

**THE NEW
REVISED STANDARD VERSION
OF THE BIBLE**

**SHALL WE ACCEPT IT?
IS IT FOR SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS?**

By
Rowland F. Wilkinson, B.S., M.D., F.I.C.S.
Takoma Park, Md.

FIRST EDITION
March, 1953
SECOND EDITION
May, 1953
THIRD EDITION
June, 1953

REVISED STANDARD VERSION OF THE BIBLE

Shall We Accept It?

By Rowland Wilkinson

Dr. Luther Weigle, chairman of the Revision Committee of the Revised Standard Version, recently published by the National Council of Churches, speaking to a capacity audience in the armory in Washington, D. C., Sept. 30, 1952, said, in effect, that you cannot use the King James Version and the Revised Standard Version together. It will bring in confusion; use one or the other. Of course he recommended the Revised Standard Version. The National Council of Churches, widely known for its higher critical attitude toward inspiration, has plainly stated that it intends to displace the King James Bible with this new Version.

You cannot use these two Versions together because one teaches doctrines conflicting with the other. To accept two mutually contradicting versions as Bibles will tend to destroy faith in the Bible itself and in God. We do not overlook the improvement made in the new Version by replacing with modern expressions a number of words in the King James whose meanings have changed during past decades. We wish the revisers had stopped there. Instead, they gave us many uncalled-for changes. We now compare only a few of the texts drastically changed in the new Version. One need not be a Hebrew or Greek scholar to see the revolutionary effect of these changes.

TEXTS THAT AFFECT DOCTRINE

I. CREATION

GEN. 1:5

KING JAMES: *And the evening and the morning were the first day;*

REVISED STANDARD VERSION:* *And there was evening and there was morning, one day.* * From the Revised Standard Version of the Bible. Copyrighted 1946 and 1952.

“One day” is indefinite. “First day” as in the King James is definite. The other days in the RSV are “second day”, “third day”, etc. Modernists say “one day” is a long period, possibly billions of years. You therefore cannot find in Genesis I the literal seven-day week of creation as in the King James Version.

This indefinite “one day” opens the way for the long geological ages which the revisionists believe and which they intend to propagate as their commentaries show.

Patriarchs and Prophets says: “Assumption that the events of the first week required thousands upon thousands of years, strikes directly at the foundation of the fourth commandment . . . It is infidelity in its most insidious and hence most dangerous form.” p. 111.

II. SABBATH

EXODUS 20: 10

KING JAMES: *But the seventh day is **the** sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work.*

REVISED STANDARD VERSION: *But the seventh day is **a** sabbath to the Lord your God; in it you shall not do any work.*

This change anticipates making a ceremonial sabbath out of the weekly, holy Sabbath. A translation from the Hebrew as “a sabbath” is entirely uncalled for. Col. 2 :16 is also translated a sabbath. See drastic changes in Acts 17: 1, 2.

III. SOUL AFTER DEATH

JOB 19:25, 26

KING JAMES: *For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet **in** my flesh shall I see God.*

REVISED STANDARD VERSION: *For I know that my Redeemer lives, and at last he will stand upon the earth; and after my skin has been thus destroyed, then **without** my flesh I shall see God.*

This change in the RSV is against a resurrection of the body. It also teaches the, immortality of the soul.

II PETER 2:9

KING JAMES: *The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust **unto the day of judgment** to be punished.*

REVISED STANDARD VERSION: *The Lord. knows how to rescue the godly from trial, and to keep the unrighteous **under punishment until** the day of judgment.*

This text, of course, teaches purgatory pure and simple, or that torments await the wicked at death. Other texts in the RSV that teach the same idea are Jude 6 and 7, Matt. 25:46, and Job 26:5,

IV. THE DIETY OF CHRIST

ISA.7:14

KING JAMES: *Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.*

REVISED STANDARD VERSION: *Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign. Behold, a young woman shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.*

Read verses 10, 11, and 12. Notice the setting for verse 14. The Lord Himself is going to give a great sign. A young woman having a son is certainly no sign. It is obvious that “young woman” does not come up to the proclamation of the Lord. Hebrew scholars of authority down through, the centuries translate the Hebrew word “almah” as “virgin.” Biblical scholars such as Rawlinson, Machen, Wilson, Lowth, Gesenius, Ewald, and Delitzsch also render that word “almah” by “virgin.” The historical creed going back to 150 A.D., says, “conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.” Will Christianity now accept this repudiating of the creed by this new Version? The virgin birth is likewise denied in the RSV in Gal 4:4; Matt. 1:16 (footnote); Luke 1:34, 35; and 2:33. Attempts are made in these texts to imply that Jesus had a human father—Joseph.

Dr. John C. Trevor, executive director, department of English Bible, of the National Council of Churches and closely associated with the translating committee that produced this Version, in discussing Isa. 7: 14, said, “It has nothing to do with the doctrine of the virgin birth of Jesus. . . . A later time in history there appeared a man who embodied the symbol in His own life, of the Immanuel. But Isaiah was talking

about Immanuel, the name of a child, to symbolize the necessity of faith in God to get through a difficult political situation that arose in 735 B.C.”¹ Thus the revisers make Matthew misinformed when he quotes Isa. 7:14 in Matt. 1:23. Furthermore, Matthew is made to misquote this Old Testament prophecy. This change is consistent with the revisers systematic undermining of the doctrine of the Deity of Christ.
¹Dr. John C. Trever, a quoted in Milwaulkie, Wi., “Sentinel”. Jan. 24, 1953.

In the new Version the old forms of “thee” and “thou” have been changed to “you” and “yours”, except (according to the revisers) when referring to Deity. Yet when referring to Christ, the familiar form of “you” is used: Matt. 16:16; Ps.2:7; Ps. 45:6; Matt 14:28; Matt. 14:33 and others, thus denying the Deity of Christ. Micah 5:2 in the RSV removes His eternal pre-existence. According to this new Version in Matt.27:54 and Mark, 15:39, Christ becomes “a son of God” instead of “the Son of God” instead of “his Son.” Hebrews 1:2 has “a Son” instead of “his Son.”

In John 3:16 the word “begotten” is omitted. Also this is true in John 1:14, 18, and I John 4:9. There are at least sixty texts in the RSV that tone down or destroy the Deity of Christ. If you remove the Deity of Christ from the Bible you destroy the Bible and undermine the whole Christian economy.

V. BLOOD ATONEMENT OF CHRIST

COL. 1:14

KING JAMES: *In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.*

REVISED STANDARD VERSION: *In whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.*

Through his blood is omitted in the RSV.

I COR. 5:7

KING JAMES: *For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us.*

REVISED STANDARD VERSION: *For Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed.*

For us is omitted in the RSV.

ZECH. 9:9

KING JAMES: *Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion! behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having **salvation** . . .*

REVISED STANDARD VERSION: *Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion! . . . Lo, your king comes to you; triumphant and victorious is he.*

Notice how the RSV has removed salvation from the prophecy of Christ’s first coming.

MATT. 18:11

KING JAMES: *For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.*

REVISED STANDARD VERSION: *This entire verse is omitted.*

See how the doctrine of the blood atonement of Christ is weakened.

VI. SECOND COMING OF CHRIST

MATT. 24:3

KING JAMES: *And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what, shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the **end of the world?***

REVISED STANDARD VERSION: *As he sat on the Mount of Olives, the disciples came to him privately, saying, Tell us, when will this be, and what will be the sign of your coming and of **the close of the age?***

Other texts that change “the end of the world” to “the close of the age” are Matt. 13 :39, 40, 49; and Matt. 28:20. This change destroys the personal and apocalyptic second coming of Christ which will bring an end to time and, usher in eternity. The expression “close of the age” can mean merely the gradual transition from one era of earth’s history to another.

TITUS 2:13

KING JAMES: *Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the “great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.*

REVISED STANDARD VERSION: *Awaiting our blessed hope, the appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.*

This text in the King James demands definitely an event in the future; as changed in the RSV the event can be in the present. The event as given in the King James is physical. As given in the RSV it can be a spiritual conversion, or some other nonphysical phenomena.

The second coming of Christ is prophesied in Jude 14 and discussed in II Thess. 2:2. In the RSV these texts have both been put in the past tense as having already occurred. How can prophecy refer to events which transpired in the past? Confusion is thus produced. Matthew 25:13 in the RSV omits His second coming.

VII. PROPHECY

DAN. 8:14

KING JAMES: *And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.*

REVISED STANDARD VERSION: *And he said to him, “For two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings; then the sanctuary shall be restored to its rightful state.”*

The doctrine of the cleansing of the Sanctuary is gone. Also the 2300 days are gone. There can be no meaning to the 2300 days if the topics it concerns are gone. Chapter 23 of *Great Controversy* was written about this verse.

DAN. 9:25

KING JAMES: *Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and three score and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.*

REVISED STANDARD VERSION: *Know there fore and understand that from the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem to the coming of an anointed one, a prince, there shall be seven weeks. Then for sixty-two weeks it shall be built again with squares and moat, but in a troubled time.*

The prophetic time-period for Christ's first coming is ruined. This indefensible rendering has taken away that basis of the Seventh-day Adventists' date of Christ's first coming.

DAN. 9:27

KING JAMES: *And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.*

REVISED STANDARD VERSION: *And he shall make a strong covenant with many for one week; and for half of the week he shall cause sacrifice and offering to cease.*

The prophecy of Christ's crucifixion in the “midst of the week”, which locates the date of Christ's death, is gone.

REV. 12:17

KING JAMES: *And the dragon was wrath with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.*

REVISED STANDARD VERSION: *Then the dragon was angry with the woman, and went off to make war on the rest of her offspring, on those who keep the commandments of God and bear testimony to Jesus.*

This change destroys the basic text of the Seventh-day Adventist doctrine of The Spirit of Prophecy. Also the Remnant Church is gone. Mrs. White wrote much about the Remnant Church. I believe that the foregoing group of texts speak for themselves. We need not be highly schooled in the Biblical languages to recognize these detrimental changes. These texts change doctrine! The revisers did not follow any one manuscript. According to their own admission, they translated portions from many different manuscripts (MSS) which in their Judgment were correct. By so doing they claim to clarify the meaning they think the original writers meant to convey. Actually they entered upon their task with a preconceived philosophy. They apparently picked out such portions of different MSS which would teach what they wanted taught, not what the MSS as a whole taught. Also they seem to have sought out obscure MSS to harmonize with their own doctrines. To claim that from such a maze of varied and conflicting morsels of MSS the word of God is easily discernable is obviously untrue. This choosing of sections and verses from different MSS they designate as the *eclectic principle*.²

² Members of the Revision committee, "An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament", p. 41.

TWO TYPES OF MANUSCRIPTS: TWO STREAMS OF BIBLES

In reality there are only two types of manuscripts. One type was miraculously preserved by God through the centuries; the other corrupted by man with pagan and papal philosophies.

This is true both of the Old and New Testaments. The first type of manuscripts of the New Testament contains a great number which generally agree among themselves. The second type have far fewer manuscripts. These disagree with one another. The first group came from the original Greek in which language the New Testament books were written by the apostles themselves. From the Greek came a translation into the Syriac language, known as the Peshitto. This occurred in the Apostolic Age. Almost at the same time, another translation was made into the Latin. This is generally considered to be the Itala.

The original Greek autograph of the New Testament is represented by hundreds of manuscripts, all of which virtually agree with one another. These were preserved down through the centuries by the arduous copy-work of God-fearing Christians in every age and in every land. This group of Christians is referred to in Revelation as the "church in the wilderness". (Rev. 12:6, 14) Mrs. White says: "Satan had urged on the papal priests and prelates to bury the word of truth beneath the rubbish of error, heresy and superstition; but in a most wonderful manner it was preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness."³ Ellen G White, Great Controversy, p. 69. Also read the book Truth Triumphant: The Church in the Wilderness by B. G. Wilkinson, Ph.D. Pacific Press Pub. Co.

According to this authoress, we must look not to papal but to evangelical forces for the preservation of the true MSS. Erasmus and Tyndale based their famous translations of the New Testament on these pure sources. On these sources the scholars who produced the King James Bible based their New Testament Version.

The second group of manuscripts, is the corrupted stream. Erroneous teachings began with Justin Martyr who was born about 100 A.D. His pupil Tatian embraced the Gnostic heresy and wrote a harmony of the Gospels, called the Diatessaron, which had a stormy career. Clement (200 A.D.) headed a school of heresy at Alexandria. In all probability he was a pupil of Tatian. Origen, the pupil and successor of Clement, did the most of all to create and to give direction to the forces of apostasy and of corrupted manuscripts down through the centuries. Yet, by their own confession, Origen is a great guide to the revisionists. He published a six-column edition of the Greek Bible called the Hexapla. Eusebius took up the work of Origen and edited the famous fifth column of his Hexapla. This fifth column became a masterly source of errors. The Roman Emperor Constantine (312 A.D.) ordered 50 of the Eusebio-Origen Bible manuscripts to be made for his new capitol at Constantinople. Evidence points to two of these MSS as

being in existence today; one being the *Vaticanus*; the other, the *Sinaiticus*. These two latter MSS partake of the corruptions of the said Bible. It was from this type of manuscript that Jerome translated the *Latin Vulgate* which has been the official Bible of the Catholics up to the present time.⁴

Mrs. White has also given us a clear lead about manuscripts she says: “While Luther was opening a closed Bible to the people of Germany, Tyndale was impelled by the Spirit of God to do the same for England. (Note the word *impelled*). Wycliffe’s Bible had been translated from the Latin text, which contained many errors.”⁵ God led Tyndale to know this and to reject that version, which had many errors.

“In 1516 . . . Erasmus had published his Greek and Latin version of the New Testament. Now for the first time the word of God was printed in the original tongue. In this work many errors of former versions were corrected.”⁶

Mrs. White shows that Tyndale based his Bible, not on the Latin of the Vulgate, but upon the Greek of Erasmus; which, according to the above statement, was both the word of God and the original Greek.

“Tyndale was to complete the work of Wycliffe in giving the Bible to his countrymen. A diligent student and an earnest seeker for truth, he had received the gospel from the Greek Testament of Erasmus.”⁷

Since the King James Version is a continuation of the Bible of Tyndale, it is not correct to say that the King James was based upon the Latin. Erasmus, Tyndale and Mrs. White present it as based on the Greek New Testament.

On this point I now quote a paragraph from a pamphlet put out by the revisers themselves.

⁴ B.G. Wilkinson, *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, pp. 16-22.

⁵ White, *Great Controversy*, p. 245.

⁶ *Idem*.

⁷ White, *Great Controversy*, p. 245

“The first and most important improvement made by the revisers was in the Greek text which was made the basis for their translation. The King James Version was based essentially upon the Greek text of Beza, printed in 1598. Though he had available what we know to be much better manuscripts, Beza had followed the text of Erasmus, which was based on late and corrupt medieval manuscripts.”⁸

So! The revisers were obliged to confess that the great scholar Beza followed Erasmus, (though he printed his text eighty years after Erasmus printed his). Beza evidently threw away as corrupt some manuscripts which the revisers now pick up.

In other words, both Mrs. White and the revisers themselves state that the King James Bible was based on the Greek text of Erasmus. The only difference is that Mrs. White upholds the pure text of Erasmus which the revisers claim to be corrupt. I, for one, would feel that in accepting the work of the revisers I would be rejecting the leading of Mrs. White, as well as that of Erasmus and the great scholar Beza.

The revisers assert that the King James contains 5,000 errors. They claim repeatedly that they have produced in 1952 a Bible superior to the King James. These claims, they allege, are based upon keener analyses of manuscripts, Biblical criticism, literary criticism and archaeology. Now, dear friends, do you think that the Lord would wait until 1952 to give us the true Bible, while through centuries He gave His people a Bible full of errors?

Mrs. White says that the truth was kept unadulterated down through the centuries of the Dark Ages.⁹ She also says: “By a miracle of His power He has preserved His written word through the ages.”¹⁰ Speaking of the King James Version in 1889, twelve years before the American Revised version was published, p. 27.

⁸ Revisers. “Introduction to the RSV of the New Testament”, p. 15.

⁹ White, *Great Controversy*, p. 69.

¹⁰ White, "Sign of the Times", March 28, 1906, as quoted in My Life Today,

Mrs. White wrote, "My brethren, let the word of God stand just as it is. Let not human wisdom presume to lessen the force of one statement of the Scriptures." ¹¹

There are 59 verses or passages which are found in the New Testament of the King James Version that are omitted from the text of the Revised Standard Version! In the light of this mutilation of the original text, notice the following quotation from *Patriarchs and Prophets*: "Every chapter and every verse of the Bible is a communication from God to men." (p. 504).

Mrs. White quotes and comments on most of these passages from the King James which are omitted from the text of the Revised Standard Version.

SCHOLARSHIP

It has been said over and over that we must believe in the revisers' inherent honesty of scholarship regardless of what changes they made. Let us examine the honesty which we are asked to accept.

1. In the Old Testament of the RSV footnotes appear repeatedly to indicate that the Hebrew original has been abandoned. In its place, a reading has been adopted which is found only in some ancient translation different from the original Hebrew. Frequently the Revised Standard Version Old Testament abandons the Hebrew altogether and substitutes a different reading of questionable evidence. Footnotes often indicate substitution; often there is nothing to show what has been done.

2. It is claimed that many new Bible manuscripts have been discovered in the last 50 years since the first Revised Version was published. This claim has not been substantiated. Whatever documents they offer in proof are not weighty enough to have any affect upon the text of the King James Version. Each manuscript is to be judged on its own merit.

¹¹ White, Testimonies, Vol. 5, p. 711.

3. There are portions of the Bible narratives in which practically all types of manuscripts agree; yet, the revisers take no account of this fact. In a variety of ways they transmit these texts arbitrarily.

4. This new Version has greatly unsettled texts in the Old Testament which are quoted or referred to in the New Testament. This causes the Old Testament and the New Testament to disagree. Old Testament prophecy is practically done away with.

5. There are many supplied words, but no italics or *footnotes* are present to indicate that these words have been supplied. It is impossible for one to discern between the words of the Bible writers and those of the translators. This is not literary honesty.

6. The revisers repeatedly claim that they have revolutionized the readability of the Bible by the major improvements they have made in clarity of renditions and in modernizing the language of the new RSV. We do not overlook that they have put a number of words and phrases in modern speech, but they certainly have not retained the beauty of the King James. Compare this new Revised Standard Version with the King James and you will surely agree with Dorothy Thompson's statement in the "Ladies' Home Journal" of March, 1953, article, "The Old Bible and the New." She says:

"I find the new text inferior on nearly every page to the one it seeks to supplant. . . It is weaker, less vivid, defective in imagery, less beautiful, less inspired. And I, at least, do not find it easier to understand."

Please contrast with this her tribute to the King James Bible.

"The men in the reign of King James who produced the great Bible were a large body of the greatest scholars of the period. . . The fidelity of their text to the original has never since been successfully challenged, and its beauty makes it the greatest monument of the English language. . . It appeared in an age when the Reformation was revitalizing the religious sense of the people; in an age when men had gone to the block for the right to print and read the Bible; it coincided with the English renaissance that produced Shakespeare; it was written when the English language was most vivid and virile. All these factors

combined to produce the clarity, simplicity, passion, beauty and majesty of the King James Bible which has outlasted all subsequent revisions.”

A MISLEADING ARGUMENT

There are those who say it makes no difference what version you use; the Message can be found in anyone of them. They point out that some people in foreign lands have been brought into the Truth through the use of many different versions; such as Spanish, French, Italian, German, the different languages of India, and of other non-English speaking countries. To this we reply, Some foreign versions are based on the superior manuscripts from which the King James came; others’ are not. Missionaries going to these foreign fields were schooled in the King James and could “square? the deficient foreign versions with the King James. It is argued that many people in foreign lands never heard of the King James or of the manuscripts upon which the King James is based. Be that as it may; after they hear the Message, they will have been taught doctrines as found in the King James.

This Revised Standard Version is more dangerous than any other version now in general use. If all the Bibles in the world were destroyed except this new RSV, the Third Angel’s Message could never be taught from it. Deficient foreign versions should not be used to give standing to this most deficient one of all.

If the Revised Standard Version had been the Bible in the days of William Miller, there never would have been an Advent movement. The message could not have arisen from it, because the 2300 days-prophecy and the 70 weeks predicting the year of Christ’s baptism are completely destroyed by the RSV.

WHAT ARE THE BELIEFS OF THE REVISERS?

At this point the logical question is, Who are the revisers that put out this new Version and what do they believe? The majority of them are modernists, liberal scholars who do not believe in the Deity of Christ or the inspiration of the Bible. The Revision Committee was created and sponsored by the National Council of Churches, originally the Federal Council of Churches. The Revision Committee was headed by Dr. Luther A. Weigle, former head of Yale University Divinity School, an out-spoken higher critic, and former Federal Council president. On the cover-piece for this new Version is a list of the members of the Revision Committee, both Old and New Testament. These men have written books. Following are extracts from books written by some of them which give the tenor of their thinking and writing.

JULIUS A. BEWER, *Literature of the Old Testament*.

“The chronological sequence of the books which literary criticism has established differs greatly from their order in our Bibles. And not only is this true of the books as a whole but of their component parts as well, for most of the books are of composite authorship. The majestic story of Creation, for example, which now stands at the beginning of the Old Testament, is quite late as a literary composition. The stories of the Garden of Eden and of the Temptation which follow immediately upon it are several centuries earlier; and the history of Saul and David in the Books of Samuel is, from a literary point of view, older than the books themselves, older indeed than the oldest stories in the Book of Genesis.” Intro. xii.

HENRY J. CADBURY, *Jesus, What Manner of Man*.

“Much of the most appreciative writing about him (Jesus) runs the risk of putting him into the introvert class. Indeed, as is well known, the emphasis of orthodoxy upon his messianic claims and messianic consciousness led some psychiatrists to doubt his sanity.” p. 8.

“Why does he Jesus seem such an extremist? Something could be set down to a habit language. He was given to overstatements,—in his case not a personal idiosyncrasy, but a characteristic of the oriental world.” p. 69.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED, *How to Read the Bible*.

“Genesis is not hard reading in any version, for it is almost entirely narrative; indeed, it reveals the oriental story teller at his best.” p. 40.

“The little idyll of Ruth follows the Book of Judges in the Bible, only because its story falls in the days of the Judges. But it belongs to Israel’s fiction, rather than to its history, and should be read among its tales and stories.” p. 51.

“We must think of the books of the Bible which are fiction, that is, short stories. The Book of Job is more than a novel, for it is principally drama and debate, but its setting is unmistakably fiction.” p. 147.

An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament, Article by Goodspeed.

“The APOCRYPHA whatever we may think of their value for religion, form an INDISPENSABLE introduction to the New Testament, for it is they and not the Old Testament that constitute its immediate background.” p. 31. (Caps supplied).

Goodspeed looks forward to the much discredited Apocrypha being inserted in a new version of the Bible, as he brought out in his three lectures in Long Beach, California, Oct., 1952.

JAMES MOFFATT.

Moffatt, of the famous modern speech Moffatt Bible says in the preface to the translation, that the Hebrew manuscripts from which the King James Bible was translated are “desperately corrupt.”

The Approach to the New Testament, London, 1922.

“We also know that the New Testament writers attached a meaning to some Old Testament prophecies which was unhistorical . . . Historical criticism has rendered a true service to Christianity by relieving it of the necessity of accepting literally such attempts. . . Predictions like that of the millennium in the book of Revelation are due to some passing mood of faith in a particular age.” pp. 85-86.

WALTER R. BOWIE, *The Renewing Gospel.*

“As poetry, the story of the Virgin Birth has imperishable loveliness, . . . Recognition of the incomparable spiritual power of Jesus does not in this period of Christian development make itself dependent upon assurance that he was miraculously born.” p. 96.

Bowie questions the fact of the resurrection and states that the gospels are an expression of mystic emotion. pp. 104, 105.

FREDERICK C. GRANT, *The Earliest Gospel.*

Grant believes that the Bible is tradition. “The source material available for the composition of Mark’s gospel was the evangelic tradition as it circulated in the church at Rome in the middle or late sixties of the first century.” p. 58.

WILLIAM A. IRWIN, *Revision of The Prophets and Their Times*, (written by J. M. Powis Smith).

“The pious tradition of more than twenty centuries has loved to affirm that they were divinely inspired.” p. 321.

“Only bigotry could bring us to deny an equal validity with the prophets of Israel in the religious vision of men such as Zoroaster or Ikhnaton or, on a lower level, the unnamed thinkers of ancient Babylon,” p. 322.

“The prophets were forced by the disaster that befell Israel to do some hard and painful thinking. They were forced by the history of their own times to revise their messages again and again in order to keep pace with the progress of the age. The Assyrians and Babylonians forced them to revise their conception of Yahweh from time to time until they finally made him God of the Universe.” p. 324.

MILLAR BURROWS, *Founders of Great Religions.*

“The accounts of the resurrection in the Gospels are confusing, and it is impossible to, construct from them a clear, consistent story.” As to what actually happened to the of Jesus we may not be able to agree among ourselves.” pp. 206, 207.

“Modern study of the gospels makes all too plain how distressingly little We know about Jesus.”
p. 207.

“Yet it is by no means certain that he (Jesus) considered himself the Messiah.” pp. 217, 218.

“Recent investigators tend to believe that Jesus thought of his mission simply as that of a prophet.”
p. 218.

CLARENCE T. CRAIG, *The Beginning of Christianity*.

He says of the death of John the Baptist, “Clearly we have to do with a popular legend.” p. 74.

Of the virgin birth of Christ he affirms, “We are not in position to trace just how in certain circles of Hellenistic Judaism a belief in the Virgin Birth of the Messiah originated.” p.208.

Again he asks, “How early was Jesus called ‘the Lord’?” . . . and answers, “Luke puts the term in the mouth of Peter at his first sermon, but it is unlikely that it began that early.” p.209.

ABDEL R. WENTZ, *A New Strategy for Theological Education*.

According to Dr. Wentz, the New Testament writers ‘are the origin of what they wrote, not God; it is what the writers meant, not what God meant. They wrote to win men to their experience and way of life. The Bible, accordingly, is all a human affair. The work of translating and revision is never really finished. The New Testament is to reproduce the experience of the apostles.

“An Introduction to the RSV of the Old Testament”, article by Wentz.

“As, a matter of fact the work of translating and revising the New Testament is never really finished; it must go on as continuously as changing human life. . . And the work of the translator of the Word is never completed, as with tender sympathy and clear understanding he cleanses the temple and beautifies it and spiritualizes it.” p. 69.

WILLIAM F. ALBRIGHT, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*.

He believes that this earth evolved through long ages, that man evolved from lower forms, of animal life and that the Bible religion came not by revelation, but from myths and legends. Thus he wrote: “The important point for us to know is that the oldest stone artifacts¹² so far found in the Near East. . . cannot be less than 200,000 years old and may possibly be much older. . . .

“Toward the end of the Early Palaeolithic Age in the middle or late Acheulian (Tayacian), perhaps about 150,000 years ago, appear the first cave deposits of human origin in Palestine.” p. 90.

To assess the influence exerted by native Hebrew on Moses, among other factors Albright lists “the adoption of the stories of the Fathers as part of Israel’s inheritance. . . specific appellations of deity and perhaps the nucleus of the cosmogony of Genesis, though *the latter may again have been developed later from the native stock of myths and legends*” pp. 206, 207.

(Italics supplied.)

¹²Artifact— “A Product of human workshop.”—Webster’s Dictionary.

J. PHILIP HYATT, *The Prophetic Religion*.

“The careful student of the Old Testament can find in the writings even of the great prophets predictions which were not fulfilled and in the very nature of the case can never be fulfilled.” p. 93.

HARRY M. ORLINSKY.

He is a Jewish Rabbi and of course does not believe in the Deity of Christ. On page 30, of “An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament” he says that the early Christians substituted the word “virgin” in place of “young woman” in the Septuagint Manuscript.

Quotations from official members of the National Council of Churches are just as startling as the above quotations. They follow the same modern, liberal, higher-critical teachings. It is a serious question whether men such as these in the above list, are qualified to translate the Word of God. Through holy men

in ages past, God has preserved the Bible for us. Scholarship is not enough! Belief in the inspiration of the Bible is fundamental to allowing the Spirit of God to direct in such a work. Why should Bible-loving Christians be asked to accept a new Version put out by men who do not believe in the inspiration of the Bible, and who do believe such things as we have quoted above?

At a recent meeting in Denver, Dr. John MacKay said that the N.C.C. *does* believe in the Deity of Christ. This is an obvious attempt to answer the recent accusations that they do not. Their printed statements and also their changes in the new Version seem to betray otherwise.

EVANGELICAL FUNDAMENTALISTS ARE AROUSED

The Seventh-day Adventists should be told these facts. The Fundamentalist groups have unceasingly, warned their people of the dangers and pitfalls in this new Version. The Modernists do not have a monopoly on, scholarship. The Fundamentalists have brought forth many scholarly arguments against the new Version. Good articles have appeared in the "Sunday School Times", the "Eternity" magazine, "Christian Life", "Moody Monthly" and "Action". Also a number of pamphlets and booklets have been printed by various. Protestant organizations protesting this new Version. The following are a few excerpts to show the opinion and the studied findings of these groups.

Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., D.D., LL.D.; Ph.D., president of Shelton College, and professor of Philosophy and Theology, shows that many of the changes in the new Bible were deliberately made to accord with the revisers' opinions and that they did not honestly follow the manuscripts which they were using:

"Translation work is: expected to be objective. There are outstanding scholars in the New Testament field who would have been glad to spend much time in presenting evidence looking toward the elimination of such errors as I have indicated. The complete avoidance of Bible-believing scholars, complete failure to consider their criticisms, does not give evidence of pure objectivity."¹³

Dr. Oswald T. Ellis wrote an article in the "Eternity" Magazine and I quote editorial comment from the same magazine:

"Dr. Oswald T. Allis, in his critical review of the RSV Old Testament which appears elsewhere in this issue (p. 5), has made it abundantly clear that the highly touted 'Bible' has been prepared by men who do not believe in the Lord Jesus Christ as evangelicals believe in Him. They have: used their position to strike at Him as much as the Pharisees cried 'Crucify: Him'! This is not a matter of conjecture, nor a wild statement by irresponsible or unscholarly men; this is a sober statement made by men highly trained in the languages of the Bible and able to weigh evidence. . .

¹³ Oliver Buswell, Jr., D.D., LL.D., Ph.D., "The Sunday School Times", p. 5, (Nov. 16, 1952).

"It should be noted, in passing, that the publishers spent \$500,000 on the advance publicity and arranged for thousands of meetings to advertise the new 'Bible,' and that the meetings were held in advance of the sale date of the volume. In other words, the whole thing was rigged in order that there might be no sour note of criticism, such as this, to mar their serene plans. The ethics of the launching of the volume conforms with the ethics of the translators."

"In closing, we might remind you that neither the divine throne nor the Lord Jehovah Jesus are in danger. The condemnation of these men slumbereth not. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but God's Word will not pass away. (Matt. 24:35)"¹⁴

Notice a statement made by a scholar of the Bible Baptist Seminary in Ft. Worth, Texas, in a pamphlet entitled, "Why We Reject the 'National Council' Bible".

"The philosophy of modernism underlies the whole translation. According to modernistic theology, we are all sons of God. Jesus is not 'the Son' but 'a Son'. In *Hebrews 1:2* instead of the reading 'God. . . hath spoken unto us by His Son', they make it to read: 'But in these last days, he has spoken to us by a Son'.

"The modernistic picture of Christ is that Jesus went farther with God, yielded more completely to God, and was more fully surrendered to God than any other son of God in the history of the race. He was a

pioneer and trailblazer to show all of God's other sons (the whole human race) just how Godlike they might all be. In fact, in *Hebrews 12:2* instead of translating the Greek text correctly 'Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our faith' they make it read: 'Looking unto Jesus the pioneer and perfecter of our faith.'

¹⁴"Eternity", November, 1952, p. 8.

"One National Council leader, J. W. Nixon, said: 'We shall hardly bandy words about the finality of Christ. The field is open for any one at any time to mean more to men than Jesus has meant.'"¹⁵

There are a few Seventh-day Adventists who feel that since some non-Adventist Fundamentalists are against the New Version that we should go slow, because these Fundamentalists have, in the past, misunderstood and misinterpreted some of our beliefs. However, truth is truth, and should be supported always by truth lovers. Many Seventh-day Adventists feel that these Fundamentalists are right in opposing this new Version. We should not hesitate to endorse their warning of the insidious dangers in this modernistic Version.

WHAT WILL BE THE END RESULT OF THIS NEW VERSION?

First, it will destroy faith in the Bible. This will be accomplished by teaching different doctrines that are based on supposedly new manuscripts which give supposedly new light. Because of this false theory many will lose faith in the Bible altogether. According to Mrs. White this is Satan's present plan:

"Now that Satan can no longer keep the world under his control by withholding the Scriptures, he resorts to other means to accomplish the same object. To destroy faith in the Bible serves his purpose as well as to destroy' the Bible itself."¹⁶

¹⁵Dr. Luther C. Peak, "Why we Reject the National Council' Bible" pp. 16,77.

¹⁶Ellen G. White, *The great Controversy*, p. 586.

"Secondly, it will aid in uniting modernistic Protestant bodies in one super-organization. This new Version is a product of the National Council of Churches which embraces 30 Protestant bodies, who endorsed it. It is the aim of this organization to unite all churches' into one large Protestant group. They state that they are not a super-church, nor do they intend to become one. Yet at a recent meeting in Denver, this Council pointed out that there are more members in the United States in their organization of Protestant Churches than there are in the Roman Catholic Church. The members of this Council are also interested in a one-world ecumenical movement which will embrace the Catholics as well as Protestants, and thus form a one world church. By accepting the theology taught in this new "Bible" it is easy to see that the new Protestant super-church could go hand-in-hand with the Catholic Church. The Revised Standard Version teaches Purgatory and the Immortality of the Soul; it leads to evolution by demanding the long geologic ages in Creation; it removes the certainty of the seventh-day Sabbath and abolishes the doctrine of the Deity of Christ; it destroys the doctrine of the cleansing of the Sanctuary; it aids in establishing the Catholic view of the Atonement. All of this, of course, coincides with Catholic theology. The following quotations enlarge on this point:

"The National Council of Churches of Christ in America has issued a new version of the Bible. The way they went about preparing it, publishing it, monopolizing it, publicizing it, and promoting it is a first lesson in the way a Super-Church works . . .

Leaders in a Super-Church would have people believe that the Church and not the Bible is the supreme authority in matters pertaining to religion. The Roman Catholic Church has used this idea in a most effective manner to strengthen its power. Attempts at creating a Protestant Super-Church has been hampered by the commonly accepted belief that 'the Bible is the religion of Protestants'. If NCC Super-Church advocates could get the people to believe that the NCC produced the Bible, that the NCC owns the Bible, that the NCC has the right to change the text of the Bible, that the NCC can permit or deny its use, then the minds of the people would gradually be conditioned to believe that the NCC is more important than the Bible. From that point on it would only be a matter of time until the people would accept the NCC as a Protestant Super-Church and its authority as superior to the Bible."¹⁷

Dr. Carl McIntire, President of the International Council of Christian Churches, states:

“The leaders of the (RSV) committee are active in the ecumenical movement, the World Council of Churches, which desires to include the Roman Catholics and have a ‘one-world church’. All this fits into a pattern.”¹⁸

Dr. McIntire hits the nail on the head. This new Version creates a common ground of belief for the Protestants, Catholics, and even Spiritualists, so that they can quickly unite into a one-world church. Of course we Seventh-day Adventists have believed for many years this would come to pass. The Spirit of Prophecy has warned for years against this coming event:

“Through the two great errors, the immortality of the soul and Sunday sacredness, Satan will bring the people under his deceptions. While the former lays the foundation of Spiritualism, the latter creates a bond of sympathy with Rome. The Protestants of the United States will be foremost in stretching their hands across the gulf to grasp the hand of Spiritualism; they will reach over the abyss to clasp the hands of the Roman power; and under the influence of this threefold union, this country will follow in the steps of Rome in trampling on the rights of conscience.”¹⁹

The Lord has given us ample warning concerning this matter. Revelation, chapters 12-20, deals with the subject of the beast and his image. The Third Angel’s Message of Revelation 14:9, 10, deals exclusively with this prophecy. The Lord further illumines this topic through His servant.

¹⁷ James DeFrost Murch, “Action” magazine, Nov. 15, 1952, p. 8.

¹⁸ Carl McIntire, “The New Bible, Why Christians Should Not Accept It” 2nd Ed. p. 21

¹⁹ White, Great Controversy, p. 588.

“The wide diversity of belief in the Protestant churches is regarded by many as decisive proof that no effort to secure a forced uniformity can ever be made. But there has been for years, in churches of the Protestant faith, a strong and growing sentiment in favor of a union based upon common points of doctrine.”²⁰

Are we watching for the sign posts along the way pointing to that which will eventually bring about this union foretold by the Apostle John?

CONCLUSION: SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS SHOULD BE ALERT

The dangers and errors in this new Version need to be brought to the attention of our people. If this Version is used publicly as a commentary or help, the listener should be at the same time aware that it contains many corruptions. Some of our ministers and church papers are recommending this new Version. To say, “*Oh, this is only another version,*” fails to reveal the dangerous situation. Nothing like this ever happened before in the history of the world. Never before was a nation wide drive for the Bible undertaken “by Catholics and Protestants at the same time, as on the week of Sept. 28 to Oct. 5, 1952: the declared aim of Protestants was to sell a million copies of the RSV and to eliminate the King James Bible from English-speaking churches.”²¹ This means that the birth of this new Version is intended to bring about the doom of the King James Bible. This is declared conflict. Therefore the promoters of the RSV are instigators of controversy; the believers in the King James are defenders.

The RSV cannot be considered “just another version” for these additional reasons:

1. Never before was a Bible version published backed by a million dollars in advertising, and promoted by high-pressure Sales campaigns in thousand of public centers, so that it is known even to the man in the street.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 444

²¹ “Our Parish Confraternity”, August, 1952, Washington, D.C.

2. No other version has affected so many fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and uprooted the pillars of the Third Angel’s Message.

3. No previous version has so radically manhandled and changed the Holy Scriptures. We are told by a college Professor of Hebrew that, “by actual count, we have found in the footnotes of the O. T., 1292

references to the versions.” This means that in 1292 places in the RSV the original Hebrew has been displaced, and other versions used instead. He also says, “There are at least 344 conjectures in the O. T.”²²

“This is just another version” is a slogan of those who think it will disarm the fears which the RSV has aroused. Widespread opposition to this version’s anti-evangelical teachings has come from Evangelical and Fundamentalist bodies. Moreover: we have read that a Protestant translation will soon appear which will be more modern and contain the extra Catholic books of the Apocrypha. Will that also be “just another version”? This new RSV in the hands of modernists, coupled with their own modernistic interpretations and commentaries, will hasten a disbelief in all Bibles; then in Christ; then in salvation and in the hereafter. (Read Amos 8:11-13).

We do not feel that we should be slow or timid in exposing the unusual errors of this Version. On this principle we quote Mrs. White:

“Between truth and error there is an irrepressible conflict. To uphold and defend the one is to attack and overthrow the other.”²³

We are also told:

“Indifference and neutrality in a religious crisis is regarded of God as a grievous crime, and equal to the very worst type of hostility against God.”²⁴

As to the manuscripts: Mrs. White has pointed out unmistakably the true line of manuscripts.²⁵

²² C. L. Feinberg, “The RSV, What Kind of Translation?”, p. 3.

²³ E. G. White, Great Controversy, p. 126.

²⁴ E. G. White, Testomies, Vol. 3, p. 281.

²⁵ E. G. White, Great Controversy, p. 245.

With that line, genuine textual science agrees. It has been further shown that the revisers of this new Version have condemned this true line of manuscripts as erroneous.²⁶

We cannot use both versions together as authority; they will bring in confusion. We must either accept the King James Bible and its doctrines from which the Seventh-day Adventists and all other standard Protestant churches were born, and the assurances of our servant of the Lord that this is the true Message; or accept this new Standard Revised Version with its changed doctrines and modernistic statements tending toward atheism. There is only one Bible; namely, the one based on the original and inspired Hebrew for the Old Testament and on the original and inspired Greek for the New. The true representative of this in English is the King James Bible.

²⁶ Members of the Revision Committee, “Introduction to the RSV of the N.T.”, p. 15.

Reprinted 2007

Harvestime Books Resource Library
<http://www.remnant-prophecy.com>
<http://www.Harvestimebooks.com>
<http://www.bible-sabbath.com>