOES OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE REFUTED, The Bible For Today Press, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ, 1997, P.32

[6] <http://www.buzzardhut.net/index/htm/Forever.Settled.pdf>

[7] Jack Moorman, FOREVER SETTLED, The Dean Burgon Society Press, Collingswood, NJ, 1999, p. 72.

[8] Scriveners Annotated Greek New Testament, Dean Burgon Society Press, Collingswood, NJ, 1999, title page, unnumbered.

[9] Ibid. p. vii

The next paper “The King James Bible and USA Based Mission Boards” was written to hopefully help a pastor know where the mission board stands on the King James Bible.
The King James Bible and USA based Mission Boards

Many Independent Baptist Churches which use only the King James Bible also use mission boards in seeking to carry out the Great Commission. The purpose of this paper is to help those churches to know where at least the following seventeen boards stand on the Bible version issue.

The following statements of belief on the Bible are taken directly from the individual web site of the named mission organization.

Appalachian Independent Baptist Missions: “Standing Without Apology for the A.V. 1611 King James Bible.”

Association of Baptists for World Evangelism: “We believe the Scriptures of the Old and New testaments as originally written were God-breathed, both verbally and in every part.”

Baptist Bible Fellowship “Of The Scriptures - We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men

supernaturally inspired; that it has truth without any admixture of error for its matter; and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the age, the only complete and final revelation of the will of God to man; the true center of Christian union and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and opinions should be tried.

1. By "The Holy Bible" we mean that collection of sixty-six books, from Genesis to Revelation, which, as originally written does not only contain and convey the Word of God, but IS the very Word of God.

2. By "inspiration" we mean that the books of the Bible were written by holy men of old, as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, in such a definite way that their writings were supernaturally and verbally inspired and free from error, as no other writings have ever been or ever will be inspired.

Psalms 19:7-11; 119:89,105,130,160; Proverbs 30:5-6; Isaiah 8:20; Luke 16:31; 24:25-27,44-45; John 5:39,45-47; 12:48; 17:17; Acts 1:16; 28:25; Romans 3:4; 15:4; Ephesians 6:17; 2 Timothy 3:16-17; 1 Peter 1:23; 2 Peter 1:19-21; Revelation 22:19”

BAPTIST HOME MISSIONS: “We believe the Bible is the inerrant Word of God and the sole authority for faith and practice.”

Baptist International Missions, Inc.: “The Inspiration of the Bible – We believe the Bible is the verbally inspired Word of God. We believe the writings of the Old and New Testaments are fully God-breathed to the extent that the very words were chosen by God from the human vocabulary so that the Bible is the very word of God, inerrant in all its assertions and teachings. The Bible is therefore the only infallible authority for both doctrine and life. Since this is true, it is the special revelation of God to man and the only basis for true Christian unity. (II Timothy 3:16-17; Matthew 5:18; Acts 1:16; Mark 12:36; II Peter 1:19-21; Hebrews 4:12; John 10:35;16:12,13;17:17)”

Bible Translations – “In the English speaking countries of the world, our missionaries preach from the King James version of the Bible.”

Baptist Missions to Forgotten Peoples, Inc.: “The Word of God – We believe the Bible is the divinely inspired Word of God in its entirety, written by men as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, and that it is the sole authority for the Christian's faith and conduct. We believe that the King James Version of the Bible (KJV) is the preserved Word of God for the English-speaking people of the world. (Psalm 12:6-7, II Peter 1:20-21)”

Baptist World Mission: “POSITION STATEMENT ON ISSUES OF THE SCRIPTURES

I. ON THE KING JAMES VERSION

Recognizing that different convictions exist among us regarding Bible texts and versions, we believe we should balance soul liberty with Christian charity in these matters, and therefore, agree not to magnify these differences. We believe we should leave such discussion and decision

14 “The Drift In Baptist Missions, Churches And Schools” By Dr. David Bennett

to the privacy of individual conscience and the sovereign determination of each local church. Though some men may use certain versions in the study, we require the King James Version to be used by our missionaries in their preaching in the United States. Also, we ask our preachers in our Baptist World Mission meetings and conferences to use the King James Version. We continue to believe that the King James Version is the Word of God in English.*

II. ON BIBLE PRESERVATION

We believe God has promised in both the Old and New Testaments to preserve His Word as given to us in the original Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek texts (Psalm 12:6-7; 78:1-8; 119:89; 111; 152; 160; Isa. 30:8; 40:6-8; Eccl. 3:14; Matt. 4:4; 5:17-18; 24:35; 28:20; Jn. 10:35; Col. 1:17; 1 Pet. 1:23-25; 2 Jn. 1:2; and elsewhere.) By His Providential care, we believe God has kept His Word pure down through the ages as He promised, and we reaffirm our belief in what our Baptist forefathers wrote in their London Baptist Confession in 1677 and 1689. It states in part:

"The Old Testament in Hebrew, (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament Greek (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations) BEING IMMEDIATELY INSPIRED BY GOD, AND BY HIS SINGULAR CARE AND PROVIDENCE KEPT PURE IN ALL AGES, are therefore, AUTHENTICAL"

Recognizing that different convictions exist among us regarding the method and product of Bible preservation, we all believe that God has indeed kept His promise and has preserved His Word in the original language texts. We believe we should balance soul liberty with Christian charity as to the method and product of Bible preservation, and therefore, agree to respect different views. We believe we should leave such discussion and decision to the privacy of individual conscience and the sovereign determination of each local church.*

III. ON TRANSLATION WORK DONE BY BAPTIST WORLD MISSION MISSIONARIES

Baptist World Mission missionaries must consult with and secure permission from the BWM administration before they begin any Bible translation project. No BWM missionary shall cooperate in any ecumenical or New Evangelical Bible translation project. All completed translations must have the approval of the BWM administration prior to publication and distribution.

Unanimously adopted by the Board of Directors on April 16, 1996.

* Statements borrowed from those by the Independent Baptist Fellowship and adapted to BWM use.”

Continental Baptist Missions: “We Believe In...The verbal and plenary inspiration of the Bible as given in the original manuscripts, which constitute the inerrant Word of God in all matters in which it speaks. 2 Tim. 3:16, 17; 2 Peter 1:19-21”

Fundamental Baptist World-Wide Mission: “We believe in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as verbally and plenary inspired by God and without error in the original writings; that the Bible is reliable in science, history, and every other matter it discusses; and that the Bible is of supreme and final authority in faith and life. We believe that the King James Version is the preserved Word of God for the English-speaking people of today. It is the version used by our Mission and missionaries. We diligently seek a true translation in the various foreign languages in which we work.”

Macedonia World Baptist Missions, Inc.: “The plenary, verbal, Divine inspiration of Scripture, consisting only of the 39 Old Testament and 27 New Testament books, in the original language, their consequent inerrancy and infallibility, and as the Word of God, the supreme and final authority in faith and life.”

Open Door Baptist Missions: “We believe in the Holy Scriptures, accepting fully the writing of the Old and New Testaments as the very Word of God, verbally inspired in all parts in its original autographs, our infallible and authoritative rule of faith and practice.”

The Hope of Israel: “The Holy Scriptures - We believe the Holy Scriptures (66 Books, apocrypha not included) of the Old and New Testaments to be the only verbally plenary infallible inspired Word of God; inerrant in the original writings, but providentially preserved in its inspired state while maintaining infallibility and inerrancy in the King James Bible. We believe that the King James Bible is the only Bible in the English language that God would have us to use, preach, teach, study, and memorize from, because it is the God preserved translation of the Masoretic Text and the Textus Receptus for the English speaking people. The Bible teaches that the providentially preserved Holy Scriptures are and shall remain the only complete unerring and unchanging standard by which all human conduct, creeds and opinions should be tried. (2 Tim. 3:16,17; 2 Peter 1:19-21; Matt. 5:18; John 16:12,13; Ps.119:9,11,89; I Peter 1:23; Rom 15:4; Rev. 22:18-19; Is40:8; Matt. 24:35; >Prov30:5-7; Ps 12:6-7; Matt 4:4; Deut 4:2; John 10:35; Is 59:21)”

TABERNACLE BAPTIST MISSIONS INTERNATIONAL: “We believe in the verbal, plenary inspiration and the infallibility of the Scripture (II Tim, 3:15-17; II Pet. 1:19-21), We believe that the Word of God has been divinely preserved without contradiction or error in the King James Version for the English-speaking people (Psa. 112:6-7; 138:2; Mt. 5:18; Jn. 12:48)”

WORLD WIDE NEW TESTAMENT BAPTIST MISSIONS, INC.: “All Board members, officers and missionaries of the Corporation shall subscribe to the following statement of doctrine:A. We believe that the Bible is the divinely inspired Word of God. We believe the Received Text (Textus Receptus) carries the full authority of the Original Autographs which includes The King James Version and translations in other languages that are accurately translated from the Received Text (Textus Receptus). (II Peter 1: 19-21; II Timothy 3:15-17.)”

Wayfarer Ministries Baptist Mission: “We believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are verbally inspired of God, and preserved in the KJV 1611. That the Scriptures are inerrant and are the supreme and final authority.”

16 “The Drift In Baptist Missions, Churches And Schools” By Dr. David Bennett

Baptist Mid-Missions: “We believe that the sixty-six books of the Old and New Testaments are verbally inspired of God and inerrant in the original writing and that they are of supreme and final authority in faith and life. (II Timothy 3:16-17; II Peter 1:19-21).

Working with BMM is Bibles International. This is their Translation Policy: “Accepting the Bible as the very Word of God, given to us by plenary-verbal inspiration, and totally without error in its original manuscripts, the consultants and translators of Bibles International, a ministry of Baptist Mid-Missions, base their work upon the divinely preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts, and seek the guidance and help of God in achieving a good and accurate translation of His Word.

While many texts in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, and many versions in English and other languages may be consulted, final decisions on textual content are based on the Massoretic text of the Old Testament and the Majority Text of the New Testament. Translations produced by Bibles International express the very Word of God as literally as possible in the receptor languages without distorting, adding to, or obscuring the meaning of the original text.”

In conclusion as an Independent Baptist Church which uses only the King James Bible you should only support those missionaries and those mission boards which stand where you do on the King James Bible issue!

The last paper owes its existence to a visit from the then Editor of Regular Baptist Press to Australia.

REGULAR BAPTIST PRESS AND THE KING JAMES BIBLE AND THE RECEIVED TEXT

Spiritually I grew up feeding on the King James Bible and Regular Baptist Press (RBP) Sunday school material. As a young boy the church in which I was saved used RPB material and when I went into the ministry the first church I pastored used RBP materials. When we came to Australia in 1979 with the Association of Baptists for World Evangelism (then an approved agency of the General Association of Regular Baptists, GARBC) RBP was kind enough to supply us and other GARBC approved missionaries with free Sunday school material. The RBP materials were well presented and a great help in our teaching ministry.

In the mid 1980’s I was studying for a Masters degree through Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary. By the providence and good hand of the Lord I transferred from Grand Rapids to Bethany Theological Seminary. One of the courses at Bethany required reading books on the Textual issue of the New Testament. The books chosen by the professor for the course were written by Dr. David Otis Fuller and Dean of Chichester John Burgon. Through reading these books my spiritual eyes were opened to the real Bible Textual issue. Therefore I became more conscious of the commentaries I used and the teaching materials we were using in our ministry.

In the very early 1990’s the Executive Editor of Regular Baptist Press, Vernon Miller, now retired, visited Sydney, Australia. Mr. Miller had come to conduct a Sunday school conference for the independent Baptist churches in the surrounding Sydney area. At one of the sessions Mr.

Miller made the comment that Regular Baptist Press only used the King James Bible. Most of the pastors attending that conference also used only the King James Bible so that assurance from Mr. Miller sounded good to their ears. However, I was at that time teaching the adult Regular Baptist Sunday school material CHOOSING TO BE SPIRITUAL by Dave and Pat Warren. In the Instructor's manual page 7 of CHOOSING TO BE SPIRITUAL the Warren's had sought to clarify something in the King James Bible saying that "In 1 Corinthians 3:1 the Greek word for 'carnal' is sarkinos." Then they went on to say that "In 3:3 the term for 'carnal' is sarkikos." This statement prompted me to do a little research concerning the Greek word found in these two verses. This research uncovered the fact that the Warren's consulted the Critical Greek Text, by Westcott and Hort, rather than the Greek text underlying the King James Bible, the Received Greek Text. The Critical Text did use different words than the Received Greek Text and therefore the difference. However, my question then and still is "Why did the Warren's use the Critical Text rather than the Received Text? Then I wondered why, James Dyet, the then editor of youth and adult Sunday school material at RBP did not at least make a note somewhere in the manual informing the teacher that the Critical Greek Text was used rather than the Received Greek Text? Was this a matter of dishonesty and deception by Regular Baptist Press?

Back to the Sunday school conference in Sydney. When Mr. Miller made it a point to say Regular Baptist Press only used the King James Bible I decided to ask him a question when he and I were alone. The question I was going to put to him was; why did the Warren's use the Critical Greek Text which differs from the Received Greek Text underlying the King James Bible in not only the passage under consideration by the Warrens but in a whole host of other Biblical passages? Simply put, it was their use of the Critical Greek Text that brought about the explanation of this English word, carnal, found in the 1 Corinthians 3 passage. When I was able to speak to Mr. Miller alone and brought this matter to his attention his reply was that I was being too picky and made it clear he was not discussing it any further.

So, my impression from Mr. Miller was that while Regular Baptist Press only used the King James Bible it knowingly approved using the Critical Greek Text even though it was not the Greek text underlying the King James Bible. This meant that the English words in the King James Bible would be clarified or corrected by a Greek text that John Burgon deemed as "...a Text vastly more remote from the inspired autographs of the Evangelists than any which has appeared since the invention of printing." REVISION REVISED pages 25, 26.

Consider for a moment, if a Christian publishing company said they used only the New International Version in their published material but in that material explained the various nuances of the Greek words using the Received Greek Text, would that be honest? No, it would not and neither do I believe it is honest for Regular Baptist Press to do what they did and most likely continues to do. Now, I do not know how many other authors writing for Regular Baptist Press have done this but Mr. Miller's remark did lead me to take a closer look at the other Regular Baptist Press materials I had on my shelves.

As I examined the other Regular Baptist Press material my attention was drawn to an adult lesson entitled KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE by Wallace Alcorn and written for use in adult Vacation Bible School. KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE has a copyright of 1975 and lists Merle R. Hull as the Executive Editor and Valerie Wilson as the VBS editor.

18 "The Drift In Baptist Missions, Churches And Schools" By Dr. David Bennett

As I opened the Teacher's Guide to KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE I did not have to look far until I knew where Mr. Alcorn's affections were placed as to Bible manuscripts. Mr. Alcorn wrote on page 11 of the Teacher's Guide that "The three most important manuscripts extant today are the Vatican, the Sinaitic and the Alexandrian." Of the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts, John Burgon who lived at the time of Westcott and Hort, said they "...have within the last twenty years established a tyrannical ascendancy over the imagination of the Critics, which can only be fitly spoken of as blind superstition." REVISION REVISED page 11. Burgon went on to say on page 26 of REVISION REVISED that Westcott and Hort had such a love for the Vatican manuscript that they believed "...when it stands alone, its readings must never be lightly rejected." This same superstition and love Westcott and Hort had for the Vatican, the Sinaitic, and Alexandrian manuscripts continues today. This superstition and devotion to these manuscripts is disseminated to the Christian public through the multitude of new English versions and materials published by Christian printing organizations such as the American Bible Society and Regular Baptist Press.

Mr. Alcorn shows his fondness to these three early manuscripts when he goes on to say on page 11 of the Teacher's Guide that the "Scribes who copied the manuscripts (Vatican, Sinaitic, and Alexandrian) demonstrated great devotion to their task." That isn't what Dean of Chichester John Burgon thought of these manuscripts. He wrote on pages 13 and 14 of REVISION REVISED that the Sinaitic manuscript is the most untrustworthy codex "...which bears on its front a memorable note of the evil repute under which it has always laboured: viz. it is found that at least ten revisers between the IVth and the XIIth centuries busied themselves with the task of correcting its many and extraordinary perversions of the truth of Scripture." The next in the line of impurity according to John Burgon is the Vatican manuscript. On page 15 of REVISION REVISED John Burgon says the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts have a "depraved text." Alcorn may believe these Scribes "demonstrated great devotion to their task" of manuscript copying but not so with Dean of Chichester John Burgon!

Reading further on we see Mr. Alcorn says on page 20 of the Teacher's Guide KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE that the "Autographs are the actual writings of the authors. None of the original autographs of Scripture exist today. We have only copies made from them. The autographs are approximated by a critical construction of the text. This is done by finding common readings among the oldest manuscripts and, thus, eliminating the variants in the more recent and less reliable texts." (Emphasis added by me). Note the teacher is being told that "the oldest" is the best while "the more recent" is the "less reliable" of the Greek texts. All this is doing is preparing the teacher for the coming assault on the King James Bible and its Received Greek Text. However, John Burgon had distaste for those "old manuscripts" and said they were "...the most scandalously corrupt copies extant:-exhibit the most shamefully mutilated texts which are anywhere to be met with...." Emphasis Burgon's, REVISION REVISED page 16.

In the student's book of KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE on pages 89, 90 there are listed numerous English Bible versions. Mr. Alcorn says that with all these many versions "No wonder the average Bible student is confused! He knows there is only one Bible; yet all these versions of the one Bible make it appear that there might be more than one. Moreover, the person who needs modern language versions the most (because he does not read biblical languages) is not in a position to judge critically those which appear." So, if the student cannot read the original languages of the Bible he is not qualified to make a critical judgment on the many English

versions of the Bible? Then, what does this unqualified Bible student do?

The Regular Baptist Press textbook on pages 89 and 90 for KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE goes on to tell the unqualified Bible student that there is a consensus "...of the scholars who exegetically study the Bible in modern languages and who teach these matters in the colleges and seminaries approved by the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches." Here we are introduced to "the scholars" and the unqualified Bible student is told that "the scholars" know more than he does. This is all because he is only an unqualified Bible student! These "scholars" know the original languages and will tell the Bible student the truth and nothing but the truth, so one would think. Alcorn continues in the Teacher's Guide to say that when the "scholars" "...analyse and work from the modern language versions, they do so as men trained for and experienced in scientific procedures of investigation. Some have served as Bible translators." The student is supposed to be impressed with this!? These "scientific procedures of investigation" are what John Burgon called "a land of shadows." REVISION REVISED page 254.

Mr. Alcorn encourages the student to unhesitatingly follow the "scholars", for they know more than he the lowly student does! I wonder if Acts 17:11 is pertinent here? "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so."

Mr. Alcorn now writes in the student's text page 90 that these "scholars" "...have a deep appreciation and warm affection for the Authorized Version of 1611. This is due not only to what God has been pleased to do through it in past years, but for its abiding worth" This high commendation is often given the King James Bible by the antagonist just before it is removed from its rightful place as God's Word in the English language via their condemnation of the Greek text underlying the King James Bible. In the book THE MAKING OF A CONTEMPORARY TRANSLATION page 196 Edwin Palmer said "I love the King James Version (KJV). I was converted under it. My first memory verses were taken from the KJV. I have been blessed by it. And God still uses the KJV. Salvation can still be found in the KJV. But the KJV is not the best translation to use today." I LOVE IT BUT! "Salvation can still be found in the KJV."? If these are lovers of the King James Bible one would hate to see its enemies.

Mr. Alcorn now reveals what he thinks of the Received Greek Text, for he writes in the student's text book on page 90 that "It is acknowledged that the Greek text (the Received text) on which the AV is based is not the best text currently available. The original translation would have been even better had the more recently reconstructed text been available." Oh, the arrogance of these people! Let me reiterate, that this criticism of the King James Bible and the Received Greek Text was taking place in 1975! This criticism is being made in print with the consent of the official publishing house of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches, Regular Baptist Press!

At this point I ask who is being divisive in this Greek text issue. No where in KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE is John Burgon or Dr. D. A. Waite mentioned and their stand for the Received Greek Text. No where in KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE are we ever told the Greek Text is an issue. We are only told that the King James is outdated and the Received Greek Text is not as good as the newly constructed Greek Text.

20 "The Drift In Baptist Missions, Churches And Schools" By Dr. David Bennett

KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE was written well before I really became aware of the issue. Thank the Lord I did not read KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE until after reading Revision Revised by John Burgon! Only God knows how far down that anti-Bible road I would have travelled. Mr. Alcorn with RBP's knowledge said the AV, King James Bible, is not based on "the best text currently available." Oh, if only the Critical Greek Text had been available when the King James was translated it would "have been even better" bewails Alcorn. However, John Burgon said in REVISION REVISED, page 235, that Alcorn's favourite Greek Text was the result of "some ingenious theory-monger" and that the resultant Translation "...reads like a first-rate school-boy's crib, -tasteless, unlovely, harsh, unidiomatic; -servile without being faithful, -pedantic without being really learned; -an unreadable Translation, in short; the result of a vast amount of labour indeed, but of wondrous little skill; -how all this has come about, it were utterly useless at this time of day to enquire." REVISION REVISED page 238. Are the new versions based on the same Critical Greek text much better? No, for good fruit will never come from a bad tree.

Mr. Alcorn and RBP were endorsing the Critical Greek Text in KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE without printing one word from those who held to the superiority of the Received Greek Text! Mr. Alcorn and RBP are audacious indeed in their superciliousness and deception on the Greek textual issue. If the student and teacher did not know anything about another side to the issue before reading KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE they would have probably swallowed all this mis-information hook line and sinker. The unquestioning teacher and student after reading KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE would naturally desire to use the best English version of the Bible based on this "more recently reconstructed text."

But, wait a minute; Mr. Alcorn has more to say on the subject of the King James and its ill favoured Greek text. Mr. Alcorn, in the student text book on page 90, writes that "However, the Received Text was not corrupt, and variations have not made a bit of difference to doctrine or practice." The Received Text is not the best but it is not corrupt! Wow! The student may be a little confused by this but "If there is no doctrine or practice affected then I will stay with the King James Bible." Woe now, hold it right there, student of the Bible, for Mr. Alcorn adds that "Because of a better text, greater understanding of the languages and changes in English since 1611, the AV is not fully adequate for every purpose." So now the student is told he may use the King James Bible for its Greek text, the Received Text, is not corrupt, but in spite of that, the King James Bible is not the most "adequate for every purpose." Now the student might be wondering what purpose the King James is adequate for and what purposes it is not adequate for. Mr. Alcorn now answers that by reciting the Critical Text mantra that the King James Bible "...is still preferred for public worship and most general purposes, but use of modern versions in serious Bible study will help in further understanding of the Biblical text." Oh, the King James Bible is not adequate for "serious Bible study."! And I wonder why the preachers and churches have abandoned the King James Bible for another?

In the Teacher's Guide page 31 Alcorn writes that "...the point of comparison is not the Authorized Version or any other one version, but the original languages. The worth of a translation stands or falls upon the adequacy of its representation of the original language Bible." That is so true and that is why John Burgon and others in his day and today hold to the Received Greek Text and the King James Bible. The Received Greek Text contains the original words of the original autographs! And the King James Bible is a faithful English translation from those

original language words found in the Received Greek Text! John Burgon believed the translators of the King James Bible were men that "...understood their craft! 'There were giants in those days.' As little would they submit to be bound by the new cords of the Philistines as by their green withes. Upon occasion, they could shake themselves free from either. And why? For the selfsame reason: viz. because the SPIRIT of their God was mighty upon them." REVISION REVISED page 196. The same cannot be said of those translating the Scriptures today.

To add further endorsement for using another version as opposed to using the King James Bible, Alcorn displays in the Teacher's Guide a chart of what English version is preferred by the GARBC "scholars" alluded to earlier. According to the Teacher's Guide chart, in the year 1975, the preferred version of the theology and Bible professors, the "scholars", in approved Regular Baptist colleges and seminaries was the American Standard with 60%. That was in 1975! The New International Version was second with 59%, the New American Standard with 57%, New Scofield with 54% and with 52% the old Book God used in sending revivals and spiritual awakenings to England and America, the Authorized King James. Not far behind the King James was the New Berkeley at 50%. Remember, this survey was in 1975. Again it is worth noting that this is a survey of those professors, the "scholars", who were teaching in approved GARBC schools. The students of these "scholars" in 1975 were then future GARBC pastors and missionaries!

I wonder where would the King James Bible these "scholars" had such "a deep appreciation and warm affection" for in 1975 rate today? If the old Book only rated 52% then, it would certainly be much less today. Also, it is worth noting that those who the professors, the "scholars", were teaching in 1975 are today behind the pulpit and on the mission field teaching people what they were taught by their professor, the "scholar". Sad indeed! Sad that so many have swallowed the line that older is better. Sad that so many are being duped to go the way of the new versions and forsaking the old Book of Holy Ghost Heaven sent revivals and spiritual awakenings! Sad, the "scholars" have reared a generation of preachers who have forsaken the superior for the inferior. Sad indeed, that there will come a generation that will move even further from the words of God. But, on the other hand God always has a remnant and that remnant will continue to be faithful in holding to and using God's Word as found in the Received Greek Text and the King James Bible.

Again, reiterating what Mr. Alcorn tells the teacher on page 31 of the Teacher's Guide, that in "...the matter of modern versions, emphasize that the point of comparison is not the Authorized Version or any one version, but the original languages." But, which Text of the original Greek language are these people to go too, the Received Text or the Westcott and Hort Text? The answer undoubtedly Alcorn and Regular Baptist Press believes is the best is the Westcott and Hort Critical Text!

As I look back now, it is not surprising so many of the GARBC schools and churches have gone the way of the new versions when the Westcott and Hort Critical Greek Text has been lifted up and promoted as superior to the Received Greek Text in Regular Baptist Press publications such as KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE.

This paper was written in September, 2004. So almost thirty years ago, this deceptive teaching regarding the King James Bible and the Received Greek Text appeared in Regular Baptist Press'

22 “The Drift In Baptist Missions, Churches And Schools” By Dr. David Bennett

KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE. However, devotion to the Critical Greek Text and the dishonesty of the Critical Greek Text crowd began much earlier than 1975. It began in the 1800's with the dishonesty of Westcott and Hort. As John Burgon wrote in Revision Revised page three, the Revisers were only "To introduce as few alterations as possible into the Text of the Authorized Version, consistently with faithfulness." We were not told that in KNOWING AND USING THE BIBLE. On page 2 of Revision Revised Dean John Burgon said that "...to construct a new Greek Text formed no part of the Instructions which the Revisionists received at the hands of the Convocation of the Southern Province." In other words, what Westcott and Hort set out to do was dethrone the Received Greek Text with a fabricated Greek text. They were dishonest and so are their children.

That dishonesty continues to this day. Churches who once used only the King James Bible have tossed the old Book aside for a new version because the preacher has fallen for a lie told by professors, the "scholars", that, older is better. Some students of those professors, the "scholars", also went out to write and edit Bible materials in Christian publishing houses. Today those professors, the "scholars, and those publishing houses have a lot to answer for!

In summing up, integrity demands that those Christian schools and Christian Publishing houses, such as Regular Baptist Press, who say they use only the King James Bible, but use the Critical Greek Text, stop using the King James Bible. If they continue to say they use only the King James Bible, honesty to the King James Bible demands they use the Received Greek Text underlying it. Or, they should come out of the closet and replace the old Book with a new English version based on the Critical Greek Text, which they purport to be the best!

This is not being picky but is a matter of Regular Baptist Press just being honest.”

Brethren, the King James Bible is an accurate and faithful translation of the original God breathed words in both the Old and New Testament. We need never apologize for taking a strong stand for our Authorized King James Bible and its underlying Texts. This stand will doubtlessly sever relationships and fellowship. Those who do not accept our conviction concerning God's Word will want us to compromise in order to continue our walk with them. However, this we cannot do for as Paul said “*Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong*” 1Corinthians 16:13 .