

A M B A S S A D O R B A P T I S T  
C H U R C H

*"be ye reconciled to God"*

## HOW DID WE GET OUR BIBLE?

PASTOR JOHNNY TAN



ORIGINAL SERIES TAUGHT BY PASTOR MARK TOSSELL, LIGHTHOUSE BAPTIST CHURCH, SYDNEY

EDITED BY PASTOR JOHNNY TAN

APPENDICES ADDED

# How Did We Get Our Bible?

## Introduction

The foundation of Christianity is the Bible. If the Bible is not the Word of God, then everything that we believe is a fairy tale. If we don't have the very words of God, then let's close the churches, call back the missionaries, and eat drink and be merry. Christianity is a lie and a fraud if the Bible is not the perfect Word of God.

The Bible claims many times that it is a Divine Book, inspired and transmitted by God to man. The phrase, "Thus saith the Lord" is found 415 times in the Bible. The sole authority of the Bible as the Christian's guide book for life is based upon the premise that the Bible is divinely inspired. As such, it must be perfect and infallible, for it comes from a perfect and infallible God, a God who does not make mistakes.

However, one of the main criticisms of the Bible is that it has been corrupted. The Mormons and Jehovah's Witnesses argue that our Bible is not the perfect Word of God. Liberal "theologians" and textual critics contend that the Bible has been changed over the years, and that it is filled with errors of copying and translation. Is that really true?

How do we know that the Bible we have today is the perfect, complete, inerrant & infallible Word of God? Has the Bible been changed & corrupted over the last 3,500 years? Can I be sure that there are no mistakes in my Bible? What about those intellectuals who say that we can only trust the original manuscripts, and not copies or translations? Are there any books missing from my Bible? Is the canon of Scripture closed? Has God finished with the work of special revelation?

To answer such important questions, we must go to the Bible, and find out what God's Word says about itself.

It is clear that the Word of God is eternal: it always was, and it always will be:

*"For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven."* Psalm 119:89

## Step 1 - Inspiration

Bible critics contend that "The Bible was written by men." The answer to that statement is obvious: The Bible was written by men. But, the Bible was inspired by God:

*“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:”*

2 Timothy 3:16

The Words of God do me no good if they stay in Heaven! I must have the Words of God if I am to be saved and live as I ought. So, how did the Bible get from Heaven to earth? By inspiration.

What is inspiration? What do I mean when I say that the Bible was written by man, but inspired by God? Well, the term “inspired” literally means “God-breathed.” Simply put, God spoke through His servants to the rest of mankind—the words of those servants were not their words, but the very words of God.

*“We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts: Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”*

2 Peter 1:19-21

Inspiration may be broken up into five basic steps: a) The Words of God have always been. b) Man must have those words. c) There needed to be some way for the Words of God to get from Heaven to man. d) God chose men and made them holy. e) God gave His Words to mankind through those chosen men.

For example, what did Samuel mean when he said, “The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word was in my tongue?” God did not give His thoughts to Samuel, and then trust Samuel to put those thoughts into words. God used Samuel as a vehicle, moved and directed by the Holy Ghost, to deliver the exact words of God to the people.

So, the first step in getting the Bible to Ambassador Baptist Church in 2011 was inspiration. This produced perfect original manuscripts in the languages of Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek, written between roughly 1,500 BC and 100 AD.

## **Step 2 - Duplication**

Sometimes a pseudo-intellectual will make a statement something like, “The King James Version says \_\_\_\_\_, but in the originals we see that it should read as \_\_\_\_\_.” They

love to sound scholarly by referring to the originals. And, they have the ears of many simple Christians who don't know any better.

Question: *Does anyone in the world have any original manuscripts in their possession?*

Answer: *No. They are all gone. All we have is copies of the originals.*

Diligent men over the last 3,500 years have carefully copied the writings of Scripture so that we could have the words of God today. For example, when the Hebrew scribes would copy the Old Testament Scriptures, they used a special system of cross-checking to make absolutely sure that no errors were made in copying the text. Every letter of the Hebrew alphabet has a numerical value assigned to it. When they finished copying a line of text, the scribes would count the numerical value of all the Hebrew letters used on that line, and add up those values. If the total value for a line of copied text was different to the original, there was obviously a mistake in copying, so they would throw the new manuscript away and start another copy from scratch.

The following is the process:

- They could only use clean animal skins, both to write on, and even to bind manuscripts.
- Each column of writing could have no less than forty-eight, and no more than sixty lines.
- The ink must be black, and of a special recipe.
- They must verbalize each word aloud while they were writing.
- They must wipe the pen and wash their entire bodies before writing the word "Jehovah," every time they wrote it.
- There must be a review within thirty days, and if as many as three pages required corrections, the entire manuscript had to be redone.
- The letters, words, and paragraphs had to be counted, and the document became invalid if two letters touched each other.
- The middle paragraph, word and letter must correspond to those of the original document.

- The documents could be stored only in sacred places (synagogues, etc).
- As no document containing God's Word could be destroyed, they were stored, or buried, in a genizah - a Hebrew term meaning "hiding place." These were usually kept in a synagogue or sometimes in a Jewish cemetery.

The final item is why we have no original manuscripts of the Old Testament today.

Over 5,100 Greek copies of the New Testament exist today, ranging in size from fragments containing two or three verses to nearly entire Bibles. Their ages vary from the second to the sixteenth century. These copies were written on two types of material: papyrus and parchment. Papyrus was a vegetable product fashioned from bark, and parchment came from the scraped skins of sheep, goats, and other such animals. Just as our Bibles wear out through frequent study and usage, any high-quality, accurate manuscript was soon thumbed to pieces. Because of this fact, only a fraction of the 5,000 surviving manuscripts are very old. These very old manuscripts owe their survival to a lack of acceptance and use by the Christians. This is easily proven by examining their obvious errors and disagreement with each other. For example, two of the oldest manuscripts in existence, the Chester Beatty and Bodmer papyri, have 73 disagreements with each other in just 70 verses! (emphasis added)

On the other hand, there exists a large degree of accuracy and conformity among the larger body of well-used later copies. Approximately 90% of all existing manuscripts agree with one another in such a way that they form their own unique text, the Received Text, thus called the Majority Text. It is this larger body of accurate and uniform manuscripts that form the Received Text (the Textus Receptus) from which the King James Version, or Authorised Version, was translated in 1611.

You might ask, "What about the Greek text from which the modern versions are translated?" This text is largely based upon two ancient manuscripts, Codex B and Codex Aleph (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus). What do we know about these two manuscripts?

*(See below for the two texts that have been used to come up with the Nestle's text, and Westcott and Hort text, and what is the background of Westcott and Hort)*

The 8,000 changes in B and the 9,000 changes in Aleph are not the same changes. Together they differ from the Received Text in about 13,000 places. Together they omit 4,000 words, add 2,000, and modify 2,000.

They disagree with each other a dozen times on every page. Colwell says they disagree 70% of the time and in almost every verse of the Gospels. It is easier to find two consecutive verses in which these manuscripts differ than two in which they agree.

We must realise that no one in the world has access to any original manuscripts of Scripture—all we can refer to are copies of the originals, created by the process of faithful duplication.

*Question: Are copies of original manuscripts considered Scripture? Can we look to these copies as the infallible words of God?*

*Answer: Yes.*

*David had only copies, and he regarded them as the Words of God.*

*Solomon had only copies, and he regarded them as the Words of God.*

*Jesus had only copies, and he regarded them as the Words of God.*

*Paul had only copies, and he regarded them as the Words of God.*

### **Step 3 - Canonization**

Out of all the religious writings used by Hebrews and Christians, how did we end up with 39 OT books and 27 NT books? Through the process of canonization. Canonization is the process whereby the Hebrews and the early churches sifted through all the many Gospels, epistles, prophetic writings, etc, and decided which were qualified to be included in the Bible—or, in what is called the canon of Scripture. It is the process whereby God guided His people to choose the sixty- six inspired books that we have in our Bible today.

The standard, or Masoretic, text of the Old Testament contains twenty-four books, beginning with Genesis and concluding with 2 Chronicles. The arrangement is such that there are only twenty-four books instead of thirty-nine as in the Protestant Old Testament, but the subject matter is exactly the same. In other words, the Old Testament canon of our Bible is identical with that of the ancient Jews; the only difference is in the order and division of the books.

Throughout the first four centuries after Christ, the books of our NT were chosen and approved by the apostles, church fathers, and NT early churches. What about additional books? What about the many other Gospels and epistles? What about the books of the Apocrypha, for example? What is the meaning of Canon? The word canon means a rule, a standard, which is a determined and defined limit. The canon were rules by which the dif-

ferent books were measured to determine its admission into the sacred collection. The name given to the collection of the 66 books as the inspired and authentic and genuine books forming the Holy Scriptures was called the sacred canon or the canon of Scripture.

Why do we need a canon?

- So that we can have complete revelation of God
- So that people may have the written word of GOD
- So that the inspired writings may be preserved from corruption and destruction
- So that the people may know the limits of the inspired writings given by GOD

### **HOW WERE THE BOOKS OF THE CANON CHOSEN?**

Some theories:

- I. The older the manuscripts, the better? Not true! There were older manuscripts than those in the canon but those were not included in the canon
- II. Those Hebrew literature which have survived after a long time must canonical. Answer: no, because Hebrew literature were still written as long as 485BC
- III. It was a collection of classics by the Jews. Ans: No, the books in the Canon were mainly for moral and spiritual purposes
- IV. Some believed that the Hebrew language determined the canonicity of the scriptures: No! There were other books written in Hebrew that were not included
- V. It must agree with the law. Ans: No. There were some books which agree with the law but were not included in the canon
- VI. It must have religious and moral elements. True to a certain extent because there were many books that have religious and moral elements but they are not included in the scriptures.

### **WHAT ARE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE BOOKS IN THE CANON?**

The book must be inspired. ALL THEORIES MISS OUT THIS IMPORTANT ATTRIBUTE. Inspiration determines canonicity. Therefore when the books were given by GOD, they were already canonized. GOD DETERMINES THE CANON: MAN DISCOVERS THE CANON.

Tests for the OT CANON:

- I. **Is it inspired?** i.e does it claim to be from GOD? They must have the following; ‘Thus saith the Lord’, the word of the Lord, or at least an allusion to the presence of GOD.
- II. **Is it prophetic?** i.e is it written by a servant of GOD. inspired books come only by prophets as they were moved by the Holy Ghost 1 Peter 1:21
- III. **Is it authentic?** Does it tell the truth about GOD. Does it contain any factual or doctrinal errors? Any book containing inaccurate facts or teachings contrary to the plain teaching was rejected.
- IV. **Is it dynamic?** Does it possess life changing power.
- V. **Is it received by the people of GOD?** Is there evidence of a universal acceptance of the books as inspired and therefore canonical

Tests for NT CANON:

- I. **Does it have apostolic authority and authorship?** Matt 28:18 – 20 / Ro 1:1, 1 Cor 1:1, Gal 1:1, etc)
- II. **Was it read to the churches** ( 1 Tim 4:11, Col 4:16)
- III. **Was it used and recognized by the church fathers?**
- IV. **Does the book agree with Oral tradition?** (the reverse is true today: does the oral tradition agree with the scripture)
- V. **Does it edify?**
- VI. **Does it have the witness of the Spirit?**

It must be clear that God guided these men to choose the books that He wanted in His Word. We do believe, after all, that God is in control of the process of assembling His Word. God used Bible-believing, soul-winning, Christ-honouring pastors and Christians to choose the sixty-six books that God had already chosen for inclusion in the Bible. This we accept by faith.

Secondly, those books that were rejected were done so because they were obviously not qualified to be a part of Scripture.



In a bid to oppose the rise of the Scripture in the reformation, the catholics initiated their counter reformation , in the 1546, the council of Trent included the Apocrypha in the Canon which obvious was wrong because of the reasons given below:

For example, consider the Apocrypha. The 14 Old Testament apocryphal books have an unquestioned historical and literary value but have been rejected as inspired for the following reasons: They abound in historical and geographical inaccuracies. They teach doctrines that are false and foster practices that contradict inspired Scripture...

They contain literary types, subject matter and styling out of keeping with inspired Scripture. They lack the distinctive elements that give genuine Scripture its divine character...

Question: *Is the canon of Scripture closed? Is my Bible complete?*

Answer: *Yes.*

The Bible that we have today is the complete and finished Word of God. It is all that we require to be saved, and to become the mature and profitable Christians that God intends for us to become. We do not need any further revelation from God, nor will we receive any. We have the perfect and complete Word of God today in the King James Bible.

*"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."*

2 Timothy 3:16, 17

*"But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away."*

1 Corinthians 13:10

## **Step 4 - Translation**

Due to the obvious fact that very few people today can read and write in the original languages of the Bible (Hebrew, Chaldee and Koine Greek), the Bible needed to be translated in order for it to be useful to the common man. So, Bibles today are translations of copies of inspired originals.

What steps led to the translation of the King James Version?

- Septuagint (Old Testament to Greek) 260 BC
- Corrupt Latin Vulgate (Catholic) 400 AD
- Wycliffe Bible 1380 AD Tyndale Bible 1525 AD
- Coverdale Bible 1535 AD
- Geneva Bible 1560 AD
- King James Version 1611 AD

Who gave us “the old black book?” Who translated the King James Version? 47 godly scholars were charged in 1607 with the responsibility of translating the Authorised Version. What were these men like? How do they compare to the scholars of today who have translated modern versions? Let us consider a few examples of these translators: John Bois: By the age of 6 he could read and write in Hebrew, and at age 15 he corresponded with his superiors in Greek while a student at Cambridge. He later became a professor of Greek at Cambridge, with students attending his voluntary lectures as early as 4:00 am. It was said of him that, “He was so familiar with the Greek New Testament that he could, at any time, turn to any word that it contained.”

Lancelot Andrews: This chairman of the New Testament Committee was conversant in 15 languages. Miles Smith: Known as a walking library. Andrew Downes: Described by Milton as the most learned man in England.

These men were not a bunch of dry and dusty theologians and scholars – they were accomplished preachers and balanced Christians. Consider Richard Brett. Although proficient in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, Arabic, and several Ethiopic tongues, it was said of him that “he was a most vigilant pastor, a diligent preacher of God’s Word, a liberal benefactor to the poor, a faithful friend, and a good neighbour.”

Now, modern teachers and preachers are in the bad habit of correcting the King James Version, saying that it was wrongly translated, and is full of errors. This is not a recent development, as you will see from the following illustration.

“An interesting story is found in Walton's biography of Bishop Sanderson illustrating the truth of the old proverb, “a little learning is a dangerous thing.” Dr. Kilbye, an excellent Hebrew scholar and Professor of this language in the university, also expert in Greek and

chosen as one of the translators (of the King James Version), went on a visit with Sanderson, and at church on Sunday they heard a young preacher waste a great amount of the time allotted for his sermon in criticizing several words in the then recent translation. He carefully showed how one particular word should have been translated in a different way. Later that evening the preacher and the learned strangers were invited together to a meal, and Dr. Kilbye took the opportunity to tell the preacher that he could have used his time more profitably. The Doctor then explained that the translators had very carefully considered the "three reasons" given by the preacher, but they had found another thirteen more weighty reasons for the rendering complained of by the young critic."

So, do we have the original Scriptures in our hands today? No. What do we have, then? We have a translation of copies of the originals.

Question: Can a translation of copies of the originals still be considered as infallible Scripture? Answer: Yes. Consider Luke 4:1-13:

"And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness, Being forty days tempted of the devil. And in those days he did eat nothing: and when they were ended, he afterward hungered. And the devil said unto him, If thou be the Son of God, command this stone that it be made bread. And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God. And the devil, taking him up into an high mountain, showed unto him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. And the devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it. If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. And he brought him to Jerusalem, and set him on a pinnacle of the temple, and said unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down from hence: For it is written, He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee: And in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone. And Jesus answering said unto him, It is said, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. And when the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a season."

Three times Jesus said, "It is written." Three times He quoted Scripture. When Jesus did so, He quoted a copy of the original Hebrew Scriptures. Jesus then translated that Hebrew Scripture into the language that He commonly spoke, most likely Aramaic. When Luke

wrote those Aramaic words in his Gospel, he translated them into Koine Greek. Are these Greek words considered infallible Scripture? Yes. So, a translation of copies of the originals can still be considered as infallible Scripture.

God not only promised to give His words to mankind, He also promised to preserve those words for every generation. If all we have today are a bunch of imperfect translations of copies that are filled with mistakes, then God has not kept His promise. My God is not a liar!

*"The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever."*

Isaiah 40:8

*"For his merciful kindness is great toward us: and the truth of the LORD endureth for ever. Praise ye the LORD."*

Psalm 117:2

*"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."*

Matthew 24:35

*"Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever."*

1 Peter 1:23

I believe that the King James Version I hold in my hands contains the very words of God, and is perfect and flawless. It is God's infallible Word for our day in the English language. Why?

Because God promised to preserve His Word to every generation:

*"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

The question is not one of "double inspiration" but of preservation to every generation according to the promise of God. Why is this so important? Because we must have a Bible today that contains every word of God, or else we cannot be what God wants us to be.

*“...that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the LORD doth man live.”*

Deuteronomy 8:3

*“But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.”*

Matthew 4:4

If the King James Version does not contain the very word of God, then I must find the Bible that does, because I cannot live without every word of God.

Our problem is that we have in our churches unwise pastors and teachers who correct the Bible with their mediocre knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, thus undermining their people's faith in the Word of God. These pseudo-scholars say, “Well, I believe that the Bible is inspired and perfect only in the originals.” How ridiculous. There are no originals! All we have is copies, and translations of those copies.

*Question: “What if there is no perfect translation today, and you can only get the true meaning of Scripture by studying the Hebrew and Greek?”*

*Answer: Well, if you have to be a Hebrew and Greek scholar to understand the Bible, then we become like the catholics who need the priest to explain it to them, or the Jehovah's Witnesses who cannot study the Bible without the help of the Watchtower, because we are not expert enough in Hebrew and Greek to understand it for ourselves. That would give a lot of power to a very select group of people, and it would take away our privilege to study and understand Scripture on our own.*

The truth is that you and I need only two things to understand the Bible:

- I. You need to study. “Study to show thyself approved unto God...rightly dividing the Word of truth.”
- II. You need the Spirit. “Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth...”

## Step 5 - Propagation

Let us review what we have learned so far. How did the Bible get from Heaven to you and me in 2011?

- Inspiration
- Duplication
- Canonisation
- Preservation

So, we have concluded that there is a perfect Bible in the world today—the preserved King James Version. However, it is no good having a perfect Bible if it stays in the warehouse of the publishers! Inspiration and preservation are no good without propagation. The Bible would have helped no one if there were not faithful Christians over the centuries who propagated and spread the Words of the living God. How has the Bible been spread across the world?

- Handwritten copies
- Printing
- Evangelism
- Church planting
- Foreign missions
- Tract distribution, etc.

As a powerful illustration of the great sacrifice that had gone into propagating the Scriptures, let us briefly consider John Wycliffe. Wycliffe was a powerful preacher and author who gave much of his life to translating the Bible into the English language during the late 1300's. Notice his dedication to the Word of God.

*“If God’s Word is the life of the world, and every word of God is the life of the human soul, how may any Antichrist, for dread of God, take it away from us that be Christian men, and thus to suffer the people to die for hunger in heresy and blasphemy of men’s laws, that corrupteth and slayeth the soul.”*

Because printing had yet to be discovered, the manuscript had to be copied by hand necessitating an exorbitant price tag. It required about 10 months of steady work by an experienced copyist. The rental fee for only an hour with so costly a treasure was “an entire load of hay,” while McClure tells us that a purchase price neared “four marks and forty pence,” the equivalent of a clergyman's entire year's salary!

Wycliffe and his godly followers, the Lollards (ancestors of modern Baptists) were fiercely persecuted for their faith, their resistance to the Church of Rome, and for their love of studying and spreading the Bible. The Lollard Christians were indeed dedicated to the Bible, far more dedicated than the lukewarm, carnal Christians of the 21st century:

*“So scanty was the supply of Bibles at this time, that but few of those who craved its teaching could hope to possess the sacred volume. But this lack was partly made up by the earnestness of those whose interest was awakened in the Bible. If only a single copy was owned in a neighborhood, these hard-working laborers and artisans would be found together, after a weary day of toil, reading in turn, and listening to the words of life; and so sweet was the refreshment to their spirits, that sometimes the morning light surprised them with its call to a new day of labor, before they thought of sleep.”*

Notice the wrath of the government toward this group of fervent Christians:

*“Our sovereign lord the King, . . . by the assent of the estates and other discreet men . . . assembled in Parliament, has granted, established and ordained that no one within the ... realm or any other dominions subject to his royal Majesty presume to preach openly or secretly without first seeking and obtaining the license of the local diocesan...and that henceforth no one either openly or secretly shall preach, hold, teach or instruct, or produce or write any book, contrary to the Catholic faith or the determination of holy Church, nor shall any of the [Lollard] sect hold conventicles (unorganized gatherings for worship) anywhere or in any way keep or maintain schools for its wicked doctrines and opinions; and also that henceforth no one shall in any way favor anybody who thus preaches, conducts such or conventicles, keeps or maintains such schools, produces or writes such books, or in any such manner teaches, informs or excites the people ...And if any person within the said kingdom and dominions is convicted by sentence before the local diocesan or his commissioners of the said wicked preachings, doctrines, opinions, schools and heretical and erroneous instruction . . . then the sheriff of the county...shall, after such sentences are proclaimed, receive those persons ... and shall cause them to be burned before the people in a prominent place, in order that such punishment may strike fear into the minds of others, to the end that no wicked doctrines and heretical*

*and erroneous opinions (against the Catholic faith, the Christian law, and the determination of holy Church), nor their authors and favorers, be sustained ... or in any way tolerated."*

Foxe adds thus:

*"The Lollards were tracked to the lonely, unfrequented places where they met, often under shadow of night, to worship God. Neighbor was made to spy upon neighbor; husbands and wives, parents and children, brothers and sisters, were beguiled or forced to bear witness against each other. The Lollards' prison again echoed with the clanking of chains; the rack and the stake once more claimed their victims."*

Convicting enough for today's lukewarm Christians, one of the common charges brought against these godly believers was not only their possession of a Wycliffe Bible but their ability to repeat from it by heart.

Among the many burning victims were:

- John Badby, a tailor, 1410.
- Two London merchants, Richard Turming and John Claydon at Smithfield, 1415.
- William Taylor in 1423.
- William White, 1428.
- Richard Hoveden, 1430.
- Thomas Bagley, 1431.
- Richard Wyche in 1440.
- Joan Broughton became the first woman to burn at the stake in England, perishing at Smithfield with her daughter, Lady Young, beside her.

The history of the real English Bible is a history unlike that of the NIV and other generic counterfeits; it is a history that is bathed in blood. Foxe continues:

*"One Christopher Shoemaker, who was burned alive at Newbury, was accused of having gone to the house of John Say, and "read to him, out of a book, the words which Christ spake to his disciples . . . " In 1519 seven martyrs were burned in one fire at Coventry, "for having taught their children and servants the Lord's prayer and the ten commandments in English . . . " Jenkin Butler accused his own brother of reading to him a certain book of Scripture, and persuading him to hearken unto the*



same. John Barret, goldsmith, of London, was arrested for having recited to his wife and maid-servant “the Epistle of St. James, without a book ... Thomas Phillip and Lawrence Taylor were arrested for “reading the Epistle to the Romans and the first chapter of St. Luke in English.”

Thank God for those faithful Christians who laboured, sacrificed, suffered, and even died so that we could have a Bible. Thank God for those brave souls who were willing to shed their blood so that we might have a copy of the Holy Scriptures in our own language.

## **Conclusion**

How did we get our Bible?

- I. Inspiration.
- II. Duplication.
- III. Canonisation.
- IV. Translation.
- V. Propagation.

Thank God for an inspired & preserved Bible! However, what good does it do us to have a perfect Bible if we don't read and study it, and what good will it do others if we don't spread it?

- Will you make time every day to read, study, meditate upon, and memorise the precious words of God?
- Will you be faithful to a church that preaches the words of God?
- Will you continue the great work of propagating the Word of God?
- Will be faithful to soul winning, discipleship, church building, and foreign missions?
- God has given you a copy of His very words, preserved for over 3,000 years in spite of Satan's attempts to destroy them. The question is, what will you do with it?

## **Bibliography:**

- A) "The Holy Bible" (King James Version)
- B) "The Final Authority." Dr. W. P. Grady.
- C) "The Need for an Every Word Bible." Dr. Jack Hyles.
- D) "The Answer Book." Dr. Samuel C. Gipp.
- E) "Serious Omissions from the NIV Bible." Pastor Keith Piper.
- F) "Answers" Pastor Keith Piper.
- G) "New Unger's Bible Dictionary" Merrill F. Unger.
- H) "Barnes Notes on the New Testament" Albert Barnes.
- I) "International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia" James Orr
- J) "Strong's Exhaustive Concordance" James H. Strong.

## APPENDICES

### Codex Vaticanus

(also known as Codex B) Codex Vaticanus is considered to be the most authoritative of the Minority Texts, although it is responsible for over 36,000 changes that appear today in the new versions.

This manuscript was "found" in 1481 in the Vatican library in Rome, where it is currently held, and from whence it received its name. It is written on expensive vellum, a fine parchment originally from the skin of calf or antelope. Some authorities claim that it was one of a batch of 50 Bibles ordered from Egypt by the Roman Emperor Constantine; hence its beautiful appearance and the expensive skins which were used for its pages. But alas! this manuscript, like its corrupt Egyptian partner Codex Sinaiticus (Aleph) is also riddled with omissions, insertions and amendments.

The corrupt and unreliable nature of Codex B is best summed up by one who has thoroughly examined them, John W Burgon: "The impurity of the text exhibited by these codices is not a question of opinion but fact...In the Gospels alone, Codex B(Vatican) leaves out words or whole clauses no less than 1,491 times. It bears traces of careless transcriptions on every page..." According to The Westminster Dictionary of the Bible, "It should be noted . . . that there is no prominent Biblical (manuscripts) in which there occur such gross cases of misspelling, faulty grammar, and omission, as in (Codex) B."

Consider these facts and oddities relating to the Codex Vaticanus: - It was corrected by revisers in the 8th, 10th, and 15th centuries (W. Eugene Scott, Codex Vaticanus, 1996).

- The entire manuscript has been mutilated...every letter has been run over with a pen, making exact identification of many of the characters impossible. Dr. David Brown observes: "I question the 'great witness' value of any manuscript that has been overwritten, doctored, changed and added to for more than 10 centuries." (The Great Unicals).
- In the Gospels it leaves out 749 entire sentences and 452 clauses, plus 237 other words, all of which are found in hundreds of other Greek manuscripts. The total

number of words omitted in Codex B in the Gospels alone is 2,877 as compared with the majority of manuscripts (Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, p. 75).

- Vaticanus omits Mark 16:9-20, but a blank space is left for that section of Scripture. The following testimony is by John Burgon, who examined Vaticanus personally: *“To say that in the Vatican Codex (B), which is unquestionably the oldest we possess, St. Mark’s Gospel ends abruptly at the eighth verse of the sixteenth chapter, and that the customary subscription (Kata Mapkon) follows, is true; but it is far from being the whole truth. It requires to be stated in addition that the scribe, whose plan is found to have been to begin a very fresh book of the Bible at the top of the next ensuing column to that which contained the concluding words of the preceding book, has at the close of St. Mark’s Gospel deviated from his else invariable practice. HE HAS LEFT IN THIS PLACE ONE COLUMN ENTIRELY VACANT. IT IS THE ONLY VACANT COLUMN IN THE WHOLE MANUSCRIPT -- A BLANK SPACE ABUNDANTLY SUFFICIENT TO CONTAIN THE TWELVE VERSES WHICH HE NEVERTHELESS WITHHELD. WHY DID HE LEAVE THAT COLUMN VACANT? What can have induced the scribe on this solitary occasion to depart from his established rule? The phenomenon (I believe I was the first to call distinct attention to it) is in the highest degree significant, and admits only one interpretation. The older manuscript from which Codex B was copied must have infallibly contained the twelve verses in dispute. The copyist was instructed to leave them out -- and he obeyed; but he prudently left a blank space in memoriam rei. Never was a blank more intelligible! Never was silence more eloquent! By this simple expedient, strange to relate, the Vatican Codex is made to refute itself even while it seems to be bearing testimony against the concluding verses of St. Mark’s Gospel, by withholding them; for it forbids the inference which, under ordinary circumstances, must have been drawn from that omission. It does more. By leaving room for the verses it omits, it brings into prominent notice at the end of fifteen centuries and a half, a more ancient witness than itself.”* (Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel of St. Mark Vindicated*, 1871, pp. 86-87)
- Similar to Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus identifies itself as a product of gnostic corruption in John 1:18, where “the only begotten Son” is changed to “the only begotten God,” thus perpetuating the ancient Arian heresy that disassociates the Son of God Jesus Christ from God Himself by claiming that the Word was not the same as the Son. John’s Gospel identifies the Son directly with the Word (John 1:1, 18), but by changing "Son" to "God" in verse 18, this direct association is broken.

- Linguistic scholars have observed that Codex Vaticanus is reminiscent of classical and Platonic Greek, not Koine Greek of the New Testament (see Adolf Deissman's *Light of the Ancient East*). Nestle admitted that he had to change his Greek text (when using Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) to make it "appear" like Koine Greek.
- Codex Vaticanus contains the false Roman Catholic apocryphal books such as Judith, Tobias, and Baruch, while it omits the pastoral epistles (I Timothy through Titus), the Book of Revelation, and it cuts off the Book of Hebrews at Hebrews 9:14 (a very convenient stopping point for the Catholic Church, since God forbids their priesthood in Hebrews 10 and exposes the mass as totally useless as well!).

## **Codex Sinaiticus: Found In a Waste Basket**

Did you know that the new translations come from two main sources? One is called Vaticanus and the other is Sinaiticus. Vaticanus is housed in the Vatican, hence it's name. Sinaiticus was found in the trash can of a Catholic monastery in the area believed to be near Mt. Sinai, hence it's name. As though this fact alone shouldn't be enough to cause any Bible Believer to reject any new translation coming from these sources, Alexandrian text defenders not only find the Pope's Bible completely acceptable but they also LIE about the circumstances at the time that Sinaiticus was found.

### **Count Tischendorf's Damning Testimony**

The Sinaiticus manuscript was discovered by a German textual critic and collector named Count Lobegott Friedrich Constantin Von Tischendorf. We will call him Count Tischendorf.

Count Tischendorf says he found what came to be called Codex Sinaiticus in a "basket" filled with old parchment being used to start fires to keep monks warm. Here is his account:

*"I perceived in the middle of the great hall a large and wide basket full of old parchments; and the librarian, who was a man of information, told me that two heaps of papers like these mouldered by time, had been already committed to the flames. What was my surprise to find amid this heap of papers a considerable number of sheets of a*

*copy of the Old Testament in Greek, which seemed to me to be one of the most ancient that I had ever seen.”<sup>1</sup>*

Shoot the Messenger!

So how do Alexandrian apologists defend their trash can bible? Bentley's blind rejection of Tischendorf's account is as follows:

*“It seems to me hardly likely to be true. Quite apart from the fact that the forty-three parchments he supposedly rescued from a basket of rubbish are in remarkably good condition, the highly suspicious circumstances under which Tischendorf took the Codex Sinaiticus from the monks in 1859 made him (as we shall see) desperate to prove that the original owners of the manuscript were unfitted to keep it.”<sup>2</sup>*

So, the man who discovered Sinaiticus is demonized in order to protect the reputation of the rejected manuscript. And Bentley's reasoning is ridiculous.

First, the parchments were missing huge numbers of portions. Obviously, these were BURNED. And the fact that the surviving manuscripts were in good condition is not surprising. Go throw a stack of papers in a basket in a dry room and let them lay there for as long as you want and when you go back, they will be in the same condition.

Secondly, it is obvious that the St. Catherine monks didn't know that what they had in their possession was worth something because it was only AFTER Tischendorf's visits that they began capitalizing on their worth. Before Tischendorf, they were clueless.....

## WHO WAS WESTCOTT AND HORT?

### THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF B. F. WESTCOTT & F. J. A. HORT

One of the early pioneers of modern Spiritualist inquiry was the Ghost Society at the University of Cambridge, England. Alan Gauld has recorded in *The Founders of Psychical Research* the founding and objective of the Ghost Society: "In 1851 was

---

<sup>1</sup> Tischendorf quoted by James Bentley in, "Secrets of Mount Sinai: The Story of Finding the World's Oldest Bible--Codex Sinaiticus," page 86. © 1985, James Bentley and Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1986.

<sup>2</sup> Bentley, James. "Secrets of Mount Sinai: The Story of Finding the World's Oldest Bible--Codex Sinaiticus," page 86. © 1985, James Bentley and Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1986.

founded at Cambridge a Society to 'conduct a serious and earnest inquiry into the nature of the phenomena vaguely called supernatural,' and a number of distinguished persons became members." 70.

The Society For Psychical Research directly succeeded the Cambridge Ghost Society. The Society for Psychical Research: An Outline of its History, written in 1948 by the president, W. H. Salter, provides the following record: "Among the numerous persons and groups who in the middle of the nineteenth century were making enquiries into psychical occurrences may be mentioned a society from which our own can claim direct descent. In the Life of Edward White Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury, by his son, A. C. Benson, will be found, under the year 1851-2, the following paragraph:

*"'Among my father's diversions at Cambridge was the foundation of a 'Ghost Society,' the forerunner of the Psychical Society [meaning the S.P.R.] for the investigation of the supernatural. Lightfoot, Westcott and Hort were among the members. He was then, as always, more interested in psychical phenomena than he cared to admit.' "Lightfoot and Westcott both became bishops, and Hort Professor of Divinity. The S.P.R. has hardly lived up to the standard of ecclesiastical eminence set by the parent society."* [parenthesis in original]

The following are excerpts from The Life And Letters Of Fenton John Anthony Hort, published by his son Arthur Hort. These statements are representative of his theological beliefs, personal attitudes, and occult affiliations during his commission with B.F. Westcott to edit the New Greek Text. Many of the letters were written to B.F. Westcott, whose affinity for Roman Catholicism can be seen in the excerpts from his biography, The Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, written by his son, Arthur Westcott. The information revealed in these volumes renders both Hort and Westcott suspect as a qualified Bible translators.

## **THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF FENTON JOHN ANTHONY HORT**

(All emphases added)

1851 -- Cambridge: Graduate Life "In June (F.J.A. Hort) joined the mysterious Company of the Apostles . . . He was mainly responsible for the wording of an oath which binds members to a conspiracy of silence . . . Two other societies. . . were started . . . in both of which Hort seems to have been the moving spirit . . . the other

called by its members 'The Ghostly Guild.' The object was to collect and classify authenticated instances of what are now called 'psychical phenomena' . . . the 'Bogie Club' as scoffers called it, aroused a certain amount of derision, and even some alarm; it was apparently born too soon."

July 6, 1848 -- to Mr. John Ellerton -- On Roman Catholicism

*" . . . almost all Anglican statements are a mixture in various proportions of **the true and the Romish view . . . the pure Romish view seems to me nearer, and more likely to lead to, the truth than the Evangelical.**"*

November 16, 1849 -- to the Rev. F. D. Maurice -- On Substitutionary Atonement

*"Thus there is the question of Substituted Punishment, which, as it seems to me, is quite distinct from the Atonement and reconciliation of the person of sinning man and God. I can at most times thankfully contemplate the fact of God's forgiveness (in the strict sense of the word; that is, removal of estrangement from the offender, irrespective of the non-enforcement of penalties) and His delight in humanity as restored through its Head; but surely this has little to do with the principle that every offence must receive its just recompense. The Father may forgive the child, and yet cannot justly exempt him from the punishment of disobedience; "*

*'Amen!' says the evangelical, 'the penalty must be paid somehow by somebody. The penalty is tortures to all eternity for each man. Christ, in virtue of the infinity which He derived from His Godhead, was able on earth to suffer tortures to be suffered by all mankind; God must have the tortures to satisfy His justice, but was not particular as to who was to suffer them, -- was quite unwilling to accept Christ's sufferings in lieu of mankind's suffering.'*"

*"O that Coleridge, while showing how the notion of a **fictitious substituted righteousness**, of a transferable stock of good actions, obscured the truth of man's restoration in the Man who perfectly acted out the idea of man, had expounded the truth (for such, I am sure, there must be) that underlies the corresponding heresy (as it appears to me) of a **fictitious substituted penalty!**...Nor, as far as I can recollect, have you anywhere written explicitly upon this point; even on the corresponding subject of vicarious righteousness, I know only of two pages...and they have not been able to make me feel assured that the language of imputation is strictly true, however sanctioned by St. Paul's example. The fact is, I do not see*



*how God's justice can be satisfied without every man's suffering in his own person the full penalty for his sins."*

October 15, 1850 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On Evolution

*" . . . I do not see why the inconceivableness of a beginning is any argument against any theory of development. The contrary theory is simply a harsh and contradictory attempt to conceive a beginning. That **we are in doubt about the early history of organic life** arises not from an impotence of conception, but from the mere fact that we were not there to see what, if it were taking place now, we certainly could see. The beginning of an individual is precisely as inconceivable as the beginning of a species...It certainly startles me to find you saying that you have seen no facts which support such a view as **Darwin's**...But it **seems to me the most probable manner of development**, and the reflexions suggested by his book drove me to the conclusion that some kind of development must be supposed."*

April 19, 1853 -- to Rev. John Ellerton -- On Bible Revision

*"One result of our talk I may as well tell you. He (Westcott) and I are going to edit a Greek text of the New Testament some two or three years hence, if possible. Lachmann and Tischendorf will supply rich materials, but not nearly enough; and we hope to do a good deal with Oriental versions. **Our object is to supply clergymen generally, schools, etc., with a portable Greek text which shall not be disfigured with Byzantine corruptions.**"*

October 21, 1858 -- to Rev. Dr. Rowland Williams -- On the Authority of Scripture

*"Further I agree with them [authors of Essays and Reviews] in condemning many leading specific doctrines of the popular theology. . . **The positive doctrines even of the Evangelicals seem to me perverted rather than untrue. There are, I fear still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority and especially the authority of the Bible . . .** If this primary objection were removed, and I could feel our differences to be only of degree, I should still hesitate to take part in the proposed scheme. It is surely likely to bring on a crisis; and that I cannot think desirable on any account. The errors and prejudices, which we agree in wishing to remove, can surely be more wholesomely and also more effectually reached by individual efforts of an indirect kind than by combined open assault. **At present very many orthodox but rational men are being unawares acted upon by influences which will assuredly bear good fruit in due time if it is allowed to go on***

*quietly; but I fear that a premature crisis would frighten back many into the merest traditionalism."*

April 3, 1860 -- to Rev. John Ellerton -- On Evolution

*"But the book which has most engaged me is Darwin. Whatever may be thought of it, it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with. I must work out and examine the argument more in detail, but at present my feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable. If so, it opens up a new period in -- I know not what not."*

May 2, 1860 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On the Inerrancy of Scripture

*"But I am not able to go as far as you in asserting the infallibility of a canonical writing. I may see a certain fitness and probability in such a view, but I cannot set up an a priori assumption against the (supposed) results of criticism."*

August 14, 1860 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On the Divinity of Man

*"It is of course true that we can only know God through human forms, but then I think the whole Bible echoes the language of Genesis 1:27 and so assures us that **human forms are divine forms.**"*

August 16, 1860 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On Substitutionary Atonement

*"Perhaps we may be too hasty in assuming an absolute necessity of absolutely proportional suffering. I confess I have no repugnance to the primitive doctrine of a ransom paid to Satan though neither am I prepared to give full assent to it. But I can see no other possible form in which the doctrine of a ransom is at all tenable; **anything is better than the notion of a ransom paid to the Father.**"*

October 15, 1860 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On Substitutionary Atonement

*"I entirely agree--correcting one word--with what you there say on the Atonement, having for many years believed that 'the absolute union of the Christian (or rather, of man) with Christ Himself' is the spiritual truth of which the popular doctrine of substitution is an immoral and material counterfeit. But I doubt whether that answers the question as to the nature of the satisfaction. **Certainly nothing can be more unscriptural than the modern limiting of Christ's bearing our sins and sufferings to His death; but indeed that is only one aspect of an almost universal heresy.**"*

April 12, 1861 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On Heresy

*"Also -- but this may be cowardice -- I have sort of a craving our text should be cast upon the world before we deal with matters likely to brand us with suspicion. **I mean a text issued by men already known for what will undoubtedly be treated as dangerous heresy, will have great difficulties in finding its way to regions which it might otherwise reach, and whence it would not be easily banished by subsequent alarms.**"*

December 4, 1861-- to B.F. Westcott -- On Greek Philosophy

*"My chief impression is a strong feeling of incapacity to criticize, partly from want of knowledge, and still more from not having fully thought out cardinal questions, such as the relation of 'philosophy' and 'faith'; e.g., you seem to me to make (Greek) philosophy worthless for those who have received the Christian revelation. **To me, though in a hazy way, it seems full of precious truth of which I find nothing, and should be very much astonished and perplexed to find anything, in revelation...**Without condemning anything you have said on the Stoics, I yet feel you have not done them justice. The spiritual need which supported, if it did not originate, their doctrine is, I think, profoundly interesting, above all in the present day."*

September 23, 1864 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On Protestantism

*"... and I remember shocking you and Lightfoot not so very long ago by expressing a belief that **Protestantism is only parenthetical and temporary.** In short, the Irvingite [Catholic Apostolic] creed (minus the belief in the superior claims of the Irvingite communion) seems to me unassailable in things ecclesiastical."*

NOTE: Edward Irving, who started the Irvingite movement in the 1800s, which was a precursor of Pentecostalism in the 1800s, appointed twelve apostles. Today the Latter Rain Movement claims to have 35 Apostles. B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort belonged to the mysterious "Company of Apostles" which was concerned with establishing "an equitable and frictionless society." In her New Age book, *When Humanity Comes of Age*, Vera Alder predicted that a Council of Twelve which would reign with the false Christ in the New World Order: "[T]he World Government and its Spiritual Cabinet of 12, headed by 'the Christ' will study all archaeological archives... From it, the Research Panel would develop the 'New' Bible of a World Religion which would be the basis of future education."

April 28, 1865 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On Democracy

*"I dare not prophesy about America, but cannot see that I see much as yet to soften my **deep hatred of democracy in all its forms.**"*

October 11 and 12, 1865 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On The Cross

*"I am very far from pretending to understand completely the ever renewed vitality of Mari-olotry. But is not much accounted for, on the evil side, by the natural reverence of the religious instinct to idolatry and creature worship and aversion to the Most High; and on the good side, by **a right reaction from the inhuman and semi-diabolical character with which God in invested in all modern orthodoxies -- Zeus and Prometheus over again? In Protestant countries the fearful notion 'Christ the believer's God' is the result.**"*

October 17, 1865 -- to B.F. Westcott -- On Roman Catholicism

*"I have been persuaded for many years that Mary-worship and 'Jesus'-worship have very much in common in their causes and results...we condemn all secondary human mediators as injurious to the One, and shut our eyes to the indestructible fact of existing human mediation which is to be found everywhere. But this last error can hardly be expelled **till Protestants unlearn the crazy horror of the idea of priesthood.**"*

May 14, 1870 -- to Rev. J.Ll. Davies -- On The Trinity

*"No rational being doubts the need of a revised Bible; and the popular practical objections are worthless. Yet I have an increasing feeling in favor of delay. Of course, no revision can be final, and it would be absurd to wait for perfection. But the criticism of both Testaments in text and interpretation alike, appears to me to be just now in that chaotic state (in Germany hardly if at all less than in England), that the results of immediate revision would be peculiarly unsatisfactory... **I John 5:7 might be got rid of in a month; and if that were done, I should prefer to wait a few years.**"*

July 7, 1870 -- to a Friend -- On Bible Revision

*"It is quite impossible to judge the value of what appear to be trifling alterations merely by reading them one after another. Taken together, they have often important bearings which few would think of at first . . . The difference between a picture say of Raffaele and a feeble copy of it is made up of a number of trivial differences . . . **We have***

*successfully resisted being warned off dangerous ground, where the needs of revision required that it should not be shirked . . . It is, one can hardly doubt, the beginning of a new period in Church history. So far the angry objectors have reason for their astonishment."*

November 12, 1871 -- to the Bishop of Ely -- On Substitutionary Atonement

*"But it does not seem to me any disparagement to the sufferings and death of the Cross to believe that they were the acting out and the manifestation of an eternal sacrifice, even as we believe that the sonship proceeding from the miraculous birth of the Virgin Mary was the acting out and manifestation of the eternal sonship. -- So also the uniqueness of the great Sacrifice seems to me not to consist in its being a substitute which makes all other sacrifices useless and unmeaning, but in its giving them the power and meaning which of themselves they could not have... He (Mr. Maurice) may have dwelt too exclusively on that idea of sacrifice which is suggested by Hebrews x. 5 - 10, and he may have failed to make clear that Sacrifice is not the only way of conceiving Atonement..."*

#### THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT

January, 1852 -- On Spiritualism

*"His devotion with ardour is indicated in a 'Ghostly Circular' authorized by him. 'The interest and importance of a serious and earnest inquiry into the nature of the phenomena which are vaguely called 'supernatural' will scarcely be questioned.' . . . My father ceased to interest himself in these matters not altogether, I believe, from want of faith in what, for lack of a better name one must call Spiritualism, but because he was seriously convinced that such investigations led to no good. But there are many others who believe it possible that the beings of the unseen world may manifest themselves to us in extraordinary ways, and also are unable otherwise to explain in many facts the evidence for which cannot be impeached."*

Second Sunday after Epiphany, 1847 -- To His Fiancée -- On Mariology

*"After leaving the monastery, we shaped our course to a little oratory which we discovered on the summit of a neighboring hill...Fortunately we found the door open. It is very small, with one kneeling place; and behind a screen was a 'Pieta' the size of life \*i.e., a Virgin and dead Christ+...**Had I been alone I could have knelt there for hours.**" See: Mystery Babylon the Great: The Medici November 17, 1865*

To Rev. Benson -- On the Black Virgin

"B.F. Westcott promoted visions of 'the Virgin' in LaSalette, France... 'As far as I could judge, the idea of LaSalette was that of **God revealing himself now, and not in one form but in many.**'" See: The Merovingian Dynasty: Cult of the Black Virgin

May 5, 1860 -- To F.J.A. Hort -- On Infallibility of Scripture

*"For I too 'must disclaim settling for infallibility.' In the front of my convictions all I hold is the more I learn, the more I am convinced that fresh doubts come from my own ignorance, and that at present I find the presumption in favor of the absolute truth -- **I reject the word infallibility** -- of Holy Scripture overwhelming."*

June 14, 1886 -- To the Archbishop of Canterbury -- On Heaven

*"No doubt the language of the rubric is unguarded, but it saves us from the error of connecting the presence of Christ's glorified humanity with place: **heaven is a state and not a place.**"*

March 4, 1890 -- To the Archbishop of Canterbury -- On Creation

*"No one now, I suppose holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history -- **I could never understand how any one reading them with open eyes could think they did** -- yet they disclose to us a gospel."*

November, 1895 -- Address at Manchester to the Christian Social Union -- On Socialism

*"The Christian Law, then is **the embodiment of the truth** for action, in forms answering to the conditions of society from age to age. **The embodiment takes place slowly and can never be complete.** It is impossible for us to rest indolently in conclusions of the past. In each generation the obligation is laid on Christians to bring new problems of conduct into the divine light and to find their solution under the teaching of the Spirit."*