

Chapter 5

A FALSE BIBLE

1928-1932

I saw that God had especially guarded the Bible; yet when copies of it were few, learned men had in some instances changed the words, thinking that they were making it more plain, when in reality they were mystifying that which was plain, by causing it to lean to their established views, which were governed by tradition.

Early Writings, pp. 220, 221.

Speaking of the attempt to remove the name Seventh-day Adventist from the *American Sentinel* in 1890, to make the magazine popular with other denominations, Ellen White stated, “*This policy is the first step in a succession of wrong steps.*” (*Counsels to Writers and Editors*, page 96, emphasis supplied). In the context of this testimony Ellen White was speaking of the “wrong steps” the leading brethren were taking down the road to ecumenical ties with the churches of fallen Babylon.

“The principles which have been advocated in the *American Sentinel* are the very sum and substance of the advocacy of the Sabbath, and when men begin to talk of changing these principles, *they are doing a work which it does not belong to them to do,*” Ellen White warned. “Like Uzzah, they are attempting to steady the ark which belongs to God, and is under His special supervision.” (*ibid.*, *Counsels to Writers and Educators*, page 96, emphasis supplied).

The Second Wrong Step Toward Ecumenism Approved

In 1928 the second wrong step toward ecumenism was the approval and acceptance by the Seventh-day Adventist leadership of an erroneous Bible translation -- the *American Standard Version*. Not only that, but the *American Standard Version* was stated by leadership to be preferred above the “Authorized” *King James Version*. (See below).

The English Revised Version

The English Revised Version; NT 1881, OT 1885. The phenomenal discovery of new manuscripts in the centuries that followed the production of the KJV gave rise to a new, radical revision, as scholars now had a more ancient text of the Greek NT from which to make their translation. Also a better understanding of Hebrew resulted in a clearer rendering of the OT. The result was the Revised Version. An effort was also made to eliminate obsolete words and archaisms. The paragraphing of the text by verses was superseded by a division into sense units or paragraphs. The version, however, lacked the literary charm of the King James Version. (*Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary*, Art. “Versions,” Second Revised Edition, 1995, emphasis supplied).

The first sentence in this statement from the *SDA Bible Dictionary* is just not true. The discovery of new Greek manuscripts did not give scholars “a more ancient text of the Greek NT from which to make their translation.” The so-called “more ancient” text of the Greek New Testament came from the fourth century. These Greek manuscripts are called the *Vaticanus*, and the *Sinaiticus*. The

Vaticanus text because it belongs to the Vatican, the *Sinaiticus* because the manuscripts were discovered at a monastery near Mount Sinai. Again, these are fourth century Roman Catholic Greek manuscripts. The King James Greek text (*Textus Receptus*, the Received Text) came from much earlier manuscripts. (See below). However, the *Seventh-day Adventist Dictionary* is correct in that these Roman Catholic manuscripts, the *Vaticanus*, and the *Sinaiticus*, did give “rise to a new, radical revision.”

The American Standard Version

“An American edition of the Revised Version [*The American Standard Version, 1901*] incorporating the readings and renderings preferred by the American Committee of Revision but not accepted by the British revisers, also containing further changes.” (*ibid.*, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary*, Art. “Versions,” Second Revised Edition, 1995. (emphasis supplied).

These erroneous English and American “revisions” of the Bible were nothing more than a clever revision by the Jesuits of Rome to infiltrate the Protestant churches. The proof in this statement is in the fact that the *American Standard Version* (1901), became the *Revised Standard Version* (OT 1946, NT 1952). The *Revised Standard Version* is the “official” Bible of the National Council of Churches. In 1991 the “New” Revised Standard Version received the IMPRIMATUR of the Roman Catholic Church, and contains the spurious Apocrypha books *rejected in almost all other English translations!* The IMPRIMATUR means that the “New” *Revised Standard Version* can be safely read by Catholics and read by priests officiating in the Roman Catholic Mass.

“In 1957 *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament, Revised Standard Version*, was published,” so states the *SDA Bible Dictionary*. “This revision was prepared by a group of scholars appointed by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., in response to a request by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1952.” (*Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary*, Art. “Versions,” Second Revised Edition, 1995).

A Common Bible For Protestants and Roman Catholics

Again, it cannot be over emphasized that in 1991 the “New” *Revised Standard Version* was published with the IMPRIMATUR of the Roman Catholic Church inside the front cover. *The Protestant and Roman Catholic churches now have a common Bible!*

“The RSV Bible Committee is. . .now an international committee consisting of members from Canada and Great Britain, as well as the U.S.A., and from Catholicism, as well as the various bodies of Protestantism. . .,” so states the *SDA Bible Dictionary*. “In the interests of ecumenism the RSV *Common Bible* was published in 1973, consisting of the 2nd ed. of the NT, the OT, and the OT Apocrypha.” (*ibid.*, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary*, Art. “Versions,” Second Revised Edition, 1995).

Notice that it was “in the interest of ecumenism” that the “Apocrypha” books of the Old Testament, approved by the Roman Catholic Council of Trent (1545) were included in the 1973 edition of the *Revised Standard Version*. Did this effort toward ecumenical ties with Rome work? Yes! Protestants and Roman Catholics now have a common Bible in the 1991 IMPRIMATUR edition of the “New” *Revised Standard Version!*

“The production of a Bible endorsed by Roman Catholics, Greek Orthodox, and Protestant leaders is a significant event,” the *SDA Bible Dictionary* concludes. *“It is a new day when all major Christian bodies can use the same English Bible.”* (*ibid.*, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary*, “Versions,” Second Revised Edition, 1995, emphasis supplied).

This statement sadly proves beyond question the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist leadership endorses ecumenism. SDA leadership believe that a common Bible is “a significant event.” Further, “It is a new day when all major Christian bodies can use the same English Bible.”

“When the churches of our land, uniting upon such points of faith as are held by them in common [a common Bible was a firm step toward ecumenism], shall influence the State to enforce their decrees and sustain their institutions,” Ellen White warned, “then will Protestant America have formed an image of the Roman hierarchy.” (*Spirit of Prophecy*, Vol. 4, page 278, emphasis supplied).

The line of distinction between professed Christians and the ungodly is now hardly distinguishable. Church members love what the world loves and are ready to join with them, and Satan determines to unite them in one body and thus strengthen his cause by sweeping all into the ranks of spiritualism. Papists, who boast of miracles as a certain sign of the true church, will be readily deceived by this wonder-working power; and Protestants, having cast away the shield of truth, will also be deluded. Papists, Protestants, and worldling will alike accept the form of godliness without the power, *and they will see in this union a grand movement for the conversion of the world and the ushering in of the long-expected millennium.* (Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy*, pages 588, 589, emphasis supplied).

Early Seventh-day Adventist Aspirations for a “Common” Ecumenical Bible

Notice the five important steps taken by Protestants and Seventh-day Adventists before the Roman Catholic Church would accept a common Bible. (1) The American Standard Version became the Revised Standard Version (OT 1946, NT 1952). (2) The Revised Standard Version is the official Bible of the National Council of Churches. (3) In the 1957 edition of the Revised Standard Version the Apocrypha books of the Old Testament were added. (4) In 1991 the “New” Revised Standard Version was published with the IMPRIMATUR of the Roman Catholic Church. (5) The *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary* admits that there now exists “a common Bible” between Protestants and the Roman Catholic Church.

“How did Seventh-day Adventists come to accept these erroneous revisions of the Bible?” you ask. With the above short background of English Bible revisions, we will begin our study of the early acceptance of an erroneous Bible by Seventh-day Adventist leadership.

Movements Made After the Death of Ellen White

Ellen White passed away on July 16, 1915. Thirteen years after her death, in 1928, the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church began to publish articles in the *Signs of the Times* and *Ministry* magazines promoting the American Revised version as on a par with the King James version. Not only did these articles appear in our leading magazines, but a book was penned by W. P. Pearce, titled, *The World’s Best Book*. This book also promoted the American Revised version as on an equal par with the King James version. Although the *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia* gives no information as

to who, or what position, W. P. Pearce held in the denomination, the book was published by the Pacific Press Publishing Association.

Of course, any movement away from historic Adventism would have to come after the death of Ellen White. Again, this movement of leadership toward the American Revised version was made thirteen years after the death of Ellen White. The reason is obvious. One question that should be asked is, “Who was the editor of *The Ministry* magazine in 1928 when these articles promoting the American Revised version began to appear?” In this case the *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia* does give the answer.

“Leroy Edwin Froom. . . was called to the General Conference headquarters, where he was first associate secretary and then secretary of the Ministerial Association from 1926 to 1950,” the SDA *Encyclopedia* states. “During this time he founded *The Ministry* magazine and was its editor for 22 years.” (*Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, Second Revised Edition, 1995, Review and Herald Publishing Association, Art. “Froom, Leroy Edwin,” emphasis supplied).

Notice that, not only was Leroy Froom the editor of *The Ministry* magazine in 1928, *but he was its founder!* “During this time he founded *The Ministry* magazine and was its editor for 22 years.” (*ibid.*). As editor Froom had to approve of the position taken by the articles published in *Ministry* promoting the American Revised version. “So what?” you ask. A pattern of Ecumenism was being established in the Seventh-day Adventist denomination in 1928 with the approval and acceptance of a modern translation, a common Bible, between Protestant denominations. In 1952 the American Revised version became the Revised Standard version, a publication of the National Council of Churches. In 1989 the Revised Standard version became the “New” Revised Standard version, with the IMPRIMATUR of the Roman Catholic Church inside the cover. Today, the American Revised version, so highly regarded by leadership in 1928, has become a common Bible between Protestants and Roman Catholics. An ecumenical move beyond question. The fact is that Leroy Froom would later become the most important figure in the Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956. (See, Chapter 13, “The Ultimate Betrayal,” *The Greatest Conspiracy*, page 234; See also, Leroy Edwin Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, Review and Herald Publishing Company, pages 469, 470).

Two years later, in 1930, Bengamine G. Wilkinson penned a book in defense of the Authorized King James version titled, *Our Authorized Bible, Vindicated*. Wilkinson’s book was highly opposed by the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The fact that neither the Review and Herald, Pacific Press, or any other SDA publishing company would publish Wilkinson’s book, plus the fact that B. G. Wilkinson had to publish his work in England confirms the above conclusion. The most convincing documented proof that the Seventh-day Adventist denomination opposed Wilkinson’s book, *Our Authorized Bible, Vindicated*, is in the fact that later Wilkinson was required to defend his book before the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. This defense by Bengamine G. Wilkinson has been published and is available for research. (See, Bengamine G. Wilkinson, *Answers to Objections To Our Authorized Bible, Vindicated*, Leaves-Of-Autumn Books, Inc., 518 W. Main St., P. O. Box 440, Payson, Arizona 85547; Phone - 520-474-3654; Fax - 520-0310).

An “unofficial” letter, dated November 18, 1928, from the then President of the General Conference, W. A. Spicer, was sent to Dr. Wilkinson asking him not to enter into this controversy. However, the magazine articles and the book *The world’s Best Book* were published after this letter was written to Dr. Wilkinson. Because these articles and book were published after his letter to Dr. Wilkinson, General Conference President Spicer was quoted as saying to Elder Robbins,

“Then let Elder Wilkinson write his side of the question.” The book was eventually published by the author [Wilkinson] in England under the appropriate title, *Our Authorized Bible, Vindicated*. (See, Bengamine G. Wilkinson, “Introduction,” *Answers to Objections To Our Authorized Bible, Vindicated*).

Why would leadership desire a new translation of the Bible? Because the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church desired the Ecumenical Bible of the National Council of Churches over the Authorized King James version so dearly esteemed by Adventist pioneers. This was one more early ecumenical move on the part of Seventh-day Adventist leadership. More ecumenical “wrong steps” would soon follow.

Some may ask, “Who was Dr. Wilkinson, and why did he feel qualified to speak for Adventists on the subject of Bible translations?” The *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia* gives the answer.

WILKINSON, BENJAMIN GEORGE (1872–1968). Dean, administrator, evangelist, author. Wilkinson was born in Canada and began to study for the ministry at Battle Creek College in 1891. The following year he worked in evangelism in Wisconsin. He received his B.A. degree from the University of Michigan in 1897 and that same year became dean of theology at Battle Creek College. The following year he became president of the Canadian Conference and in 1899 he was asked to serve as dean of theology at Union College. He served for four years as president of the Latin Conference, which later became the Southern European Division. During this time he started the work in Rome, Paris, and in Spain. Returning to the United States, he held evangelistic meetings in large cities of the Columbia Union, including Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., and Charleston, West Virginia. He also served as dean of theology at Washington Missionary College for five years. In 1908 he received his doctoral degree from George Washington University and the following year became president of Columbia Union Conference, where he served for 10 years. In 1920 he accepted the presidency of the Kansas Conference. He then served for a short time as temporary mission superintendent in Haiti. After a time as president of the East Pennsylvania Conference he gave 24 consecutive years of service to Washington Missionary College, serving as president from 1936 to 1946. He is the author of *Truth Triumphant and Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*. He retired from active work after 56 years of service. (*Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, Revised Edition, 1976, page 1609, emphasis supplied).

Although Dr. Wilkinson was an impeccably honest man and a brilliant Bible scholar, he was later challenged to defend the scholarship of his book *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*. (See, “Answers to Objections” to *Our Authorized Bible, Vindicated*: Note:- This paper can be purchased from *Leaves-Of-Autumn-Books*, P. O. Box 440, Payson, Arizona 85547). The General Conference “requested Wilkinson to not publish this work.” He yielded to the request of the brethren and did not publish his *Answers to Objections*. However, recently *Leaves-Of-Autumn-Books, Inc.* did publish Wilkinson’s *Paper* defending the Authorized King James Bible, stating in the Preface that, “Since the individuals concerned are no longer on the scene, *and since the issue of modern versions is now a very important topic*, we feel that this work should be available to students.”

Many in our denomination are “pushing” the use of the New International Version and repressing the use of the King James Version from the pulpits. Since our doctrines, particularly the Investigative Judgement and 2300 Day Prophecy cannot be taught from the NIV, *our people should be made aware of the dangers of this Romanized Bible being foisted upon them*.

It is time our members studied for themselves the history of the English Bible, and its many modern versions. If we are to adopt the NIV as a standard for use in the pulpit and in our schools, *then we might as well give up being Seventh-day Adventists and join the ecumenical*

movement back to Rome. This is not an idle statement. Just a real honest bit of study will soon reveal how the enemy has crept within our ranks. (Publisher's Preface, Dr. Benjamin G. Wilkinson, "Answers to Objections" to *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated.* page 2, emphasis supplied).

"All modern versions also have taken their basis from the Westcott--Hort Greek Text." the *Leaves-Of-Autumn* book editor stated further. "It is time we re-examine their sources and reasoning. *Our very denomination is at stake.*" (*ibid.*, Publisher's Preface, "Answers to Objections" to *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated.* page 2). (emphasis supplied).

Some Startling Facts About Modern Translations

In these contemporary translations of the Bible, 16 texts are completely omitted from the New Testament. Matt. 17:21; Matt. 18:11; Matt. 23:14; Mark 7:16; Mark 9:44; Mark 9:46; Mark 11:26; Mark 15:28; Luke 17:36; Luke 23:17; John 5:4; Acts 8:37; Acts 15:34; Acts 24:7; Acts 28:29, and Romans 16:24. This includes the *English Revised* and *American Revised Versions* that Dr. Wilkinson objected to back in 1928. Not only that, but "portions" of 35 texts are omitted, *in many instances changing the meaning of the text!* In addition to the omitted, and "partially" omitted texts, a total of 69 have been "altered," also in many instances changing the meaning of the text.

A most important point to consider is that, in every example to be presented, *all the modern translations agree on the missing, partially-missing, and altered texts!* This fact alone proves that these modern versions were translated from the same spurious "fourth century" Greek manuscripts as was the Latin *Vulgate*.

Satan well knew that the Holy scriptures would enable men to discern his deceptions and withstand his power. Therefore its sacred truths must be concealed and suppressed. This logic was adopted by the Roman Church. *For hundreds of years the circulation of the Bible was prohibited. The people were forbidden to read it or to have it in their homes.* (Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy*, page 51, emphasis supplied).

Notice that the Roman Church suppressed the Scriptures from the people during the dark ages. Today, however, *the Roman Catholic Church is acclaimed for preserving the Scriptures!* Again we quote, "Suggested by the father of lies. . .Ancient writings were forged by monks. . .And a church that had rejected the truth greedily accepted these deceptions." (*ibid.*, GC, p. 56). Are the leaders and scholars of the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church also "greedily accepting these deceptions," because they readily embrace modern translations, most notably the New International Version? Again, Ellen White stated that, "a church that had rejected the truth greedily accepted these deceptions."

Six Missing Texts Examined

There are 16 texts missing from the New Testament in the modern translations of the Bible. It is interesting to note that these 16 texts are not omitted from the 1962 *Saint Joseph "New" Catholic Edition*. However, there are interesting "footnotes" to each of these 16 texts in the Roman Catholic edition, which state that these texts are not in the *Latin Vulgate*. It will be necessary to examine only six of these 16 missing texts to prove the corruption of the New Testament by the contemporary "Protestant" translators of the *New International*, and *Revised Standard Versions*.

Example (1)

John 5:4 For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had. (K.J.V.)

This text is omitted from all new translations. Look it up in your new translation, dear reader. A footnote to John 5:4 in the N.I.V. states, “Some less important manuscripts.” There is a most informative footnote to this text in the Catholic version:

Verses 3b-4 [John], are wanting from many Greek MSS. The wording varies even in the codices of the Vulgate. *Still the text was known in the second century, and is otherwise well attested.* (Saint Joseph “New” Catholic Edition, 1962, emphasis supplied).

Notice that in the Catholic version footnote reference is made to Greek manuscripts from “the second century.” The Received Text, or *Textus Receptus*, as it is known, came from the first and second century. These were the pure Greek New Testament manuscripts used by Martin Luther in his translation of the Bible, and the translators of the Authorized King James Version. The translators of the new versions used the *Vaticanus*, *Sinaiticus*, and the Latin *Vulgate* manuscripts. That is why this text, John 5, the last part of verse 3, and all of verse 4, are omitted in the new versions. The “Received Text” manuscripts were also the pure Greek manuscripts preserved by the Waldenses of Northern Italy. That is precisely why the Roman Catholic Church hated the Waldensians and tried to exterminate them and their pure Bible from the earth. The Waldenses published by hand portions of these pure Scriptures throughout the civilized world. The Roman Church hated these pure manuscripts because they condemned the Pagan practices of the Roman Church. (See, “The Waldenses,” *The Great Controversy*, pages 61-78).

The New International Version footnote suggests that manuscripts from the second century are “*some less important manuscripts*,” yet contemporary Seventh-day Adventist leadership and scholars praise the New International Version to the heavens. However, even the Roman Catholic version admits in a footnote that this text from the second century (as it reads in the King James Version), “is otherwise well attested.”

The Fourth Century and the School at Alexandria

It is a known fact that the *Vaticanus*, *Sinaiticus* and the Latin *Vulgate* manuscripts came into being in the “fourth” century at the time of Constantine the Great, the emperor of Rome.

“The *Vulgate*, the official Latin version was produced by Jerome *in response to the request of Pope Damasus (A.D. 382)* for a revision of the Old Latin Bible.” (*ibid.*, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary*, Second Revised Edition, 1995, emphasis supplied).

“*In the early part of the fourth century*,” Ellen White wrote, “the emperor Constantine issued a decree making Sunday a public festival throughout the Roman Empire.” (*The Great Controversy*, page 53, emphasis supplied).

The nominal conversion of Constantine, in the early part of the fourth century, caused great rejoicing; and the world, cloaked with a form of righteousness, *walked into the church*. Now the

work of corruption rapidly progressed. Paganism, while appearing to be vanquished, became the conqueror. Her spirit controlled the church. *Her doctrines, ceremonies, and superstitions were incorporated into the faith and worship of the professed followers of Christ.* (*ibid.*, Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy*, pages 49, 50, emphasis supplied).

Notice that the fourth century was the time of the “nominal conversion of Constantine,” which caused great rejoicing, “and the world, cloaked with a form of righteousness, *walked into the church.*” Early in the fourth century was the time when “the work of corruption rapidly progressed.” The fourth century was when the spirit of Paganism “controlled the Church.” The fourth century was when Pagan “doctrines, ceremonies, and superstitions were incorporated into the faith and worship of the professed followers of Christ.” But most appalling of all, the fourth century was also the time of forgery, when “writings were forged by monks,” (*ibid.*, GC, p. 56), *and the time when the first Sunday Blue Law was enacted by Constantine the Great (A.D. 321).* (See, *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Art. Constantine). It was Constantine who, in the fourth century, turned the seat of Rome over to the Church.

“And the beast [Papacy] which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion,” the apostle John wrote, “and the dragon [Pagan Rome] gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority.” (Revelation 13:2).

It is proudly claimed by New International and Revised Standard Version defenders that the *Vaticanus* and *Sinaiticus* manuscripts are “two of the oldest manuscripts.” They claim that these two manuscripts date back to the “fourth century” of the Christian era. Their claim is true -- but what should the fourth century mean to Seventh-day Adventists?

“Dr. Tischendorf believed that this [the Sinaitic] and the Vatican manuscript[s] were two of the fifty copies of the Bible which were made in Greek, *by command of the Emperor Constantine, about the year A.D. 331*, under supervision of Bishop Eusebius, the historian of Caesarea.” (Sidney Collett, *The Scripture of Truth*, page 28, emphasis supplied).

Notice the date, A.D. 331. Ten years prior, A.D. 321, was recorded the edict of Constantine making the day of the sun, Sunday, the holy day for the Roman Empire. Also the “Sinaitic” and the “Vatican,” now known as the *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus* manuscripts, were two of the fifty Bibles translated into Greek by Bishop Eusebius of the Roman Church.

Example (2)

Acts 8:37 And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* (K.J.V.), emphasis supplied).

This text is also omitted from the “new” translations. A footnote to Acts 8:37 in the Catholic version states; “Omitted in the best Greek and *Vulgate* MSS, and by other authorities.” Again, the “best Greek” to the Roman Catholic scholar could only mean the *Vaticanus*, *Sinaiticus*, and Latin *Vulgate* manuscripts. The Catholic translators do not inform us who the “other authorities” might be. However, by their omission, these two texts alone confirm that the Protestant translators closely followed the manuscripts of the Roman Catholic Church.

Is it not strange that the Protestant translators would omit this text from the Bible? It is claimed by contemporary Evangelical theology that you must “only believe” to be saved. According to this

liberal theology a convert to Christianity only has to confess that “Jesus Christ is the Son of God,” and he is saved; without obedience to God’s holy law. With this kind of theology -- the one held in common by Evangelical and Seventh-day Adventist scholars -- one wonders why they would omit this text from Scripture.

Example (3)

Acts 15:34 Notwithstanding it pleased Silas to abide there still. (K.J.V.)

A footnote to Acts 15:34 in the Catholic version states: “Not in the Greek, or in the best codices of the *Vulgate*.” The New International and Revised Standard Version translators follow the Roman Catholic Latin *Vulgate* by omitting this text. The omission of these texts in modern versions also confirm that the *Textus Receptus* manuscripts (the Greek manuscripts the King James Version was translated from) were totally ignored by the Protestant translators while preparing the New International and Revised Standard Versions. Why do we arrive at this conclusion? Because this text, and the other missing texts, are in the *Textus Receptus* manuscripts, *but are omitted by the so-called Protestant translators*.

Example (4)

Acts 24: 7 But the chief captain Lysias came upon us, and with great violence took him away out of our hands. (K.J.V.).

A footnote in the Catholic version states “neither in the Greek nor in the more notable *Vulgate* codices.” Why should Protestant translators omit the text just because they are not in the “more notable *Vulgate* codices” of the Roman Catholic Church? An even more astounding question is; *Why would Seventh-day Adventists want to accept a spurious Bible handed down through the Latin Vulgate translated by Saint Jerome of the Roman Catholic Church?*

The new translations are nothing more than dressed-up versions of the Roman Catholic Bible. Indeed, the “New” Revised Standard Version has the IMPRIMATUR of the Roman Catholic Church inside the front cover, and comes complete with the Apocrypha books officially approved at the Council of Trent.

Example (5)

Acts 28:29 And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves. (K.J.V.).

Another text omitted from Protestant translations. A footnote to Acts 28:29 in the Catholic version states, “Not in the Greek, and in only a few codices of the *Vulgate*.” Notice that the Latin *Vulgate* is referred to time and time again in the footnotes of the Catholic version. Comparing the Catholic, New International and Revised Standard Versions reveal that the Protestant translators chose to follow the *Vulgate* of the Roman Church. The New International Version footnote simply states, “not in some manuscripts,” and therefore chose to follow the *Vulgate* and omit the text.

Example (6)

Rom. 16:24 The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen. (K.J.V.)

This text is also omitted from the Protestant translations. A footnote to Romans 16:24 in the St. Joseph, "New" Catholic Edition, 1962, states, "Not found in the best codices of the *Vulgate*." Although Romans 16:24 is missing completely from the New International and Revised Standard Versions, a footnote to this text in the New International Version states, "Some manuscripts; 'May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with all of you. Amen.'" These footnotes confirm once again that the Protestant translators were following the Latin *Vulgate* manuscripts of the Roman Catholic Church while preparing the English Revised, American Revised, New International, and Revised Standard Versions.

A most interesting statement is found in a footnote to Romans 16:22 in the Catholic version, "*The Clementine Vulgate adds: 'and I have been hindered till now,'* The Greek has nothing that corresponds to it." Notice the Catholic footnote refers to, "The Clementine Vulgate," and that; "The Greek has nothing that corresponds to it." The Greek here referred to could only mean the *Vaticanus* and *Sinaiticus* Greek manuscripts. By, "The Clementine Vulgate," they obviously mean, Clement of Alexandria. Again we quote Dean Burgon on the teachings of Clement:

Clement expressly tells us that he would not hand down Christian teachings, pure and unmixed, but rather clothed with precepts of pagan philosophy. All the writings of the outstanding heretical teachers were possessed by Clement, and he freely quoted from their corrupted MSS. as if they were the pure words of Scripture. (Dean Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, page 336, emphasis supplied).

A most anti-Protestant footnote to 1 John 5:7 in the Catholic version states, "The Holy See reserves to itself the right to pass finally on the origin of the present reading." (Saint Joseph, *New Catholic Edition*, 1962). Is it not curious that Protestant translators bow to the authority of the "Holy See:" in the translation of the six texts we have examined in this study? The same is true of all 16 omitted, 35 partially omitted, and 69 altered texts.

Who Wrote the Book of Hebrews?

With the modern contemporary translations has come doubt as to who was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the past there was no question among Seventh-day Adventists. All agreed that the apostle Paul wrote the book of Hebrews. Indeed, the King James Version states, "The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews."

Who does Ellen White say wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews? Writing under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit she stated, "The kingdom of grace is brought to view *by Paul in the Epistle to the Hebrews.*" Again, "*The apostle Paul, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, says: 'Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary.'*" (*The Great Controversy*, pages 347, 411, emphasis supplied).

Turning again to the book of Hebrews, the seekers for truth found that the existence of a second, or new-covenant sanctuary, was implied in the words of Paul already quoted: "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary." And the use of the word "also" intimates that Paul has before made mention of this sanctuary.

The apostle Paul declared them "an innumerable company." Daniel 7:10; Hebrews 12:22. (Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy*, pages 413, 512, emphasis supplied).

For other references by Ellen White that the apostle Paul wrote the book of Hebrews see, *The Great Controversy*, pages 408, 420, 436, 460. *Patriarchs and Prophets*, page 357. *Testimonies for the Church*, Vol. 1, page 679; Vol. 5, page 651; Vol. 8, pages 79-80. With very little research the reader can find many more references in the Spirit of Prophecy.

The introduction to the book of Hebrews in the New International Version states, “No one knows who wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews. (“Serendipity New Testament for Groups,” *New International Version*, Copyright 1973, 1976, 1984 by International Bible Society). The Spirit of Prophecy says Paul wrote the book of Hebrews. The New International Version, and contemporary Seventh-day Adventist scholars and leaders declare, “No one knows who wrote the book of Hebrews.”

Solid Evidence That Wilkinson Was Correct About the American Revised Version

The *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary* confirms Dr. Benjamin Wilkinson’s thesis back in 1928 that the English Revised and American Revised Versions of Scripture are nothing more than Roman Catholic inspired. Note carefully the evidence:

The RSV Bible Committee is . . . now an international committee consisting of members from Canada and Great Britain, as well as the U.S.A., and from Catholicism, as well as the various bodies of Protestantism. A few changes in the translation of the NT were made in 1959–1960. *But more were made both in the underlying Greek text and in the translation in the 2nd ed. of the NT. In the interests of ecumenism the RSV Common Bible was published in 1973, consisting of the 2nd ed. of the NT, the OT, and the OT Apocrypha. The apocryphal books are printed between the 2 Testaments and arranged in 2 groups: (1) The Deuterocanonical books, regarded as authoritative scripture by Roman Catholics, and (2) the remaining apocryphal books, 1 and 2 Esdras, and the Prayer of Manasseh, which are not regarded as authoritative scripture. *The production of a Bible endorsed by Roman Catholics, Greek Orthodox, and Protestant leaders is a significant event. It is a new day when all major Christian bodies can use the same English Bible.* (*Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary*, “Versions,” Second Revised Edition, 1995, emphasis supplied).*

The Apocrypha Books and the Council of Trent

As noted before, the Revised Standard Version, and the “New” Revised Standard Version come complete with the *Apocrypha* books. These spurious Old Testament books of the Roman Catholic Church were rejected by pioneer Adventists because they were written in Greek, rather than Hebrew, and because the *Apocrypha* contradicts other Scriptures of the Bible. This is primarily true in texts related to the state of man in death.

“The Roman Catholic Church at the Council of Trent (1545) placed the Apocrypha on an equal basis with the inspired books of the Bible,” Mary Walsh wrote. “All who do not receive the Apocrypha as of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures are anathematized (cursed) by the Church.” (Mary E. Walsh, “Reasons Why the Apocrypha Is Rejected,” *Doctrinal Bible Studies for the Layman*, page 17).

Whoever shall not receive, as sacred and canonical, all these books and every part of them, as they are commonly read in the Catholic Church, and are contained in the Old Vulgate Latin edition, *or shall knowingly and deliberately despise the aforesaid traditions; Let Him Be Accursed*. (Council of Trent, Fourth Session, 1545, emphasis supplied).

Contemporary Adventist View of the Latin *Vulgate*

“The popularity of the Protestant English Bibles resulted in a Roman Catholic translation of the Latin *Vulgate* (*Rheims-Douai* Version; NT Douai OT 1609–10),” the *SDA Bible Dictionary* states. “The title page speaks of it as “The Holie Bible, Faithfully Translated into English out of the Authentical Latin.” (*Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary*, “Versions,” Second Revised Edition, 1995, emphasis supplied).

Notice that the *SDA Bible Dictionary* admits that the *Douai-Rheims* is a Roman Catholic English translation from the Roman Catholic Latin *Vulgate*. Further, the *SDA Bible Dictionary* states that the reason the Roman Catholic Church translated the Latin *Vulgate* into English was because of, “The popularity of the Protestant English Bibles.” The *Douai-Rheims*, first Roman Catholic English version was translated and published in A.D. 1610, one year prior to the publication of the King James Version in A.D. 1611. The Roman Catholic Church sent St. Augustine to England armed with the new *Douai-Rheims* Roman Catholic English translation to combat the forthcoming Authorized King James Version.

“The translation is so literal as to be stilted and at times unintelligible,” the *SDA Bible Dictionary* stated about the Roman Catholic *Douai-Rheims* Version. “Nevertheless, it influenced the revisers of the King James Version, *especially in words of Latin derivation.*” (*ibid.*, *SDA Bible Dictionary*, emphasis supplied).

Contemporary Seventh-day Adventist scholars admit that the “revisors” of the King James Version were “influenced” by the Latin *Vulgate*. The English Revised Version (1881-1885), and the American Standard Version (1901), the Revised Standard Version (1946-1952), and all English “revised” versions were “influenced” by the Roman Catholic Latin *Vulgate*. *They are nothing more or less than Roman Catholic revisions!*

Yes, dear reader, Dr. Benjamin G. Wilkinson was right back in 1930 when he published his book, *Our Authorized Bible, Vindicated*. Again, the American Revised Version was indeed a Roman Catholic translation. In 1952 the American Revised Version became the Revised Standard Version, the official Bible of the National Council of Churches. In 1991 the Revised Standard Version became the “New” Revised Standard Version, complete with the *Aprocrypha* books, *and with the IMPRIMATUR of the Roman Catholic Church printed inside the front cover!*