

**Ellen White Estate General Summary:** Against Wilkinsons Book: The Authorized Version Vindicated, 1930.

**It was to this false charge against his scholarly work that he wrote: OBJECTIONS TO THE AUTHORIZED VERSION VINDICATED.**

**Below is the chapter from the book posted on the Ellen White Estate... A book written by: Warren Eugene Howell [A Review of "Our Authorized Bible Vindicated,"](https://m.egwwritings.org/en/book/944.640#640) Click here to see the full book online in the Ellen White Estate Library.**  
**<https://m.egwwritings.org/en/book/944.640#640>**

"A general summary of findings in the review of this book may be given in brief as follows: Purpose of the book.—As indicated by the title, the purport of the book is to vindicate the Authorized Version of the Bible. Its real purpose is to discredit the Revised Versions of the Bible. Plan of the book.—Its plan is to trace side by side the historical, religious, and personal influences that on one hand, brought us a so-called "pure Greek text" and a "perfect" translation in the King James Version of the Bible; and on the other hand, a manipulated, mutilated Greek text and a theologically biased, unreliable translation in the English and American Revised Versions of the Bible. As the final, determining proof of his contention, the author produces some 65 parallel Scripture passages, usually from the Authorized and American or English Revised Versions, with running comment on each. Method of the book.—In handling his material, the author classifies it well, cites his authorities with much precision, and draws his conclusions with clearness sufficient to leave no one in doubt where he stands. Nevertheless, he employs unfair and illogical methods of weighing evidence such as these:

1. He pre-judges his case before he tries it.
2. He draws material from a number of authorities without any standing in textual or historical criticism.
3. From authorities in good standing he selects only such matter as will bend to his pre-judgment of the case, often splitting paragraphs and even sentences so as to omit what would nullify his purpose in quoting if left in.
4. He draws much from the writings of men who participated in heated and bitter controversy over Versions at the time of their issuance, and less from the calmer, more dispassionate opinion of later times.
5. He quotes rather freely from Catholic, Unitarian, Gnostic, and Modernistic sources, to bolster up his contentions when he can find a paragraph or sentence that appears to slant his way.
6. He draws frequently unwarranted and illogical conclusions and strained interpretations from evidence brought forward.
7. In criticising a translation of Scripture he chooses often to ignore the Greek text, the English context, and parallel Scriptures; as also the evidence of the

8. when it serves his purpose, he disregards an alternative reading or an informative note in the margin. But when it serves his purpose, he incorporates into the text a reading from the margin, and criticises that text as if it were the translator's preferred reading.
9. He shows a manifest aversion to having a literal reading of the Greek appear in either margin or text if it involves any change or hint of change from the old reading.
10. In the examination of Scripture passages, the author's guiding star is whether or not the Revised translation differs in any respect from the Authorized Version. when it does, the rendering passes under his immediate condemnation regardless of textual or other reasons for the change.

Failures of the book.—To be more particular, the author has failed to sustain his contentions in the effort to achieve his objective in writing the book, in the following important respects:

As set forth with reliable evidence in Section I of this review, he has failed—

1. To trace down a distinct and unbroken line of MSS or texts from Apostolic times to the publication of the first Greek text of the New Testament by Erasmus, and another distinct line by way of Rome and the papists.
2. He has failed notably to prove that the Itala of the Waldenses was any other than one of the older Latin versions originating in Northern Africa, spreading thence into Catholic Europe, leading up to the Vulgate, and serving as a basis for the vulgate itself. This failure leaves a wide gap in the so-called Apostolic succession of manuscripts that must be added to other numerous gaps the author has failed to bridge as between Palestine, Constantinople, Waldensian Italy, Southern France, England, and Erasmus.
3. He has failed to establish the authorship of the Vaticanus as that of Eusebius or the author of the Sinaiticus as that of Origen, or that these two MSS, with their marked differences could be two of the fifty Bibles supplied to Constantine from Caesarea by Eusebius.
4. He has failed to show any relationship between the Hexapla of Origen and the Vaticanus or Sinaiticus MSS of the New Testament, because of the fact that Origen's Hexapla contained the Old Testament only, written in Hebrew and Greek.
5. He has failed to prove, by his method of attacking the character and theology of Revisers like Westcott, Hort, and others—the fallacy of argumentum ad hominem—that the Revised Version departs from fidelity to the best authenticated MSS in any other than a few exceptional instances—much fewer than are found in the Authorized Version.

As set forth in Section II of this review, the author has failed entirely—

1. To prove that the text of Erasmus was a "pure Greek text"; for—
2. He failed to inform the reader that Erasmus had in hand or the building of his text only seven Greek MSS at most, and these dating not earlier than the twelfth century; that he had to borrow the MS for the book of Revelation and translate from the Catholic Vulgate six full verses and other words and phrases that were missing in this MS; that all these MSS save the one on Revelation are still at Basle, and do not appear on the lists of principal and most reliable MSS as dated and classified by scholarly textual critics up to now; that Erasmus did

his work of building a Greek text in much haste over a period of less than a year, in order to be first on the market before a competitor.

3. The author failed utterly to prove that no Catholic influence could have been exercised over the work of Erasmus;

4. He failed to inform his readers that Erasmus himself was a Catholic to the day of his death; that his personal Bible was the Catholic Vulgate, which he printed in parallel columns with the Greek in his New Testament; that he dedicated his Greek Testament to Pope Leo X, and printed this Pope's imprimatur in his second edition; and that he corrected his fourth edition in more than 100 places from Cardinal Ximenes' Complutensian text printed in Spain; and that this same fourth edition became the mother-edition to the Received Text used so largely by the King James translators.

5. The author failed to prove that either of the two oldest MSS, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, was corrupted by the papists or that their authors were Eusebius and Origen, respectively.

6. He fails to inform his readers that the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus MSS are listed as first and third among the major MSS by scholars up to date.

As set forth by the evidence in Section III of this review, the author has failed—

1. To show by the Scriptures cited in chapter VI that a Jesuit influence appears in the readings of the Revised Versions;

2. He falls repeatedly into the fallacy of concluding that when or since a Revised reading is more like the Jesuit reading than is the AV, the Revised was therefore influenced by or copied the Jesuit reading—a fallacy that would eliminate nine-tenths of the Bible.

3. He ignores all other reasons for change than the Jesuit influence—such as the testimony of the MSS, greater fidelity to the Greek text, and clearer, more up-to-date and intelligible words and expressions.

4. The author further fails to show by the conclusive test of examining the Revised text itself in the scriptures cited in Chapter XI, that the Revisers struck “blow after blow against the truth”; for—

5. In addition to the fallacies pointed out in chapter VI above, the facts revealed in the review are—

a. That the author allows no motive for a change in reading or a marginal note except, as he says, either “to sow, broadcast, doubts about the sacred utterances,” or “a settled purpose... that doctrine should be changed.”

b. That of the 31 “blows” listed in chapter XI, only one can be really said to be “against the truth,” and that not contrary to truth but stating only a part of the truth—2 Timothy 3:16. c. That three of the blows are decidedly for the truth by way of a more accurate rendering—John 5:39; Acts 3:19 2 Timothy 4:1.

d. That the other 27 changes have to do merely with more literal or accurate renderings, retain omissions for lack of textual authority but supplied in the context or parallel passages in the same version, or greater fidelity to the Greek reading of that particular text.

6. Again, the author fails to show by the Revised readings in 17 passages examined in chapter XII, that “blow after blow in favor of Rome” has been struck by the Revisers; for— RABV 125.2

7. In addition to the fallacies and narrowing attitudes revealed in chapters VI and XI, these facts are obvious.

a. That among 17 cited, only one blow can be said to be "in favor of Rome," but no more so than in favor of fundamentally erroneous Protestant doctrine, namely, that the punishment of the wicked is now going on somewhere. See 2 Peter 2:9, ARV.

b. That in one other instance the Revisers failed of fidelity to the Greek text—Revelation 13:8—but with a result that it is difficult to see as favoring Rome any more than other bodies of religionists.

c. That the other 15 instances deal only with marginal readings, more literal renderings, and greater fidelity to authenticated Greek MSS. "