

**“...KEEP RANK....  
CAN YOU?”**

**A PAPER PRESENTED BY**

**DR. GARY E. LA MORE, A.A., B.A., M.A.,  
M.Div., PH.D., D.D.**

**Pastor of Grace Missionary Baptist Church  
and President of Historic Baptist Bible Institute  
and Seminary  
369 Lawson Road  
Toronto, Ontario, Canada  
M1C 2J8  
1-416-281-4865**

**AT**

**THE DEAN BURGON SOCIETY'S  
26<sup>TH</sup> ANNIVERSARY MEETINGS**

**HELD AT**

**HERITAGE BAPTIST UNIVERSITY  
GREENWOOD, INDIANA**

**JULY 14-15 2004**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	4
FUNDAMENTALISM .....	5
MARANATHA BAPTIST BIBLE COLLEGE .....	10
DR. JOHN R. RICE AND THE SWORD OF THE LORD .....	14
BOB JONES UNIVERSITY .....	16
B.B. WARFIELD .....	19
TEMPLE BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY .....	21
DR. DAVID JASPERS, PRESIDENT OF MARANATHA BAPTIST BIBLE COLLEGE	22
DR. BLAINE MYRON CEDARHOLM .....	25
WHAT BOB JONES, SR., SAID ABOUT THE KING JAMES BIBLE AND KEEPING RANK .....	27
DR. S. FRANKLIN LOGSDON (1907-1987), A RETURNEE TO THE RANKS .....	28
BROTHER CURTIS PUGH AND THE KING JAMES BIBLE .....	31
H. L. MENCKEN [1880-1956] ON THE KING JAMES BIBLE .....	35
RONALD WILSON REAGAN [1911-2004] ON THE KING JAMES BIBLE .....	35
CONCLUSION .....	36
APPENDIX I NEW EVANGELICALISM .....	41
APPENDIX II G. CAMPBELL MORGAN ON TOLERATION .....	46
APPENDIX III FIVE THINGS CONTRIBUTING TO THE BIRTH OF NEO- EVANGELICALISM .....	47

## “...KEEP RANK...<sup>1</sup> CAN YOU?”

### INTRODUCTION

God in this day and age is looking for those who can **keep rank** concerning the King James Bible. The King James Bible for years has been under attack from those who have failed to **keep rank** with those who have defended the King James Bible. Those failing to **keep rank** with the defenders of God’s Word should know better since they also claim to be **fundamentalists**.<sup>2</sup>

### FUNDAMENTALISM<sup>3</sup>

What does one mean when he uses the term fundamentalism? George Marsden declares that “By the 1930s, when it became painfully clear that reform from within could not prevent the spread of modernism in major northern denominations, more and more fundamentalists began to make separation from America’s major denominations an article of faith.<sup>4</sup> Although most who supported fundamentalism in the 1920s still remained in their denominations, many Baptist dispensationalists and a few influential Presbyterians were demanding separatism.”<sup>5</sup>

One must remember that it was the Baptists...[that] exerted a major influence upon the birth, growth and development of fundamentalism. This influence was the result of the impact of persons, organizations, schools [Emphasis, GEL], newspapers and magazines.<sup>6</sup>

Traditional Baptist principles loaned themselves quite naturally to the support of fundamentalism.<sup>7</sup> These included an emphasis on regenerate church membership, which dovetailed with the fundamentalist stress on conversion and the methodology of revivalism; the authority of the Bible, to be read and interpreted by the individual [according to the golden rule of interpretation<sup>8</sup>], which left the door open for the fundamentalist<sup>9</sup> understanding of biblical inerrancy;<sup>10</sup> and the autonomous nature of Baptist polity..., which enabled an ultraconservative theological tendency to grow rapidly and made it difficult for denominational officials to exercise any control over local churches and clergy. Fundamentalism continues to be largely associated with Baptist...congregations and ministers....<sup>11</sup>

...[It was] Curtis Lee Laws, Baptist editor of the conservative<sup>12</sup> Conservative, Conservatism Individuals and churches professing belief in the Fundamental doctrines of the Faith. Conservatism contrasts with Fundamentalism in that it does not militantly contend for the Faith and denounce the errors of the apostasy. The term is often used synonymously with orthodoxy. George W. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America (Greenville, SC.: Bob Jones University Press, 1973), 379. Orthodoxy From the Greek *orthos*, “right,” and *doxa*, “opinion”; thus “right belief” as opposed to heresy. In this sense the term began to be used in the second century. In a more specific sense, the term refers to an adherence to the central doctrines affirmed by the churches descending from the Reformation and expressed in their creeds. For a detailed comparison with *Fundamentalism*, see chapter 10, especially pp. 174-75. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America, 383. CREED. Derived from the Latin *credo* (I believe), a creed is a summary statement of Christian faith

and belief. The purpose of the earliest creeds was to present a short summary of Christian doctrine, which baptismal candidates affirmed at their baptism. Later, creeds become tools for instruction of new converts, for combating heresy and for use in corporate worship. Three of the most famous creeds established in the first five centuries of church history are the Apostles Creed, the \*Nicene (or Niceno-Constantinopolitan) Creed and the Athanasian Creed. Grenz, et al., 33-34.<sup>13</sup> Baptist publication *The Watchman Examiner*, [who] coin[ed] in 1920 the word *fundamentalist* and [who] defin[ed] *fundamentalists* as those ready “to do battle royal for the [doctrinal] Fundamentals of the faith.”<sup>14</sup>

In the North in the twentieth century, the leading proponents of fundamentalism were BAPTISTS. They included J.C. Masee (1871-1965), a pastor...who eventually disassociated himself from political fundamentalism; John Roach Straton (1875-1929), the outspoken [pastor] of Calvary Baptist Church in New York City; W. B. Riley (1861-1947), longtime pastor of the First Baptist Church in Minneapolis, publisher of *Christian Fundamentals in School and in Church* and founder of the Northwestern Bible and Missionary Training School, as well as the World’s Christian Fundamentals Association; and T.T. Shields, (1873-1955), pastor of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, onetime president of Des Moines University in Iowa, and publisher of *The Gospel Witness* [1922]. Despite their aggressive leadership, the Baptist fundamentalists failed to capture the Northern Baptist Convention in either the 1920s or the 1940s.... ..As a result some groups broke away from the convention, including the Baptist Bible Union of 1922, which evolved into the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches (1932) [now Neo-Evangelical] and the Conservative Baptist Association of America (1947-1948) [also now Neo-Evangelical].<sup>15</sup>

Dr. George W. Dollar, one of the [leading] historians of the Fundamentalist movement [in America] writ[ing] from the standpoint of a genuine Fundamentalist, gives this definition<sup>16</sup>:  
HISTORIC FUNDAMENTALISM IS THE LITERAL EXPOSITION OF ALL THE AFFIRMATIONS AND ATTITUDES OF THE BIBLE AND THE MILITANT EXPOSURE OF ALL NON-BIBLICAL AFFIRMATIONS AND ATTITUDES.<sup>17</sup>

As Brother Cloud says, “Those today who deny the **MILITANCY** and separation of historic Fundamentalism are trying to rewrite history. Instead of admitting that they are NOT old-line Fundamentalists, that indeed they have repudiated biblical Fundamentalism,<sup>18</sup> have compromised the Word of God and adopted **New Evangelicalism**,<sup>19</sup> these revisionists are trying to redefine Fundamentalism to fit their backslidden condition.”<sup>20</sup>

## **MARANATHA BAPTIST BIBLE COLLEGE**

One such backslidden Fundamentalist, who studied at the **New Evangelical Trinity Evangelical Divinity School**, Deerfield, IL., and who has turned to New Evangelicalism, is found on the faculty of Maranatha Baptist Bible College. Listen to what he has said: “In anthropology we start with perfect people and go down hill. In ecclesiology we start with a perfect church and go down hill. In the Bible we start with a perfect Bible and go down hill.” “...Can we speak of our Bibles today as inspired? In the technical sense, we cannot.” “...[E]ven with errors we can understand what the writers meant.” “...The preservation of the Word of God is perfectly

accomplished by God in heaven. The preservation of God's Word on earth has been committed to people...God anticipated the possibility of failure on man's part in accurately preserving the autographs."<sup>21</sup> "...David Cloud loves to argue the preservation of the Bible by the priesthood of believers but you have to stretch the truth to argue this!" "...God could have preserved [H]is [W]ord but history proves [H]e did not!"<sup>22</sup> This chairman of the Bible department is not keeping rank and he should know better since he studied under Dr. Cedarholm who did keep rank.<sup>23</sup>

Whether Maranatha realizes it or not, this man is a New Evangelical<sup>24</sup> infiltrator. Infiltrator rhymes with traitor. He is also following the philosophy of accommodation. ...Christianity has been plagued by accommodation time and again through the centuries, and in particular in this century. It is interesting to note what Dr. Harold J [ohn] Ockenga [1905-1985], the Father of Neo-Evangelicalism and the first president of Fuller Theological Seminary, wrote about the liberalism<sup>25</sup> at the turn of this century:

Destructive higher criticism<sup>26</sup> of the Bible became the dominant approach among the theologians at the close of the nineteenth century and during the early twentieth century. When joined with naturalistic evolution, it produced liberalism....It [liberalism] accommodated *Christianity to modern scientific naturalism*...whenever objections arose on the details of the Christian religion. (Emphasis, GEL) [See Appendix I: From Fundamentalism, Through New Evangelicalism, to Evangelicalism]

It is interesting to note further that even some liberals have begun to recognize the devastating effect of **theological accommodation** and are beginning to grow weary of it and are wondering what to do. One such liberal recently wrote:

The central theme of contemporary theology is accommodation *to modernity*. It is the underlying motif that unites the seemingly vast differences between existential theology, process theology, liberation theology, demythologization, and many varieties of liberal theology-all are searching for some more compatible adjustment to modernity. [On the subject of modernity, see, Dr. Gary E. La More's The Word of God and the Turning of the Tides: From Clothes to Fashions.] [See also Appendix II: Thomas C. Oden's Agenda for Theology: Recovering Christian Roots in Dr. La More's *God's Providential Preservation Of The Scriptures*]

Yet accommodation has become fashionable among many [Baptist fundamentalists]-in spite of the devastating effect this has had theologically and culturally. Francis A. Schaeffer's The Great Evangelical Disaster, 99-100.<sup>27</sup>

## DR. JOHN R. RICE AND THE SWORD OF THE LORD

The following is an example of what Dr. Schaeffer was talking about concerning accommodation among Baptist Fundamentalists. [Dr.] John R. Rice the famous evangelist and kindly soul winner, in his book, Our God-Breathed Book-The Bible, wrote a chapter titled, "God

Preserves His Eternal Word.” On page 360, this defender of the Critical Text<sup>28</sup> quotes Matthew 5:17-18 and then makes this comment:

The Lord here guarantees even the verbal accuracy of the translations and copies-not in one particular copy nor of one particular translation but of the inspired Word in all of them together....If we do not know how providence has overruled the wrath of men, the errors of copyists, the bias of translators, we can still know that He does overrule them. And not altogether, perhaps, in one copy or in one translation, but in them all collectively God has His perfect Word, never to be destroyed, never to pass away. Lloyd L. Streeeter, op. cit., 125.<sup>29</sup>

How sad that Dr. John R. Rice, a defender of the Critical Greek Text, could not keep rank with the historic fundamentalists of his day, who believed in the preservation of God’s Word as found in the King James Bible. The writer of this paper can only pray that the present editor of the Sword of the Lord will stop publishing Dr. Rice’s book, Our God-Breathed Book-The Bible, and will write a retraction of this book and start keeping rank with those historic Fundamentalists who believe in the preservation of the only God-preserved Bible in the English language, the King James Version.<sup>30</sup>

#### BOB JONES UNIVERSITY <sup>31</sup>

Since its inception in 1927, Bob Jones College now University has been known as “the bastion of fundamentalism” in Christian education. Bob Jones University [hereafter, BJU] is not keeping rank when it has employed Greek professors who have had an affinity for the Critical Text (CT) since the school’s inception. This affinity turned into a love affair with the completed NASV in 1971, as BJU was one of the educational institutions to assist the Lockman Foundation’s publication of this modern translation. By the middle 70’s, BJU promoted the NASV as an alternative to the KJV. Through the years, BJU and many Bible schools influenced by them used the KJV in chapel and the classroom while denigrating the underlying Greek TR text. In the middle 90’s, Pensacola Christian College exposed this “dirty little secret” of BJU in a series of videos, charging them with bringing the leaven of<sup>32</sup> Textual Criticism<sup>33</sup> into fundamentalism. This charge has brought a groundswell of concern on the part of fundamental Baptists pastors and parents as to where to send their “preacher boys” for theological education. The BJU-originated publications MOGMOM [*From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man*], GWOH [*God’s Word in Our Hands*], and Schneider and Tagiapietra’s *Bible Preservation and the Providence of God* (BPPG) are efforts aimed at these rightfully concerned fundamental Baptists to say there is no difference between the NASV and the KJV and there is no concern for alarm. In fact, [James B.] Williams implies that the preservation of the Scriptures is a non-essential (p. xix) even though he has edited two books about this doctrine. Hutcheson declares “some today are sidetracked from the proper battlefield and have busied themselves fighting their own brethren over a particular translation” (p. 28). The coalition of ten schools wants to write voluminously about preservation<sup>34</sup> but expects the KJV Only group to be quiet and non-disagreeable....<sup>35</sup> Obviously, these so-called Fundamentalists have forgotten that true Historic fundamentalism is militant against all forms of error.

B.B. WARFIELD

One wonders if Bob Jones University is not following the non-rank keeper Dr. B.B. Warfield and his treatment of the New Testament text. Dr. Lloyd L. Streeter says, And half a century earlier Dr. B.B. Warfield (1893<sup>36</sup>) expressed himself in a very similar manner. “In the sense of the Westminster Confession, therefore, the multiplication of the copies of the Scriptures, the several early efforts towards the revision of the text, the raising up of scholars in our own day to collect and collate manuscripts, and to reform them on scientific principles—of our Tischendorfs and Tregelleses, and Westcotts and Hort—are all parts of God’s singular care and providence in preserving His inspired Word pure.” [Emphasis, GEL]

Dr. B.B. Warfield was an outstanding defender of the orthodox Christian faith, so much so that one hesitates to criticize him in any way. Certainly no Bible-believing Christian would wish to say anything disrespectful concerning so venerable a Christian scholar. But nevertheless it is a fact that Dr. Warfield’s thinking was not entirely unified. Through his mind ran two separate trains of thought which not even he could join together. The one train of thought was dogmatic, going back to the Protestant Reformation. When following this train of thought Dr. Warfield regarded Christianity as true. The other train of thought was apologetic, going back to the rationalistic viewpoint of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. When following this train of thought Dr. Warfield regarded Christianity as merely probable. And this same divided outlook was shared by Dr. Warfield’s colleagues at Princeton Seminary and by conservative theologians and scholars generally throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Even today this split-level thinking is still a factor to be reckoned with in conservative circles, although in far too many instances it has passed over into modernism.

Dr. Warfield’s treatment of the New Testament text illustrates this cleavage in his thinking. In the realm of dogmatics he agreed with the Westminster Confession that the New Testament text had been “kept pure in all ages” by God’s “singular care and providence,” but in the realm of New Testament textual criticism he agreed with Westcott and Hort in ignoring God’s providence and even went so far as to assert that the same methods were to be applied to the text of the New Testament that would be applied to the text of a morning newspaper. It was to bridge the gap between his dogmatics and his New Testament textual criticism that he suggested that God had worked providentially through Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort to preserve the New Testament text. But this suggestion leads to conclusions which are extremely bizarre and inconsistent. It would have [the reader] believe that during the manuscript period orthodox Christians corrupted the New Testament text, that the text used by the Protestant Reformers was the worst of all, and that the True Text was not restored until the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when Tregelles brought it forth out of the Pope’s library, when Tischendorf rescued it from a waste basket on Mt. Sinai, and when Westcott and Hort were providentially guided to construct a theory of it which ignores God’s special providence and treats the text of the New Testament like the text of any other ancient book. But if the True New Testament Text was lost for 1500 years, how can [the reader] be sure that it has ever been found again?<sup>37</sup> [Emphasis, GEL]

#### TEMPLE BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Dr. Price, of Temple Baptist Theological Seminary, is definitely NOT KEEPING RANK when he says, “I am not a TR advocate. I happen to believe that God has preserved the autographic

text in the whole body of evidence that He has preserved, not merely through the textual decisions of a committee of fallible men based on a handful of late manuscripts. The modern critical texts like NA26/27 [Nestles] and UBS [United Bible Societies] provide a list of the variations that have entered the manuscript traditions, and they provide the evidence that supports the different variants. In the apparatus they have left nothing out, the evidence is there. The apparatus indicates where possible additions, omissions, and alterations have occurred. ...I am not at war with the conservative (?) modern versions [such as the New International Version<sup>38</sup> and the New American Standard Version]<sup>39</sup> (James Price, e-mail to David Cloud, April 30, 1996).<sup>40</sup>

This paragraph by Dr. Price deserves to be carefully analyzed but this would require another paper. Perhaps someone in the future will take the time to dissect this paragraph and expose the errors contained in it.

#### DR. DAVID JASPERS, PRESIDENT OF MARANATHA BAPTIST BIBLE COLLEGE

Dr. Jaspers, president of Maranatha Baptist Bible College, Watertown, Wisconsin, is NOT KEEPING RANK with those fundamentalists who defend the King James Bible as the only preserved Word of God in the English language. He would rather support a new evangelical on his faculty than a true historic Fundamentalist. This Young Evangelical, a wolf in sheep's clothing, on Dr. Jaspers' staff should be fired for holding a position contrary to what Dr. Cedarholm taught and held regarding the TR.<sup>41</sup>

Dr. Richard Weeks, long-time Academic Dean at Maranatha, reminded the writer of this paper that he was denied his Th.D. from Northern Baptist Theological Seminary because he was a fundamentalist even though he had completed all the course work for the degree. What about the Young Evangelical at Maranatha?

The writer of this paper would like to see Maranatha speak and write against the rank new evangelicalism at Dallas Theological Seminary and Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.

Dr. Jaspers does not realize that Hegelian gradualism is already at work at MBBC. The writer of this paper is truly sorry that Maranatha is going down hill into neo-evangelicalism<sup>42</sup> and eventually into apostasy.<sup>43</sup> Because of the dialectic,<sup>44</sup> Maranatha will eventually become neo-orthodox.<sup>45</sup> This is the way of history. Time will prove this to be so. And how sad.

#### DR. BLAINE MYRON CEDARHOLM

What was the position of Dr. Cedarholm, the founding president of Maranatha Baptist Bible College, [1968] concerning the TR<sup>46</sup> and the King James?

In a letter Dr. Cedarholm wrote to Brother Keith D. Thibo, dated May 13, 1982, he stated: "Our position here at Maranatha is that the King James is God's Word preserved in the English language.<sup>47</sup> Note, the English language. We do not say that the King James is a better translation than the Finnish or the Armenian or the Swedish or some other language. We teach here at

Maranatha that God's Word is preserved in the King James, which is the best translation that there is in the English language."

Continuing, Dr. Cedarholm, a definite rank keeper, says, " We say that God's Word is preserved in the English language in the King James translation. The King James is not inspired. The only autographs that we can honestly say are inspired are the original Greek and Hebrew manuscripts. However, these are lost in antiquity."

"We teach and believe here that the Massoretic Hebrew translation is God's Word preserved in the Hebrew language, and that the New Testament is best preserved in the Textus Receptus<sup>48</sup> in the Greek translation."

"You ask if the King James is a perfect translation without error, or is it a reliable translation with only a few errors."

"We believe and teach that the King James is God's Word in the English language without error.<sup>49</sup> However, there are some people who do believe that the King James has errors, in that "ekklesia" is translated "church" instead of "assembly," or that "baptizo" is translated "baptism" rather than "immersion." We do not believe that these are errors, but certainly these translations need to be explained, that "church" is a democratic organized body of Scripturally baptized believers. Likewise, "baptism" is explained as believer's baptism by immersion. So, we do say that the King James is a translation without error, because these two words, as examples, "church" and "baptism," are really not errors, but translations that need to be explained.

#### WHAT BOB JONES, SR., SAID ABOUT THE KING JAMES BIBLE AND KEEPING RANK

Brother Cloud says in Volume 20, Issue 10, 2003 on page 15 of O Timothy, that the following quote from Bob Jones, Sr., founder of Bob Jones University, is from *The Sword Scrapbook*, Sword of the Lord Publishers, Murfreesboro, Tenn. 1969:

"The King James Version is, after all, the best translation we have ever had. The very words of the Bible in the original languages were inspired of the Holy Ghost. That is what the Bible claims for itself; and that is what the born-again, Bible-believing Christians believe about the Bible. We are to search the Scriptures as our Lord commanded us; but, remember, there is a curse to those that add to the Word or take away from the word.<sup>50</sup> The hottest place in Hell will be reserved for those modernistic conspirators who, in a subtle, pious way, are trying to steal the faith of humble Christians in the Word of God. Remember, you do not have to be a scholar. You do not have to be a great authority on languages. You do not have to be a great literary genius. Remember this: any man who wonders if the Bible is the Word of God has not been born again.<sup>51</sup> All born again Christians believe the Word and love the Word."-Dr. Bob Jones, Sr.<sup>52</sup>

#### DR. S. FRANKLIN LOGSDON (1907-1987), A RETURNEE TO THE RANKS

Is it possible for someone to return to the ranks after breaking rank concerning the King James Bible?

The answer to this questions will be evident as the reader reads what Dr. Logsdon has said. "I got one of the fifty deluxe copies [of The New American Standard Version published by the (Dewey) Lockman Foundation] which were printed; mine was number seven, with a light blue cover.... I just took for granted that it was done as we started it, you know, until some of my friends across the country began to learn that I had some part in it and they started saying, 'What about this; what about that?'

Dr. David Otis Fuller in Grand Rapids [Michigan] [whom ] I've known...for 35 years,...would say, 'Frank, what about this? You had a part in it; what about this; what about that?' And at first I thought, Now, wait a minute; let's don't go overboard; let's don't be too critical. You know how you justify yourself the last minute.

But I finally got to the place where I said, 'Ann, I'm in trouble; I can't refute these arguments; it's wrong; it's terribly wrong; it's frightfully wrong; and what am I going to do about it?' Well, I went through some real soul searching for about four months, and I sat down and wrote one of the most difficult letters of my life, I think.

I wrote to my friend Dewey, and I said, 'Dewey, I don't want to add to your problems,' (he had lost his wife some three years before; I was there for the funeral; also a doctor had made a mistake in operating on a cataract and he had lost the sight of one eye and had to have an operation on the other one; he had a slight heart attack; had sugar diabetes; a man seventy-four years of age) 'but I can no longer ignore these criticisms I am hearing and I can't refute them. The only thing I can do-and dear Brother, I haven 't a thing against you and I can witness at the judgment of Christ and before men wherever I go that you were 100% sincere,' (he wasn't schooled in language or anything; he was just a business man; he did it for money; he did it conscientiously; he wanted it absolutely right and he thought it was right; I guess nobody pointed out some of these things to him) 'I must under God renounce every attachment to the New American Standard.'

I have a copy of the letter. I have his letter. I've shown it to some people. The Roberts saw it; Mike saw it. He stated that he was bowled over; he was shocked beyond words. He said that was putting it mildly, but he said, 'I will write you in three weeks, and I still love you. To me you're going to be Franklin, my friend, throughout the course. ' And he said, 'I'll write you in three weeks.'

But he won't write me now. He was to be married. He sent an invitation to come to the reception. Standing in the courtroom, in the county court by the desk, the clerk said, 'What is your full name, Sir?' And he said, 'Franklin Dewey...' And that is the last word he spoke on this earth. So he was buried two days before he was supposed to be married, and he's with the Lord. And he loves the Lord. He knows different now.

I tell you, dear people, somebody is going to have to stand. If you must stand against

everyone else, stand. Don't get obnoxious; don't argue. There's no sense in arguing.

But nevertheless, that's where the New American stands in connection with the Authorized Version.

I just jotted down what these versions, translations, and paraphrases are doing. Consider:

One, they cause widespread confusion, because everywhere we go people say, What do you think of this; what do you think of that? What do young people think when they hear all of that?

Two, they discourage memorization. Who's going to memorize when each one has a different Bible, a different translation?

Three, they obviate the use of a concordance. Where are you going to find a concordance for the Good News for Modern Man and all these others? You aren't going to find one. We're going to have a concordance for every one; you're going to have to have a lot of concordances.

Four, they provide opportunity for perverting the truth. There are all these translations and versions, each one trying to get a little different slant from the others. They must make it different, because if it isn't different why have a new version? It makes a marvelous opportunity for the devil to slip in his perverting influence.

Five, these many translations make teaching of the Bible difficult. And I'm finding that more and more as I go around the country. I mentioned this thing the other night. How could a mathematics professor or instructor teach a certain problem in a class if the class had six or eight different textbooks? How about that? How could you do it?

Six, they elicit profitless argumentation. Because everywhere we go they say this one is more accurate. Which one is more accurate? How do they know? And this is not a reflection against those saying this, because I would have done this a few years ago. In *Christian Life* magazine I got this. My dear friend, Dr. George Sweeting, president of Moody Bible Institute—one of the sweetest, dearest men you've ever met; he's wonderfully named—he's starting today right down near my home at southern Keswick, and if I'm back by the end of the week I expect to see him and I'm going to talk to him about these things. When he was asked for his recommendation of the New American Standard, he said, 'I like it because it reads freely.' You can read it yourself; it's in the ad in various magazines. And he said, 'I particularly like it because it's so near to the original.' I'm going to say, 'Now, George, what is the original? Have you ever seen it?' There isn't any original.

Lest I forget it in one of these questions, somebody said, 'How can we know that we have the whole truth?' Well, just simply by believing God. And what do I mean by that? John 16: 13- 'When the Spirit of Truth is come he will guide you into' how much? Tell me. Tell me, now. 'All truth.' And if we don't have all truth, the Holy Spirit isn't doing His work.

We have to have all truth for Him to lead us into all truth. And there are many, many other passages which teach this.

If we could hear His voice we would have no trouble learning His Word from the Authorized Version. Let me tell you this: You might not be able to answer the arguments, and you won't be [able to]. I can't answer some of them, either. Some of these university professors come along and say, What about this; what about that? They go into areas that I haven't even had time to get into.

As I said to you a couple of minutes ago. You don't need to defend yourself, and you don't need to defend God's Word. Don't defend it; you don't need to defend it; you don't need to apologize for it. Just say, 'Well, did this version or this translation come down through the Roman stream? If so, count me out. Whatever you say about Erasmus and Tyndale, that's what I want.'

And besides this, we've had the AV for 362 years. It's been tested as no other piece of literature has ever been tested. Word by word; syllable by syllable. And think even until this moment no one has ever found any wrong doctrine in it, and that's the main thing. He that wills to do the will of God shall KNOW the doctrine.

Well, time is up. Let's be people of the Book. It took my mother to heaven; and my dad, my grandfather, my grandmother. It was Moody's Book; it was Livingstone's Book. J.C. Studd gave up his fortune to take this Book to Africa. And I don't feel ashamed to carry it the rest of my journey. It's God's Book.

*'Our Father, we thank Thee and praise Thee for Thy Word. Help us to love it, and preach it, and teach it, and tell everybody we can the Good News through thy Word. In Jesus' name. Amen.'*<sup>53</sup>

## BROTHER CURTIS PUGH AND THE KING JAMES BIBLE

Brother Curtis Pugh, an historic Baptist missionary to Romania, wrote an article on "God's Blessings on the King James Bible." Brother Pugh is definitely keeping rank in this article.

Brother Pugh said, "Every word of God is pure..." (Proverbs 30:5). "And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God" (Luke 4:4).

It is an uncontrovertible fact that God's blessing has been upon what is commonly called the King James Bible! I do not refer alone to the effect the King James Bible has had upon society, but that has been great indeed. When its principles have been enshrined followed as a pattern for government, countries have been well governed and citizens free. The morals of society in general, where that translation has been predominant, have risen. Is there a connection between the King

James Bible and the blessing of God upon certain nations? With the modern hodgepodge of Westcott & Hort (Catholic) perversions of the Bible shall we see such influence? Do we see these new perversions of the Scriptures having such an influence on society? Obviously not! The big business involved in publishing new Bibles hit the public with well engineered media blitzes which claim that the Bible in modern words will do the job. If their claims are true, millions should have been converted by now. The only result I observe of the use of these modern “versions” is the growth of counterfeit churches, the psycho-babble industry, ungodly para-church organizations, the charismatic movement and a move of the harlot’s daughters back toward their mother Rome! There is certainly evidence that the King James Bible has had a significant and beneficial effect even on society in general where and when it has been highly regarded. Neither do I refer primarily to the effect the King James Bible has had upon “Christendom”-i.e. the nominal “Christian” world in general, but that effect has been significant. The proclamation and study of the King James Bible has born fruit even among those who are not serving God scripturally in the Lord’s churches. Not more than two hundred years ago in North America, Baptists and their principles were castigated as evil. Now one only has to look around and see the multitude of “churches” which proudly boast of being “baptistic” if not openly claiming to be “Baptist” even though they lack authority from Christ to function as churches. These grand Baptist principles of soul liberty, individual responsibility, autonomous church government, etc. have been understood and embraced by many as a direct result of the use of the King James Bible. There can be no doubt that both in society and in “Christendom” around the world, God’s blessing has been upon the King James Bible!....

...It should be pointed out that both in educational attainments and methodology, no “modern translation” measures up to the scholars who translated the King James Bible!....

...Every road has two ditches. So there are two extremes into which we can fall in the matter of translations of the Bible and especially with regard to the King James Bible. Let us say that the right-hand ditch is that of “inspiration of the translators.” This view holds that the King James translators ...were inspired by the Holy Spirit in their translation work so that the King James Bible can be used to correct the originals. But inspiration properly is attached to the original writings and the word itself (“theopneustos”) means “God breathed.” The doctrine more properly to be dealt with regarding any translation is that of preservation, not inspiration. God has promised to preserve His Word. The question today is this: where is that preserved Word to be found? If the Westcott & Hort family of manuscripts (found in the 1800's) are the correct texts, then all older translations are wrong and God’s people have not had the preserved Word of God from the time these manuscripts were put away until they were rescued by the Mary-worshipping Westcott and Hort! That is a dilemma all who espouse the modern translations must face for all such modern versions (read “perversions”) of the Bible are based on those texts claimed by Westcott and Hort to be “better....”

The left hand “ditch” into which we may fall is that of the LIBERALS who deny that we have the Word of God today. Some distinguish between having the Word of God in its purity is only in the “original manuscripts.” Their problem is that nobody on earth today has the original manuscripts! That being the case, nobody, according to their view, has the Word of God today! That is a terrible ditch in which to find ones self! In the light of Bible claims such as: The words of

the LORD *are* pure words: *as* silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.(Psalm 12:6, 7) we must believe in the Bible doctrine of Scripture Preservation.<sup>54</sup> Is it reasonable to think that God would give us His Word and then allow it to be forever lost by corruption so that it cannot be trusted? “God forbid!” Jesus spoke of the necessity of living by “every word of God” in Luke 4:4. Evidently Jesus believed that God had preserved His Word! Else how can we live by it if it is not to be found? Beware of the “ditch” which robs you of having the Word of God today!....

...As for the rest of the translations presently on the market, I would not recommend nor purchase any of them! One of the religious fads going about North America today is the idea that you can understand the Bible by comparing various versions. There is no value nor true scholarship in “comparing translations” in an attempt to arrive at truth. The foolishness of such misguided endeavor[u]r can be seen in the parody of the Amplified Bible which was all the rage a few years ago. 'Twinkle twinkle (shine intermittently, sparkle, glow) little (small, less in size, insignificant) star (heavenly body, luminary). How (to what extent or cause) I (me, myself) wonder (meditate, cogitate, think) what you are (be, consist of, are composed of), etc. ad nauseam. Is such a comparison of words, giving the reader his or her choice of words thought to be scholarship? Such comparison of words as is done by some from different translations and passes for Bible study and scholarship in certain circles, but really makes the reader the final authority rather than the Bible. He or she can choose whichever word or translation they like best at the moment! Thus, the authority is not God nor His Word, but personal preference and the mind of the reader. [The author of this paper has been saying these same things throughout this paper. What the reader needs is God's objective Word, which is not a collection of decaying documents that need new revelation to elucidate its primitive contents, but the only infallible manual that is useful for teaching (what is right), for rebuking (what is not right), for correcting (how to get right), and for training in righteousness (how to stay right)-2Ti 3:16.]

Baptists would be quick to condemn the Roman Catholics for their 'tradition' and 'church authority' in matters of doctrine. [They] vilify the popes for their claim to speaking 'ex cathedra' and yet some would make the preacher or the scholar the final authority rather than God in His Word! Beware of any position which denigrates the King James Bible! Beware of any position from which [one] cannot honestly stand and hold aloft before the people the King James Bible and tell them this is the Word of God! It is a faithful translation of the Word of God. It has been blessed by God as has been no other translation of the Scriptures known to man today! [The author] would ask those who detract from the King James Bible one question: With what would [they] replace the King James Bible? Will [they] replace it with the findings of [the occultists] Westcott and Hort and the modern translations based on Sinaticus and Vaticanus? Are [they] content to present to people the modern translations of lesbians [like the NIV] and liberals [like the RSV and NRSV]? Or would [they] replace the King James Bible with 'king preacher' or 'king Greek scholar'? Shall the Protestants Vine, Vincent, Thayer, etc., or the universal church 'Baptist,' Robertson speak 'ex cathedra' for [them] today? The words of Protestant Louis Berkhof come to mind when [one] think[s] of those who pretend to great scholarship by going to the 'Greek.' He wrote, 'It is necessary to bear in mind that the Lexicons are not absolutely reliable, and that they are least so, when they

descend to particulars. They merely embody those results of the exegetical labours of various interpreters that commended themselves to the discriminating judgment of the lexicographer, and often reveal a difference of opinion. It is quite possible, and in some cases perfectly evident, that the choice of a meaning was determined by dogmatical bias....' (*Principles of Biblical Interpretation*, Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 1950, pp. 68, 69)....

...The false argument that we need a "Bible" which can be understood by the unsaved and unchurched just does not hold water. It is still true "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know *them*, because they are spiritually discerned." (1 Cor. 2:14). Lost men and women do not understand the Scripture, they do not because they are unregenerate, not because of their ignorance of a dozen or two older words. Words, which, by the way, are easily understood if one will rise from his laziness and take a good dictionary in hand! Our problem with understanding the King James Bible is not one of not knowing Greek and Hebrew. The plain fact of the matter is, we do not know English!

...We do not need a new translation of the Bible. We need to be busy living and using the one we have. Thank God for His Word, the King James Bible!<sup>55</sup>

#### H. L. MENCKEN [1880-1956] ON THE KING JAMES BIBLE

America's pre-eminent linguist, [Henry] [Louis] Mencken, though an unbeliever, concludes regarding the King James Bible:

"It is the most beautiful of all the translations of the Bible; indeed it is probably the most beautiful piece of writing in all the literature of the world... [M]any learned but misguided men have sought to produce translations...in the plain speech of everyday.

But the Authorized Version has never yielded to any of them, for it is palpably and overwhelmingly better than they are, just as it is better than the Greek New Testament, or the Vulgate, or the Septuagint. Its English is extraordinarily simple, pure, eloquent, and lovely. It is a mine of lordly and incomparable poetry, at once the most stirring and the most touching ever heard of."<sup>56</sup>

#### RONALD WILSON REAGAN [1911-2004] ON THE KING JAMES BIBLE

Former President Ronald Reagan defends the beautiful King James Bible and denounces the threadbare bibles woven by this generation. In his September 6, 1977 broadcast, as preserved in the audio series, *Reagan in His Own Words*, he criticizes attempts to "improve" the "authorized version, the one that came into being when the England of King James was scoured for translators and scholars. It was the time when the English language had reached its peak of richness and beauty." Reagan questions sleazy versions which,

“...boast that their bible is as readable as the daily paper...But do readers of the daily news find themselves moved to wonder, ‘at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth?’”

“[D]rudes,” he calls them, “horsing around with the sacred text,” under the guise of trying to “make the Bible more readable and understandable” and “taking religion to the people”...“I can’t help feeling we should *instead* be taking the people to religion and lifting them with the beauty of the language that has outlived centuries... [I]t has already been gotten right.”<sup>57</sup>

## CONCLUSION

The heart of God must be saddened to see pseudo-fundamentalists standing against the true historic fundamentalists when it comes to the King James Bible. Truly the pseudo-fundamentalists are not keeping rank. Why then have the ten schools listed in footnote number 2 taken such a position? The answer may be found in the following: There is an almost invariable historic law that evangelistic movements become less separatistic in the second generation. These schools are now being staffed by pseudo-fundamentalists.<sup>58</sup>

The pseudo-fundamentalists of today are probably identifying with Dr. Mark A. Noll, a neo-evangelical professor of Christian Thought at Wheaton College. According to Dr. Noll, modern evangelicals have failed as intellectuals. Why should this bother him? After all, what did Christ commission His disciples to do? Surely Dr. Noll realizes that the wisdom of this world does not bring individuals into a right relationship with the Lord Jesus Christ. Noll’s The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind traces the history of evangelical thinking in America and shows how Protestants have successfully aligned themselves with national ideals and with the particular expressions of an American Enlightenment in the decades before the Civil War. Dr. Noll also explains how fundamentalists at the start of the twentieth century preserved essential elements of the faith, but only by grievously damaging the life of the mind. Noll continues by giving specific attention to evangelical thought on politics and science. Finally he discusses what some have called an “evangelical intellectual renaissance” in recent decades and shows why it is more apparent than real. After reading Dr. Noll’s book, one wonders if pseudo-fundamentalists have not fallen into The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind.

Historic fundamentalists need to heed Paul’s words in [1 Corinthians 2:1](#) - And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God. Paul continues, <sup>2</sup>For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. <sup>4</sup>And my speech and my preaching *was* not with enticing words of man’s wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: <sup>5</sup>That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. <sup>6</sup>Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect: yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to nought: <sup>7</sup>But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, *even* the hidden *wisdom*, which God ordained before the world unto our glory: <sup>8</sup>Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known *it*, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. ([1 Corinthians 2:2, 4-8](#)).

Why have modern-day pseudo-fundamentalists biblical scholars said what they have said in this paper? These modern "*evangelical*" biblical scholars and theologians have said what they have said for the sake of modernity and fashions *and* because they need to keep their jobs. They would never come out in favour of a Dean John William Burgon (1813-1888) and the clothes that he brought forth. His favourable statements and books about the King James Version and his statements and writings against Westcott and Hort and their Critical Greek Text were not fashionable in his day. The brilliant Dean Burgon was not concerned about modernity like Westcott and Hort and their entourage. He was however concerned about being right with God. If modern-day pseudo-fundamentalists biblical scholars sided with Dean Burgon and his views on the King James Bible and the Critical Greek Text, they would be fired. Since they live in fear of losing their jobs and not being accepted in the "*professional*" world of "*believing criticism*", they have voted for fashions and not for clothes and thus they are known today for their modernity and turning the tide away from the true Word of God for a word that is false and pagan and satanic in origin.

What must the reader do then in the light of all that he has read in this paper? He must proclaim his biblical faith [through the true Word of God (King James Version)] and ignore the scorn of the 'worldly wise.' The world of modern biblical scholarship dismisses the true biblical Christian as a fool. They are declared to be fools for holding to the King James Version as the only preserved Word of God in the English language today. If the true biblical Christian is a fool then he is a fool for Christ's sake. If the whole modern world of biblical scholarship is against the true biblical Christian then, like Athanasius of old, the true biblical Christian needs to stand against the whole world of biblical scholarship. If God be for them, who can be against them?

The worldly wise biblical scholar does not believe in the King James Version of the Bible. It is really quite absurd to him. The worldly wise biblical scholar does not investigate such silliness. He does not believe that God could preserve His divinely inspired Word in one version and one version only. [Remember the Young Evangelical and pseudo-fundamentalist at Maranatha Baptist Bible College] And yet God has written only one Bible. However Satan has written many translations and he has a coterie of worldly wise biblical scholars to help him.

And what must the true Christian do? He must pray for the courage to endure the scorn of the sophisticated world of the worldly wise biblical scholar. And having done all, he must stand for the only Word of God in the English language today-*THE AUTHORIZED KING JAMES VERSION OF THE BIBLE-1611*. And all of God's true people said, AMEN!<sup>59</sup>

IN CLOSING, the historic Fundamentalist has a Sword whereas the pseudo-fundamentalist has only a coulter. The pseudo-fundamentalist must go to the worldly wise Philistines scholars of today to have his coulter, his farm implement, sharpened while the historic Fundamentalist has only to go to God the Holy Spirit to have his sword sharpened.

Years ago, Dr. Richard V. Clearwaters,<sup>60</sup> reminded the writer of this paper that we are living in an era when only *MILITANT CHRISTIANITY* can survive! The Apostle Paul contributed more than half of the books of the New Testament by inspiration of God. Paul's conversion was like a call

to arms. His movements read like the chronicles of Alexander the Great. He dared difficulties like Hannibal crossing the Alps. His visits were like military invasions. His epistles read like military dispatches. His whole life was a campaign for Christ. Paul was a Napoleon of the cross!

“**Thou therefore endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.**”

May the reader of this paper pray the following two prayers:

LORD, HELP US TO STUDY THY WORD SO THAT WE MAY BE ABLE TO RECOGNIZE FALSE TEACHERS WHEN THEY COME AMONGST US.

ALSO LORD, HELP US TO RECOGNIZE ERROR, EVEN WHEN IT IS PROCLAIMED BY ONE WHO PROFESSES TO BE LEARNED.

## APPENDIX I

### NEW EVANGELICALISM

An attitude or position which professes to adhere to the Fundamentals of the Faith but advocates a spirit of *re-examination* of the basic doctrines, an attitude of tolerance toward the Liberals and an entering into "dialogue" with them, and an emphasis on the love and mercy of God rather than on His holiness and righteousness.

*Is Evangelical theology changing? Yes.*

A fundamentalist is one who “...earnestly contend[s] for the faith.” While a [neo]-evangelical is one who emphasizes “Ye must be born again.”

This is the major change in [fundamental] theological thought. What other trends in [neo]-evangelical thought mark it as different from fundamentalism?

*Here they are:*

1. A friendly attitude toward science.

*Theistic evolution:* The theory of Theistic evolution teaches that God created living creatures by an evolutionary process over a long period of time.

*Progressive Creationism:* God plans, God puts His plan in motion by distinct creative acts and the Holy Spirit through nature, carries out the plan.

2. A willingness to re-examine beliefs concerning the work of the Holy Spirit.

3. A more tolerant attitude toward varying views on eschatology.
4. A shift away from so-called extreme dispensationalism.
5. An increased emphasis on scholarship.
6. A more definite recognition of social responsibility.
7. A re-opening of the subject of biblical inspiration.
8. A growing willingness of evangelical theologians to converse with liberal theologians.

Therefore Neo-evangelicalism is:

A new form of evangelicalism which does not believe in the absolute *inerrancy* and *infallibility* of the Bible, and therefore ought not to claim the title evangelical.

*Inerrancy* (Latin negative ‘in’, with ‘errare’-to make a mistake; English word ‘err’)

The impossibility of making a mistake.

To say that the Bible is *inerrant* is to say that inspired [original] contained no mistakes, whether of science, history, geography, description or doctrine.

*Infallibility* (Latin negative ‘in’, with ‘fallere’-to deceive)

The impossibility of deception.

To say that the Bible is infallible is to say that the inspired (original) was absolutely reliable and that it could not deceive; it is to be wholly trusted in what it says of God, Christ, mankind, salvation and, indeed, of every doctrine.

Both the inerrancy and infallibility of the Scriptures spring from its original inspiration by God.

*Inspiration of Scripture*

The phrase ‘given by inspiration of God’ (2 Tim. 3:16, AV) translates one compound Greek word ‘theopneustos’-breathed by God.

In Scripture the breath of God is often a figure of speech for [H]is creating power (Job. 33:4; Ps. 33:6)

*Plenary inspiration* (Latin ‘plenus’-full)

By this we mean that the whole of Scripture has its source in God; it is ‘breathed out’ by God.

*Verbal inspiration* (Latin ‘verbum’-a word)

The words of Scripture are ‘breathed out’ by God.

A belief in inspiration does not commit us to believing that God merely dictated the

Scriptures to the writers. He took up and used their personalities and circumstances. Indeed, [H]e created those men with their personalities and circumstances in order to use them in this task of writing Scripture as [H]e wanted it written. God used different means (Heb. 1:1): [H]e spoke through dreams, visions, direct encounters, and superintended such writings as court archives (e.g. in Samuel, Kings, Chronicles) to produce the Scriptures. The word ‘theopneustos’ does not confine us to any theory of inspiration.

## APPENDIX II

G. CAMPBELL MORGAN ON TOLERATION - “. . . THERE IS A TOLERATION WHICH IS TREACHERY. THERE IS A PEACE WHICH ISSUES IN PARALYSIS. THERE ARE HOURS WHEN THE CHURCH MUST SAY NO, TO THOSE WHO ASK COMMUNION WITH HER, IN THE DOING OF HER WORK, UPON THE BASIS OF COMPROMISE. SUCH STANDING ALOOF MAY PRODUCE OSTRACISM AND PERSECUTION; BUT IT WILL MAINTAIN POWER AND INFLUENCE. IF THE CHURCH OF GOD IN THE CITIES OF TO-DAY WERE ALOOF FROM THE MAXIMS OF THE AGE, SEPARATED FROM THE MATERIALISTIC PHILOSOPHIES OF THE SCHOOLS, BEARING HER WITNESS ALONE TO THE ALL SUFFICIENCY OF CHRIST, AND THE PERFECTION OF HIS SALVATION, EVEN THOUGH PERSECUTED AND OSTRACIZED AND BRUISED: IT WOULD BE TO HER THAT MEN WOULD LOOK IN THE HOUR OF THEIR HEART-BREAK AND SORROW AND NATIONAL NEED. THE REASON WHY MEN DO NOT LOOK TO THE CHURCH TO-DAY IS THAT SHE HAS DESTROYED HER OWN INFLUENCE BY COMPROMISE.”

G. CAMPBELL MORGAN'S [1863-1945] ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, 1924 P. 493.

## APPENDIX III

### FIVE THINGS CONTRIBUTING TO THE BIRTH OF NEO-EVANGELICALISM

1. DR. HAROLD JOHN OCKENGA
2. FULLER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
3. DR. BILLY GRAHAM
4. CHRISTIANITY TODAY
5. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS (N.A.E.)

## ENDNOTES

1. [1 Chron. 12:33](#) Of Zebulun, such as went forth to battle, expert in war, with all instruments of war, fifty thousand, which could keep rank: *they were* not of double heart. [1 Chron. 12:38](#) All these men of war, that could keep rank, came with a perfect heart to Hebron, to make David king over all Israel: and all the rest also of Israel *were* of one heart to make David king.

2. The following so-called “Fundamentalists” schools are failing to keep rank: Bob Jones University, Greenville, SC; Maranatha Baptist Bible College, Watertown, WI; Northland Baptist Bible College, Dunbar, WI; Faith Baptist Bible College, Ankeny, IA [A General Association of Regular Baptist Church school-Neo-Evangelical]; Detroit Baptist Seminary, Detroit, MI; Central Baptist Seminary, Minneapolis, MN; Temple Baptist Seminary, Chattanooga, TN; Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary, Lansdale, PA; Pillsbury Baptist Bible College, Owatonna, MN; International Baptist College, Tempe, AZ. The following Canadian schools are definitely not keeping rank: Toronto Baptist Seminary and Bible College [founded in 1927 by Dr. T.T. [Thomas Todhunter] Shields (1873-1955), pastor of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church (1910-1955)] and one of the four prima donnas of Fundamentalism [the other three prima donnas were: William Bell Riley (1861-1947) pastor of the First Baptist Church, Minneapolis, MN, John Roach Straton (1874-1929), pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church, New York City and J. Frank Norris (1877-1952), pastor of the First Baptist Church, Fort Worth TX], Toronto, ON and Heritage Baptist Seminary and Bible College, Cambridge, Ontario [Heritage was originally known as London Baptist Bible College but it merged with the old Central Baptist Seminary, Toronto, ON which was a split from Toronto Baptist Seminary.] For more on these schools and the Baptist movements in Canada, see Dr. Gary E. La More’s book, Studies On Canadian Baptist History and Related Subjects.

3. FUNDAMENTALISM Originally a term that designated the movement associated with a group of books written by distinguished theologians in the early part of the twentieth century defending the fundamentals of the Christian faith, especially the deity of Christ. Over time the term has taken on a broader sense, becoming associated with any form of traditional, conservative Christianity and even with traditional and conservative forms of other religions, as in “Muslim fundamentalists.” When used in this broader way, the term is often employed in a derogatory manner, with connotations of anti-intellectualism. As a result, conservative Christians often prefer to distinguish their own views from those of fundamentalism, such as by asserting, “I am an evangelical [or ‘traditional Christian’ or ‘neoevangelical’], not a fundamentalist.” C. Stephen Evans, Pocket Dictionary of Apologetics & Philosophy of Religion (Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 48.

4. FUNDAMENTALISM, FUNDAMENTALIST-MODERNIST DEBATE A movement in North America during the early part of the twentieth century that attempted to maintain a firm

commitment to certain “fundamentals” of the Christian faith. Fundamentalism was a direct reaction to the increasing influence of “\*liberal” or “\*modernist” forms of Christianity that were becoming increasingly popular within American Protestant seminaries and churches. The fundamentalist-modernist debate pitted modernists, who tended to reject the supernatural elements of the biblical witness, against fundamentalists, who emphasized the historicity of the miraculous events recorded in Scripture, including the \*virgin birth and the \*resurrection, as well as belief in the second coming of Christ. Stanely J. Grenz, David Guretzki & Cherith Fee Nordling, Pocket Dictionary of Theological Terms (Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 1999), 54. LIBERALISM A movement in nineteenth-and twentieth-century \*Protestant circles that builds from the assumption that Christianity is reconcilable with the positive human aspirations, including the quest for autonomy. Liberalism desires to adapt religion to modern thought and culture. Consequently, it views divine love as realized primarily, if not totally, in love of one’s neighbour and the \*kingdom of God as a present reality found especially within an ethically transformed society. One of the significant early liberal theologians was Albrecht \*Ritschl. See *also* postliberalism. Grenz, et al., 72. LIBERALISM (THEOLOGICAL). Movement in Protestant \*theology since the nineteenth century that is dominated by the goal of modifying Christianity so as to make it consistent with modern culture and science. Liberalism rejects the traditional view of Scripture as an authoritative propositional \*revelation from God in favor of a view that sees revelation as a record of the evolving \*religious experiences of humankind. It sees Jesus more as ethical teacher and model rather than as divine atoner and redeemer. Evans, 68-69. MODERNISM The attempt to bring Christianity into harmony with the concerns of the modern era or modern people.... Grenz, et al., 79. MODERNISM A movement to modify Christianity to make it relevant and acceptable to modern peoples, emphasizing both science and social and political teachings. Modernism is closely linked with theological \*liberalism, but while liberalism is more exclusively tied to Protestantism, modernism enjoyed favor among Catholic intellectuals at the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth. See *also* postmodernism. Evans, 77.

5. George M. Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism (Grand Rapids, MI.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987), 7.

6. Bill J. Leonard, Dictionary of Baptists in America ( Downers Grove, IL.: INTERVARSITY PRESS, 1994), 124.

7. The writer of this paper needs to pause here and remind the reader “That there is almost an invariable historic law that evangelistic movements become less separatistic in the second generation.” For a current example of this SEE O Timothy Volume 21 Issue 6, 2004 and Dr. Cloud’s article “John R. Rice’s Daughters Speak at SBC Seminary.”

## 8. THE GOLDEN RULE OF INTERPRETATION

When the plain sense of Scripture makes common sense, seek no other sense;

therefore, take every word at its primary, ordinary, usual, literal meaning unless the facts of the immediate context, studied in the light of related passages and axiomatic and fundamental truths, indicate clearly otherwise. LA REGLA DE ORO DE INTERPRETACIÓN Cuando el sentido llano de la Escritura es de sentido común, no hay que buscarle otro sentido; por esto, hay que tomar cada palabra desde su significado primario ordinario, usual y literal a menos que los hechos del contexto inmediato, estudiados a la luz de los pasajes relatados, axiomáticos y de verdades fundamentales, indiquen claramente lo contrario.

9. A fundamentalist is one who "...earnestly contend[s] for the faith." FUNDAMENTALIST A term originally applied to conservative Christians who affirmed the fundamentals of the Christian faith. Today it is applied to almost anyone who holds conservative religious or moral views. Irving Hexham, Pocket Dictionary of New Religious Movements (Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 54.

10. INERRANCY. Literally "without error;" applied to the Bible indicating it is without historical, scientific, grammatical, numerical, *et cetera*, error in the *autographa* (same as verbal, plenary, inspiration). Thomas M. Strouse, Biblical, Theological and Religious Glossary (Newington, CT.: Emmanuel Baptist Theological Press, 2001), 17. INERRANCY. Meaning "without error" and referring to the complete accuracy of Scripture, including the historical and scientific parts. Norman L. Geisler and William E. Nix, A General Introduction to the Bible, Revised and Expanded (Chicago: Moody Press, 1986), 640. INERRANCY ...Both the inerrancy and infallibility of the Scriptures spring from its original inspiration of God. INERRANCY (Latin negative 'in', with 'errare' - to make a mistake English word 'err') The impossibility of making a mistake. To say that the Bible is inerrant is to say that the inspired original contained no mistakes, whether of science, history, geography, description or doctrine. M.E. Manton, A Dictionary of Theological Terms (London: Grace Publications, 1996), 70. INERRANCY. The idea that Scripture is completely free from error. It is generally agreed by all theologians who use the term that *inerrancy* at least refers to the trustworthy and authoritative nature of Scripture as God's Word, which informs humankind of the need for and the way to \*salvation. Some theologians, however, affirm that the Bible is also completely accurate in whatever it teaches about other subjects, such as science and history. Grenz, et al., 66. INERRANCY. The doctrine that the Bible is completely trustworthy and contains no errors. The doctrine is normally qualified in a number of ways. The Bible is said to be inerrant in the original autographs, and it is said to be without error only when properly interpreted. Proper interpretation itself requires attention to genre (such as poetry, proverbs and history) and answers to questions about the intentions of the author and conventions shared by author and reader. Some Christians affirm a limited inerrancy, declaring that the lack of error holds only for certain types of truth that God intends to reveal through Scripture, primarily matters of morality and theology.... Evans, 60.

11. Ibid.

12. Conservative, Conservatism Individuals and churches professing belief in the Fundamental doctrines of the Faith. Conservatism contrasts with Fundamentalism in that it does not militantly contend for the Faith and denounce the errors of the apostasy. The term is often used synonymously with orthodoxy. George W. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America (Greenville, SC.: Bob Jones University Press, 1973), 379. Orthodoxy From the Greek *orthos*, “right,” and *doxa*, “opinion”; thus “right belief” as opposed to heresy. In this sense the term began to be used in the second century. In a more specific sense, the term refers to an adherence to the central doctrines affirmed by the churches descending from the Reformation and expressed in their creeds. For a detailed comparison with *Fundamentalism*, see chapter 10, especially pp. 174-75. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America, 383. CREED. Derived from the Latin *credo* (I believe), a creed is a summary statement of Christian faith and belief. The purpose of the earliest creeds was to present a short summary of Christian doctrine, which baptismal candidates affirmed at their baptism. Later, creeds become tools for instruction of new converts, for combating heresy and for use in corporate worship. Three of the most famous creeds established in the first five centuries of church history are the Apostles Creed, the \*Nicene (or Niceno-Constantinopolitian) Creed and the Athanasian Creed. Grenz, et al., 33-34.

13. Conservative, Conservatism Individuals and churches professing belief in the Fundamental doctrines of the Faith. Conservatism contrasts with Fundamentalism in that it does not militantly contend for the Faith and denounce the errors of the apostasy. The term is often used synonymously with orthodoxy. George W. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America (Greenville, SC.: Bob Jones University Press, 1973), 379. Orthodoxy From the Greek *orthos*, “right,” and *doxa*, “opinion”; thus “right belief” as opposed to heresy. In this sense the term began to be used in the second century. In a more specific sense, the term refers to an adherence to the central doctrines affirmed by the churches descending from the Reformation and expressed in their creeds. For a detailed comparison with *Fundamentalism*, see chapter 10, especially pp. 174-75. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America, 383. CREED. Derived from the Latin *credo* (I believe), a creed is a summary statement of Christian faith and belief. The purpose of the earliest creeds was to present a short summary of Christian doctrine, which baptismal candidates affirmed at their baptism. Later, creeds become tools for instruction of new converts, for combating heresy and for use in corporate worship. Three of the most famous creeds established in the first five centuries of church history are the Apostles Creed, the \*Nicene (or Niceno-Constantinopolitian) Creed and the Athanasian Creed. Grenz, et al., 33-34.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid.

16. David W. Cloud, "Is Fundamentalism Merely A Belief In The 'The Five Fundamentals'?" (Oak Harbor, WA.: Fundamental Baptist Information Service, 1998), 2.

17. George W. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America, n.p. Dr. Dollar wrote this book while he was Professor of Church History at Bob Jones University. The University has replaced Dollar's work with one of its own written by David O. Beale. Dr. Beale gives his definition of fundamentalism: "The essence of Fundamentalism...is the unqualified acceptance of and obedience to the Scriptures. ...The present study reveals that pre-1930 Fundamentalism was nonconformist, while post-1930 Fundamentalism has been separatist." Beale, *In Pursuit of Purity: American Fundamentalism Since 1850*, 5. How does John Ashbrook define Fundamentalism? "Fundamentalism is the militant (Emphasis, GEL) belief and proclamation of the basic doctrines of Christianity leading to a Scriptural separation from those who reject them." Ashbrook, *Axioms of Separation*, 10.

18. Fundamentalism. The Biblical and historical movement which adheres to, in belief and practice, the fundamental doctrines of Inerrancy of Scripture, the deity and virgin birth of Christ, the creation and fall of man, the substitutionary atonement, bodily resurrection and ascension, the Second coming of Christ, and the final resurrection of all, either to eternal heaven or hell. Strouse, 14.

19. NEO-EVANGELICALISM. A term coined by [Dr.] Harold [J.] Ockenga [in 1947] to distinguish between fundamentalists and conservatives in the areas of separation and scholarship. Strouse, 20. [ SEE Appendix III ] Neo-Evangelicalism also has an increased emphasis on scholarship and is willing to re-open the subject of biblical inspiration. It also shows a growing willingness on the part of evangelical theologians to converse with liberal theologians. Therefore Neo-evangelicalism is: A new form of evangelicalism which does not believe in the absolute *inerrancy* and *infallibility* of the Bible and therefore ought not to claim the title evangelical. Finally, years ago, the writer of this paper was warned by Dr. Charles Woodbridge that one cannot play theological football with the enemy. One cannot enter into theological dialogue with the enemy. There is one thing that fundamentalists have not learned from history and that is that they have not learned from history. NEW EVANGELICALISM An attitude or position which professes to adhere to the Fundamentals of the Faith but advocates a spirit of re-examination of the basic doctrines, an attitude of tolerance toward the Liberals [SEE Appendix II and G. Campbell Morgan On Toleration] and an entering into "dialogue" with them [SEE Appendix I and point number 8.] , and an emphasis on the love and mercy of God rather than on His holiness and righteousness. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America, 383.

20. Cloud, loc. cit.

21. AUTOGRAPHS or AUTOGRAPHA. Sometimes inaccurately defined as the original writings from the hand of an apostle or prophet, these are, more precisely, writings produced under the authority of an apostle or prophet, whether or not through a scribe or in several

editions. Geisler, 637.

22. Gary E. La More, *God's Providential Preservation Of The Scriptures* (Scarborough, ON.: Grace Missionary Baptist Church, 1998), 6.

23. And yet Dr. David Jaspers says that "I count it a great joy to serve Maranatha alongside [the new evangelical] Dr. Oats. Although he has been the subject of great criticism [and rightly so] and unfair gossip [which is wrong], I count [the new evangelical] Dr. Oats as a friend, wise counselor [Ahithophel (?)] and trusted leader within our institution. The thousands of students who have sat in his classes know that he is true to God's Word [Which Bible?] and lives a life that exemplifies his love for God and for His Word [Which Bible?]. I pray that Larry and I will have the privilege of serving shoulder to shoulder until Jesus comes again.... Both these men are keeping rank but for the wrong Greek text and therefore for the wrong Bible in the English language.

24. Evangelical, evangelicalism, neo-evangelicalism. A set of terms arising out of the Greek word *euangelion*, "good news," or "gospel." In its most general sense *evangelical* means being characterized by a concern for the essential core of the Christian message, which proclaims the possibility of salvation through the person and work of Jesus Christ. More specifically, *evangelicalism* has been used to refer to the transdenominational and international movement that emphasizes the need to experience personal conversion through belief in Christ and his work on the cross, and a commitment to the authority of Scripture as the infallible guide for Christian faith and practice. *Neo-evangelicalism* is the classification given particularly to a movement of North American Christians that arose initially in the 1940s. Neo-evangelicals were initially interested in proclaiming not only the personal but also the social dimensions of the gospel, such as the need to work for justice for those who are socially oppressed as well as to offer care and relief to those who suffer physically. Stanley J. Grenz, et. al., Pocket Dictionary of Theological Terms, 47-48. For more on this subject, See Appendix I: From Fundamentalism, Through New Evangelicalism, to Evangelicalism in Dr. La More's paper, "God's Providential Preservation of the Scriptures." This paper is found in the Messages From The 20<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Dean Burgon Society, At Calvary Baptist Church, Grayling, Michigan. This volume may be purchased from The Bible for Today (B.F.T. #2889-P).

25. Liberalism. Religious Liberalism has varied somewhat from country to country. In America it is inseparably identified with the social gospel, which addresses itself to the social needs rather than the heart needs of man. It is derived from the German rationalists and Higher Criticism. It rejected miracles and the inspiration of the Bible. [Remember what the infiltrator at Maranatha Baptist Bible College said concerning inspiration.] It sought to harmonize the Scriptures with science. Those who, at the turn of the century, actively contended for these ideas may be designated as Modernists, though in belief they would be classified as Liberals. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America, 382. German

rationalists German philosophers of the nineteenth century who contended that truth and knowledge are established by reason and not by empirical (experiential) means or by supernatural revelation such as the Scriptures. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America, 381.

26. Higher Criticism. The area of Biblical Criticism which deals with introductory problems such as authorship, date, background, *et cetera*, in contradistinction with Lower Criticism which deals with the text (*Textual Criticism*); it often carries with it the connotation of unbelieving rationalism. Strouse, 16. Higher Criticism. A term that refers to the critical study of biblical texts, especially the evaluation of questions such as authorship, date, sources and composition. The term originated with \*J.G. Eichhorn and was contrasted with \*textual, or \*lower, criticism. Among conservative interpreters, the term *higher criticism* frequently implied the imposition of modern, “scientific” presuppositions upon the study of Scripture. These terms are no longer widely used by scholars. See historical criticism. Arthur G. Patzia & Anthony J. Petrotta, Pocket Dictionary of Biblical Studies (Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 57. Eichhorn, Johann Gottfried (1752-1827). Father of modern “introductions” to the Bible. Eichhorn lectured on the OT, NT, \*Semitic languages, and literature and culture in relation to world history. While accepting the notion of divine revelation in Scripture, he nonetheless reserved the right to interpret that revelation through modern knowledge. He applied the new \*historical criticism to the Bible, tracing the development of the literature historically rather than following the traditional order of the \*canon. Patzia & Petrotta, 40. HIGHER CRITICISM. The scholarly discipline dealing with the genuineness of the text including questions of authorship, date of composition, destination, and so forth. It is often called “historical criticism,” but in its more radical expressions it has been labeled “destructive criticism” or “negative criticism.” Geisler, 640. HIGHER CRITICISM An approach to the Bible taken by nineteenth-century German Biblical scholars and theologians who were strongly influenced by the German rationalism of the times. To a large degree it ruled out the supernatural elements in the Bible and denied the early authorship of the Pentateuch (first five books of the Bible) by Moses and of the prophetic books. It ascribed only human authorship to the Bible and rejected its divine inspiration. It provided the foundation of the Liberalism and Modernism of the twentieth century. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America, 381. THE ROOTS OF MODERNISM. The roots of Modernism lay in the critical philosophies of [David] Hume (1711-1776) and [Immanuel] Kant (1724-1804) with their radical disavowal of any supernatural elements in religion and their unbounded faith in an autonomous man who can decide for himself with unaided reason what he will believe without dependence upon divine revelation. KANT, IMMANUEL (1724-1804). One of the greatest philosophers of the Western tradition. Kant’s thought grew out of the mindset of the \*Enlightenment (which emphasized the primacy of reason in human life and in the pursuit of knowledge) and has had a profound affect on nineteenth-and twentieth-century philosophy and theology. Kant held that human knowing was dependent on the active mind and that theology should be conducted from the foundation of our sense of being morally conditioned. Grenz, et al., 70.

RATIONALISM. Conviction that \*reason provides the best or even the only path to \*truth. In \*philosophy, rationalism as an epistemological theory is often contrasted with \*empiricism, which emphasizes the role of sense experience in the acquisition of truth. In this context reason is understood narrowly as a faculty distinct from sensation and memory. Rationalist philosophers of this type include René \*Descartes, Baruch \*Spinoza and Gottfried \*Leibniz. In \*theology the term *rationalism* often designates a position that subordinates \*revelation to human reason or rules out revelation as a source of \*knowledge altogether. In this sense an empiricist can be a rationalist who gives precedence to human reason over revelation (understanding reason here in a broad sense that includes such faculties as sensation and memory). See *also* epistemology; rational. Evans, 98-99.

27. La More, *God's Providential Preservation Of The Scriptures*, 8.

28. CRITICAL TEXT. An edited text of the Bible that attempts, by critical comparison and evaluation of all [?] of the manuscript evidence, to approximate most closely what was in the autographs; the Westcott and Hort text of the Greek New Testament is an example of a critical text. Geisler, 638. CRITICAL TEXT. *n.* A printed biblical text that does not reflect any single ancient document but rather is a conjectural reconstruction and the product of \*textual criticism. It is a text formed by comparing the numerous variations of the \*manuscripts and including what is considered to be the superior \*reading of each variation. A critical text will include a \*critical apparatus. DeMoss, 40. WESTCOTT, BROOKE FOSS (1825-1901). British NT scholar and textual critic. Westcott and F.J.A. \*Hort are best known for their significant insights and contributions to the science of NT \*textual criticism. The Westcott-Hort edition of the Greek NT (*The New Testament in the Original Greek, With Introduction and Appendix*, 1881) took twenty-eight years to complete. In it the authors identify four major text types [ ? ] (Syrian, Western, Alexandrian, Neutral) and set forth their principles of textual criticism. Westcott, Hort and \*Lightfoot formed the Cambridge Trio because of their similar commitment to the text-critical, linguistic and exegetical study of Scripture. Patzia & Petrotta, 123. HORT, F.J.A. (1828-1892). Notable British textual critic. Much of Hort's work is associated with his colleague, B.F. \*Westcott, with whom he collaborated on an important critical text of the Greek NT, *The New Testament in the Original Greek, with Introduction and Appendix* (1881). He was a major contributor to the English Revised Version [ERV] of 1881. Patzia & Petrotta, 60. LIGHTFOOT, J.B. (1828-1889). British NT scholar. Lightfoot was bishop of Durham and was known for his hermeneutical passion to interpret the text of the Bible within the context of the languages and cultures of the time in which they were written. In addition to being a brilliant scholar, he championed many causes for the church, such as lay ministries and female participation in church leadership. His essay "The Christian Ministry" in his commentary on *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (1897) remains a timeless statement on this topic. Patzia & Petrotta, 73. FOR MORE ON WESTCOTT AND HORT, see Dr. D.A. Waite's [Heresies of Westcott & Hort](#) and Dr. Phil Stringer's [The Westcott & Hort ONLY Controversy](#).

29. Gary E. La More, Six Chapters In Defense Of The King James Bible (Scarborough, ON.: Grace Missionary Baptist Church, 2002), 32.

30. For more on Dr. John R. Rice, Bob Jones University and The Sword of the Lord, see the following publications: Custer's Last Stand Or: The Scholarship Of The Sword Of The Lord And Bob Jones University! and Dear Dr. John: Where is my bible? The first publication was written by Dr. Peter S. Ruckman and the second by Herbert F. Evans.

31. SEE Pastor D.A. Waite's Bob Jones University's Inconsistent Position on the Textus Receptus and the King James Bible. This study has been published by The Bible For Today [B.F.T. #2987].

32. [Matthew 16:6](#) - Then Jesus said unto them, **Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.**

[Matthew 16:12](#) - Then understood they how that he bade *them* not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.

33. What is meant by the phrase "Textual Criticism"? According to Dr. Thomas Strouse, Textual Criticism [is] the discipline which attempts to restore the Biblical text from the extant [existing] manuscripts closest to the *autographa*. Modern Textual Criticism has rejected the majority of [the] evidence (Cursives and Patristics) to opt for a few questionable, Egyptian-bred manuscripts (*Aleph* [a], B, <sup>P66</sup>, <sup>P72</sup>) and consequently abandoning textual certainty for the textual variants. Strouse, 26. TEXTUAL CRITICISM. *N*. The study of \*manuscript evidence for a written work of which the \*original is no longer \*extant, with the intent to discern the original text. Textual criticism involves gathering and organizing data, evaluating \*variant readings, reconstructing the history of the \*transmission of the text and attempting to identify the original text. DeMoss, Pocket Dictionary For The Study of New Testament Greek, 121-122. TEXTUAL CRITICISM. The scholarly discipline of establishing the text as near to the original as possible or probable (also known as \*lower criticism). Since we no longer have any original manuscripts, or "autographs," scholars must sort and evaluate the extant copies with their variant wordings. For example, errors commonly occur when letters are confused (in Hebrew the *dālēt* [ d ] and the *rèš* [ r ] are easily confused), when letters and words are omitted (\*haplography; \*homoioteleuton) or written more than once (\*dittography), and when letters are transposed (\*metathesis) or juxtaposed from parallel words or texts. The textual critic not only sorts through manuscripts and fragments for copyist errors but also considers early translations (such as the \*Vulgate, or \*Peshitta) and \*lectionaries for their witness to the text. For example, the [so-called] \*Septuagint sometimes has a reading that appears older or closer to what scholars think was the original text of the Hebrew Bible and can form the basis of an emendation (a correction of a text that seems to have been corrupted in transmission). It is not always clear, however, when an ancient translation is preserving a different text or rendering a word or verse in a more comprehensible way. Textual criticism is often seen as the most objective of the various biblical criticism because there are clear rules governing the establishment of texts.

However, judgments regarding any textual reading involve an element of interpretation, so disagreements remain.... Patzia & Petrotta, 114-115. [For more on the so-called Septuagint see, Dr. Floyd Jones' *The Septuagint (A Critical Analysis)* and Dr. Peter S. Ruckman's The Mythological Septuagint. Autographa. The original product of the process of Inspiration manifested by the inerrant and authoritative Divine revelation inscripturated on manuscripts in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. Strouse, 7. **Autographa. Plural of autograph. Strouse, 25. Autograph. N.** An \*original handwritten document (αὐτόγραφος, “written in one’s own hand”). Ibid. **Patristics.** From the Latin for “father” (*pater*); it refers to the Church Fathers. Strouse, 22. **Patristic citation/evidence. N.** A biblical quotation or \*allusion that appears in a writing by an early church father. Patristic evidence is helpful in \*textual criticism as it gives us additional access to textual \*readings extant in the early centuries of the church. DeMoss, 95. **CURSIVE MANUSCRIPTS.** Usually the equivalent of minuscule or small-lettered manuscripts written in a “running hand,” hence “cursive”; it is akin to handwriting rather than printing. Geisler, 638. **CURSIVE. Adj.** Designating a style of handwriting in which the letters are joined together, and which was employed in antiquity for everyday correspondence (letters, receipts, etc.) Because it could be written rapidly (Lat. *Cursus*, “run”). -*n.* This style, a letter in this style or a manuscript that is written in this style. Also referred to as \*minuscule writing, a “running hand” or *scriptio continua*. Matthew S. DeMoss, Pocket Dictionary For the Study of New Testament Greek (Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 2001), 40. **MINUSCULE MANUSCRIPT.** A manuscript written in rather small letters, commonly in a cursive or free-flowing hand. Geisler, 641. **MINUSCULE. n.** Cursive script; or a manuscript written in this style. - *adj.* Designating this style. Minuscule script became the norm for manuscript production after the ninth century, whereupon these manuscripts grew to outnumber \*uncial manuscripts ten to one. Minuscules are designated by Arabic numerals without a zero preceding (e.g., 1739). Also referred to as a running hand. DeMoss, 85. **TEXTUAL CRITICISM.** Synonymous with “lower criticism.” Geisler, 643. **LOWER CRITICISM.** The scholarly discipline dealing with the authenticity of the biblical text and that seeks to discover the original words of the autographs. It is also called “textual criticism.” Geisler, 640. **TEXTUAL CRITICISM. n.** The study of the \*manuscript evidence for a written work of which the \*original is no longer \*extant, with the intent to discern the original text. Textual criticism involves gathering and organizing data, evaluating \*variant readings, reconstructing the history of the \*transmission of the text and attempting to identify the original text. Also referred to as text-criticism. DeMoss, 121-122.

34. For an excellent study on preservation by one who is keeping rank, see Brother John M. Krinke's *Should Believers Accept The Preservation of God's Word (s) by Faith, or by History & Science?* Also on the issue of Bible preservation, the reader is directed to another fellow soldier who is also keeping rank, Dr. Kirk D. Divietro, whose study, *Preservation of God's Words*, is excellent and should be read by all historic Fundamentalists.

35. Thomas M. Strouse, "A Critique of *God's Word in Our Hands: The Bible Preserved for Us*," Sound Words from New England, Volume 4, Issue 2 (Newington, CT.: Emmanuel Baptist Theological Seminary, n.d.), 4.

36. Another non-rank keeper and contemporary of B.B. Warfield was Dr. Philip Schaff. Dr. Schaff was one of the translators of the American Standard Version (ASV) of 1901. What major theological event took place in 1893? Philip Schaff called this event "the sum of my life and my theological activity" and it was also heralded as the debut of the New Age movement.... Riplinger, New Age Bible Versions, 459. The World's Parliament of Religions was the major theological event in 1893. Schaff said, "I give you, with pleasure, the liberty of using my name in the list of those who recommend the holding of an international and interdenominational religious congress." Ibid., 460. And "I want to die in the Parliament," said Schaff. Ibid., 462. On September 22, 1893, Schaff presented a paper on "The Reunion of Christendom" at The World's Parliament of Religions in Chicago. For more on The World's Parliament of Religions, see Dr. La More's Following In The Footsteps Of A Liberal: The Life And Work Of Dr. Philip Schaff and Appendix IV. Appendix V of the same paper gives an excellent summary and critique on the American Standard Version of 1901 by Dr. William P. Grady, another rank keeper.

37. Lloyd L. Streeeter, Seventy-five Problems with Central Baptist Seminary's Book *The Bible Version Debate* (LaSalle, IL.: First Baptist Church of LaSalle, 2001), 86-87. For more on B.B. Warfield, see Dr. La More's The Word of God and the Turning of the Tides: From Clothes to Fashions, 5-6.

38. Dr. Jack Moorman has written an excellent study on the N.I.V. and other Modern Bible Versions. His study, Three Hundred Fifty-Six Doctrinal Errors in the N.I.V. and other Modern Bible Versions, can be purchased from The Bible For Today [B.F.T. #2956]. See also Terry Watkins' NEW INTERNATIONAL perVERSION published by Dial-The-Truth Ministries.

39. For excellent studies on what is wrong with the New American Standard Version, SEE Dr. Laurence M. Vance's Double Jeopardy The New American Standard Bible Update and Dr. D.A. Waite's The New American Standard Version Compared to The King James Version and the Underlying Hebrew & Greek Texts. Dr. Vance's volume is published by Vance Publications, Pensacola, FL and Dr. Waite's volume is published by The Bible For Today (B.F.T. #1494–Revised). Also Dr. Waite has written Defects In The New American Standard Version. This study is published by the Dean Burgon Society [#1518].

40. For more on the Nestle-Aland 26<sup>th</sup>/27<sup>th</sup> Editions, see Dr. Samuel C. Gipp's Reading and Understanding the Variations Between the Critical Apparatuses of Nestle's 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> Editions of the Novum Testamentum-Graece. This volume also includes an update on Nestle's 27<sup>th</sup> edition. For a study on the United Bible Societies' Greek Text, see Dr. La More's "The Evaluation of Evidence For The Text", a paper presented at the Dean Burgon Society Meeting, at Ramsey, Minnesota, in July of 2001. This paper has been published by

Grace Missionary Baptist Church, 369 Lawson Road, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M1C 2J8, in a parallel English-Spanish format.

41. SEE footnote 48.

42. NEW EVANGELICALISM An attitude or position which professes to adhere to the Fundamentals of the Faith but advocates a spirit of re-examination of the basic doctrines, an attitude of tolerance toward the Liberals and an entering into “dialogue” with them, and an emphasis on the love and mercy of God rather than on His holiness and righteousness. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America, 383.

43. Apostasy From the Greek *apostasia* meaning “to desert a post or responsibility.” In the Authorized Version it is translated “falling away” (II Thess. 2:3). The context indicates that it means a departure from the correct doctrinal position and, thereupon, a readiness to receive and accept the person and teaching of the man of sin. Today the term refers to the worldwide departure from the authority of Scriptures in matters of faith and practice. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America, 378. WEBSTER’S 1828 DICTIONARY - APOSTASY, n. [Gr. a defection, to depart.] 1. An abandonment of what one has professed; a total desertion, or departure from one's faith or religion. 2. The desertion from a party to which one has adhered. APOSTATE, n. [Gr.] One who has forsaken the church, sect or profession to which he before adhered. In its original sense, applied to one who has abandoned his religion; but correctly applied also to one who abandons a political or other party. APOSTATE, a. False; traitorous. APOSTATICAL, a. After the manner of an apostate. APOSTATIZE, v.i. To abandon one's profession or church; to forsake principles or faith which one has professed; or the party to which one has been attached. APOSTATIZING, ppr. Abandoning a church, profession, sect or party.

44. DIALECTIC. A process of thinking or argument that involves contradictions and their resolution, sometimes in the form of questions and opposing answers. The term has been used very differently by different philosophers. \*Plato though of dialectic as the highest form of reasoning. \*Aristotle and later medieval philosophers tended to think of dialectic as a formal method of disputation. Immanuel \*Kant developed a “transcendental dialectic” that attempted to reveal the contradictions into which uncritical reason falls. G.W.F. \*Hegel developed a dialectical logic, which he saw as providing the formal structure of history as well, seen as the progressive unfolding of the Absolute. This historical dialectic was taken over by Karl \*Marx and put to use in his dialectical materialism. Evans, 34-35. For more on the Hegelian Dialectic, SEE footnote 58.

45. NEO-ORTHODOXY A theological position halfway between Conservatism and Liberalism. Because it contains truth along with error, it is more insidious and dangerous than an open espousal of error. The followings are its positions on major doctrines. (1) It regards Jesus as the revelation of God, being the Word of God. The written word is human and therefore to a greater or lesser degree contains error. Thus it cannot fully give the

revelation of God. (2) It is existential in method. It contends that one must have an experience (divine-human encounter) with God that transcends rational explanation. (3) It does not take the fall of Adam literally; instead it holds that Adam is a figure of all men who fall. (4) It presents nebulous views of the atonement of Christ. (5) It strongly emphasizes the social welfare of man, insisting that the church must give itself to the needs of society rather than merely rescuing individuals out of the muck of society. (6) It considers matters of eschatology to be beyond human analysis; and, consequently, it does not consider the events of Daniel and Revelation to have a literal fulfillment. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America, 383. NEO-ORTHODOXY. Early-to mid-twentieth-century theological movement associated with such Protestant theologians as Karl \*Barth and Emil \*Brunner. Neo-orthodoxy criticized \*liberalism for diminishing the \*transcendence of God and the importance of divine \*revelation. Neo-orthodox theologians frequently argued for a dialectical theology that held contrasting emphases, such as divine sovereignty and human freedom, together in tension. Evans, 80. NEO-ORTHODOXY. An early twentieth-century Protestant movement (involving among others, Karl \*Barth, Emil \*Brunner and Reinhold and H. Richard \*Niebuhr) born out of a sense that Protestant \*liberalism had illegitimately accomodated the gospel to modern science and culture, and in the process had lost the classical focus on the \*transcendence of God as well as the Word of God. In this situation neo-orthodox thinkers promoted a return to the basic principles of \*Reformation theology and the early church (especially the primacy of Scripture, human depravity and God's work in Christ) as the basis for proclaiming the gospel in the contemporary context, while taking seriously the \*Enlightenment critique of \*orthodoxy and rejecting Protestant \*scholasticism. Neo-orthodox theologians often used a \*dialectical approach, which sought theological insight through the juxtaposing of seemingly opposing formulations held together as paradoxically true (e.g., humans are fallen and depraved, yet free and accountable to God). Grenz, et al., 82-83. For an excellent evangelical evaluation of Barthianism, see Dr. Charles Caldwell Ryrie's NEOORTHODOXY, 1-64. The Presbyterian Journal has this to say about Dr. Ryrie's book: "To many, the recent theological movement called Neoorthodoxy, Barthianism, or Crisis Theology has seemed to be a return from liberalism to conservative faith. It stresses the Word of God, the sovereignty of God, the sinfulness of man, and the centrality of Christ. 'The system must either be something very good or terribly deceiving,' the author asserts, 'and we must know which.' The purpose of this book, he says, is 'to show as simply as possible something of the system and its errors.' Beginning with the historical and theological background of the movement, Dr. Ryrie analyzes the positions of Barth, Brunner and Niebuhr, three of the leading exponents of neoorthodoxy. Next, he summarizes the basic doctrines of the movement and then offers a critique of its internal inconsistencies and its departures from biblical principles. 'From reading Neoorthodoxy, one will be reminded that the Reformed doctrine must be one that is God-centred-not man; that the Bible is the Word of God-not that it becomes the Word; that the cross is to be preached-but not without the blood; and that salvation is for all-but only those who believe are saved.'" This material from the Presbyterian Journal came from the back cover of Dr. Ryrie's book NEOORTHODOXY.

46. See endnote 48.

47. Obviously the Young Evangelical presently at Maranatha should have read Dr. Cedarholm's statement on the preservation of the King James Bible before he made his infamous statement: "...The preservation of the Word of God is perfectly accomplished by God in heaven. The preservation of God's Word on earth has been committed to people...God anticipated the possibility of failure on man's part in accurately preserving the autographs." "...David Cloud loves to argue the preservation of the Bible by the priesthood of believers but you have to stretch the truth to argue this!" "...God could have preserved [H]is [W]ord but history proves [H]e did not!" Maranatha has certainly departed from its original position on the King James Bible as stated by Dr. Cedarholm.

48. TEXTUS RECEPTUS. *N*. The name given to the edition of the Greek New Testament published by Erasmus in the first part of the sixteenth century and essentially reproduced by a number of others on the European continent, including Stephanus, Théodore de Bèza and Abraham Elzevirs. An edition printed by this last individual, in 1633, included a remark in the preface about this form of the text being "commonly received"-and the name stuck (i.e., the Received Text). Prior to this, in 1611, the translators of the King James Version relied heavily on this form that stands behind the Textus Receptus. The term is sometimes used loosely as a synonym for the Byzantine text form that stands behind the Textus Receptus. Commonly confused with the Majority Text (see Byzantine text-type). DeMoss, 122.

49. Dr. Cedarholm said in his letter, "We believe and teach that the King James is God's Word in the English language without error." The Young Evangelical presently at Maranatha contradicted what Dr. Cedarholm wrote in his letter when he said: "...[E]ven with errors we can understand what the writers meant." Maranatha Baptist Bible College TODAY is definitely not keeping rank with the position of Dr. Cedarholm, its founding President.

50. Based on Dr. Jones' observation, the reader does not have to wonder where Westcott and Hort are. All the reader needs to do is purchase a copy of The "Doctored" New Testament from The Bible For Today and he will know where they are based on the thousands of additions and deletions that these two Anglican apostates made to the Greek New Testament.

51. What about the Young Evangelical at Maranatha? The reader needs to read again what he said: "...In the Bible we start with a perfect Bible and go down hill." "...Can we speak of our Bibles today as inspired? In the technical sense, we cannot." "...[E]ven with errors we can understand what the writers meant." "...The preservation of the Word of God is perfectly accomplished by God in heaven. The preservation of God's Word on earth has been committed to people...God anticipated the possibility of failure on man's part in accurately preserving the autographs." "...David Cloud loves to argue the preservation of the Bible by the priesthood of believers but you have to stretch the truth to argue this!" "...God could have preserved [H]is [W]ord but history proves [H]e did not!"

52. Robert (Bob) R. Jones (1883-1968) was from 1920 until his death an evangelist of national and international stature. He founded Bob Jones College (now university) at St. Andrews Bay, Florida (now in Greenville, South Carolina). He was licensed by the Methodist Church to preach when he was 15. His life is carefully portrayed in *Builder of Bridges* by R.K. Johnson. Dr. Bob, Sr., was one of the most militant of the old-time evangelists. He was famous for his hard-hitting style, and warmth of personal applications. He was also known for his incisive Christian philosophy and sayings. Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, 334.

53. Dr. Frank Logsdon, *From The NASV To The KJV The Testimony of a Committee Member for the New American Standard Version* (Oak Harbor, WA.: Way of Life Literature, 1992), 20-25.

54. Again, for an excellent study on the Preservation of God's Words, see Dr. Kirk D. DiVietro's study of the same title. This study has been published by The Bible For Today, 900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, NJ 08108 [B.F.T. #2769].

55. Curtis Pugh, "God's Blessings on the King James Bible," *The Berea Baptist Banner*, June 5, 1996, 101, 106-108. The writer of this paper finds it ironic that Brother J.C. Settlemoir, writing in the same paper on "Ministerial Honesty," was found out to be a wolf in sheep's clothing by the editor of *The Berea Baptist Banner*. Mr. Settlemoir did not keep rank when he wrote an article for *The Berea Baptist Banner* on "The King James Controversy." Because Brother Settlemoir is a wolf, he no longer writes for *The Berea Baptist Banner*. The reader may find Brother Settlemoir's entire article in *The Flaming Torch* for July/August/September 1996.

56. G.A. Riplinger, *In Awe of Thy Word: Understanding the King James Bible, Its Mystery and History, Letter by Letter* (Ararat, VA.: A.V. Publications Corp., 2003), 27-28. Even though H.L. Mencken was not born again, he definitely was keeping rank with those who affirm what he has said about the King James Bible.

57. *Ibid.*, 28. The reader may not agree with the policies and practices of the former U.S. president but he can conclude that the president was keeping rank with those who believe that the King James Bible is God's preserved Word in the English language.

58. Years ago when the writer of this paper taught at Maranatha Baptist Bible College [1976-1980] he heard Dr. Rodney Bell, successor to G. Archer Weniger, as president of the Fundamental Baptist Fellowship of America, preach a series of messages at Maranatha on pseudo-fundamentalism. How does one arrive at pseudo-fundamentalism? The dialectic of Hegel will serve to illustrate this. In the dialectic one has a thesis-Fundamentalism, an antithesis-Neo-Evangelicalism and finally a synthesis-Pseudo-fundamentalism. Remember, the Young Evangelical at Maranatha went to a Neo-Evangelical school. Maranatha at one time was a fundamentalist school. But no longer. It, like the other 9, is a pseudo-

fundamentalist school. What does the reader know about G. Archer Weniger? Dr. G. Archer Weniger was one of five brothers in the ministry who grew up under the ministry of William Bell Riley, one of the four prima donnas of Fundamenatlism. For many years Dr. Weniger pastored the Foothill Boulevard Baptist Church in Oakland, California. This church has since moved to Castro Valley, California. He was founder and editor of *The Blu-Print*, a weekly paper exposing Liberalism, New Evangelicalism and compromise. He was co-founder of the Lucerne Christian Conference Center. He was a professor at San Francisco Baptist Seminary, founded by his brother, Dr. Arno Q. Weniger. Dr. G. Archer Weniger was an informed, militant FUNDAMENTALIST. With an uncle like Dr. G. Archer Weniger, one wonders what happened to Dr. Arno Q. Weniger, Jr., successor to Dr. Cedarholm as president of Maranatha? Remember: There is an almost invariable historic law that evangelistic movements become less separatistic in the second generation.

59. Antonin Scalia, "We Are Fools For Christ's Sake," Intercessors For America Newsletter, XXIII, No. 6 (June 1996), 3.

60. Clearwaters, Richard Volley (1900-). Baptist preacher and educator. Born in Wilmot, Kansas, Clearwaters graduated from Moody Bible Institute (1924) and went on to earn degrees from Northern Baptist Theological Seminary (Th.B., 1928; B.D., 1931). He also attended Kalamazoo College (B.A., 1930) and the University of Chicago Divinity School (M.A., 1931). Clearwaters served churches in the Northern Baptist Convention...becoming pastor of Fourth Baptist Church, Minneapolis, Minnesota (1940-1982). He was president of the Iowa Baptist Convention (1937-1939) and served on the board of trustees of Northern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Apart from his pastoral ministry, Clearwaters served as dean and professor of practical theology of Northwestern Theological Seminary and then, in 1956, became founder and president of Central Baptist Seminary in Minneapolis, which was housed in his church. He also founded and served as first president of Pillsbury Baptist Bible College, Owanatonna, Minnesota. He received honorary degrees from Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, San Francisco Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary and Bob Jones University (Leonard, Dictionary of Baptists in America, 85-86).