

Sunday, June 2, 2019— Grace Life School of Theology—*From This Generation For Ever*  
 Lesson 90 The Two Streams of Bibles Model of Transmission: Its Origins & Accuracy, Part 4  
 (The Adventism of Wilkinson)

## Introduction

- For the last three Lessons (87, 88, and 89) we have been studying the “two streams of Bibles” model of transmission. In doing so we have observed the following points:
  - The “Two Streams of Bibles” View of Transmission
  - Historical Origins of the “Two Streams of Bibles” Paradigm
  - First Questioning of the “Two Streams of Bibles” Paradigm
    - Gothic ([Lesson 87](#))
    - Peshitta ([Lesson 88](#))
  - Public Questioning of the “Two Streams of Bibles” Paradigm
    - Old Latin vs. Latin Vulgate Dichotomy ([Lesson 89](#))
- In Lessons 87 and 88 we identified the historical origins of the paradigm in the writings Benjamin G. Wilkinson. We then traced its development and progression in subsequent works by Jasper James Ray and Peter S. Ruckman. In summation we noted the following progression:
  - 1930—Benjamin G. Wilkinson wrote *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* (*OABV* hereafter).
  - 1955—Jasper James Ray wrote *God Wrote Only One Bible* which contains a chapter titled “Historically Only Two Streams of Bibles Have Come to Us” (Cp. 2). Moreover, on pages 59 and 87 Ray depicts his “corrupt” and “pure” trees of Bibles.
  - 1964—Peter S. Ruckman wrote *The Bible “Babel”* which contained diagrams of the “good” and “corrupt” trees of Bibles. In addition, we observed in Lesson 88 that Ruckman’s “trees” are nearly identical to the ones presented by Ray fourteen years earlier in 1955.
  - 1970—David Otis Fuller edited *Which Bible?* This volume contains an edited reprint of Wilkinson’s 1930 work, *OABV*, including the entirety of Chapter 1, “Fundamentally, Only Two Different Bibles.”
- Furthermore, we observed how once this notion was deposited into the thought stream by Wilkinson it was picked up by later defenders of the Traditional Text and the Authorized Version and advanced in an uncritical manner. Through the twin influences of Ruckman and Fuller, the “two streams of Bibles” paradigm of transmission cemented itself into the argumentation of the King James Only movement. Later, pro-King James authors repeated this talking point in some manner to varying degrees.

- The goal of this Lesson is an in-depth consideration of Wilkinson’s reliability as the Fountainhead of the “two streams” paradigm. In order to accomplish this task, we will consider the following points:
  - The Adventism of Wilkinson
  - Adventist Criticism of the “Two Streams” Paradigm
  - The Spirit of Prophecy: Wilkinson’s Defense

### **The Adventism of Wilkinson**

- In Lesson 87, and again in the introduction to this Lesson, we noted that David Otis Fuller editor of the 1970 publication *Which Bible?* included an edited reprint of Wilkinson’s 1930 book, *OABV*. Consuming 146 pages of *Which Bible?*, material from the pen of Wilkinson comprised 46% of the book. In this section of *Which Bible?*, Fuller reprinted ten Chapters of Wilkinson’s sixteen chapter work. (Kutilek & Hudson)
- Beginning on page 174 of the 5<sup>th</sup> edition of *Which Bible?* and ending on page 175, Fuller introduced Wilkinson to his readers in the following manner:

- “Benjamin G. Wilkinson, Ph.D., is all but unknown to the world of scholarship but, once his book is carefully considered it will be evident that here is a scholar of the first rank with a thorough knowledge of the subjects about which he wrote. Dr. Wilkinson taught for many years in a small and obscure Eastern college. For this excellent work which he produced he secured copyrights in both England and America back in 1930.

... Dr. Wilkinson’s book is...a cogent presentation of little known facts along with a thrilling review of the battle that began in Eden with Satan’s skeptical question, “Yea, hath God said?” and has continued unabated until this present hour.

With such a surfeit of Bible translations and such profound confusion existing in Christian circles, Dr. Wilkinson’s work will go a long way in bringing into proper focus and perspective the whole question on where final authority lies and just what we can trust with confidence in the midst of this multiplicity of versions.” (Fuller, 174)

- The remainder of the introductory material on page 175 is a verbatim reproduction of the Forward to *OABV* by Wilkinson. From Fuller’s introduction, readers of *Which Bible?* are left with the following impressions of Wilkinson: 1) he “is a scholar of the first rank” 2) he “taught for many years in a small and obscure [unnamed] Eastern college,” and 3) copyrights were secured by Wilkinson in both England and America. Beyond these three pieces of information readers of *Which Bible?* are told nothing about Wilkinson’s background.
- It was at a meeting of the Dean Burgon Society in 1989 that Gary R. Hudson, a former Ruckmanite, asked the Society President D.A. Waite if he knew anything about Benjamin G. Wilkinson. Waite proceeded to inform Hudson that Wilkinson had been a Seventh-day Adventist

(SDA hereafter). By way of follow up, Hudson asked Waite if Fuller was aware of Wilkinson's Adventism. To which Waite replied, "Yes, but he didn't like to mention it because he knew how people might react." (Kutilek)

- After learning this piece of information about Wilkinson, Gary R. Hudson and Doug Kutilek secured an original 1930 copy of *OABV* and learned that the "small and obscure Eastern college" mentioned by Fuller was an SDA training school called Washington Missionary College, now known as Washington Adventist University. Not only did Wilkinson teach there for many years but the title page identified him as the "Dean of Theology." (Kutilek)
- The SDA publication *Review and Herald* ran the following obituary for Benjamin G. Wilkinson on May 2, 1968.
  - "Wilkinson, Benjamin George--b. June 20, 1872, Hamilton, Ont., Canada; d. Jan. 25, 1968, Riverdale, MD. His family became Adventists through the reading of The Great Controversy. In 1891, he began to study for the ministry at Battle Creek College. The following year, he began evangelism in Wisconsin. He received his B.A. degree in 1897 at the University of Michigan. He became Dean of Theology at Battle Creek College that same year. He was called to the presidency of the Canadian Conference in 1898. The following year he became dean of theology at Union College. From 1901 to 1905 he was president of the Latin Conference (now Southern European Division). During those years, he started our work in Rome, Paris, and Spain. Maude Morrison became his wife in 1902, and to this union two sons were born, both of whom preceded him in death. Upon his return to the United States he labored in the Columbia Union holding evangelistic services in large cities, such as Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Washington, D. C., and Charleston, W. Va. For five years he was Dean of Theology at Washington Missionary College. In 1908 he received his Ph.D. degree from George Washington University. In 1909 he became president of Columbia Union Conference, which responsibility he carried for more than 10 years. His wife died in 1911, and in 1914 he was united in marriage with Dorothy Harris. To this marriage a son was born, Dr. Rowland Wilkinson, who survives. In 1920, he became president of the Kansas Conference. For a time he served as temporary mission superintendent in Haiti. In 1923, he became president of the East Pennsylvania Conference. Following this he gave 24 years of consecutive service to Washington Missionary College. From 1936 to 1946 he served as president of the college. He retired from active work after 56 years of service. Two of his literary productions are *Truth Triumphant* and *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated.*" (quoted by Kutilek)
- So, not only was Wilkinson an Adventist but he was one of the movements leading advocates during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. There can be little doubt that David Otis Fuller intentionally suppressed Wilkinson's identity as a member of the SDA church from the readership of *Which Bible?*. This fact is brought into focus when one considers how Fuller edited the portions of *OABV* that were reprinted in *Which Bible?* to obscure Wilkinson's Adventism.
  - "As part of this premeditated fraud, Fuller sought to remove telling remarks and references which would have clued the reader to Wilkinson's background. The most blatant of these is Fuller's deletion of a footnote on page 215 of *Which Bible?*

(corresponding to page 42 of Wilkinson's original edition). As the reproductions accompanying this article show, Wilkinson quoted the Seventh-day Adventist "prophetess" Ellen G. White as authoritative. Fuller kept the quotation in, but concealed the source by deleting the footnote. How many thousands have read this page, not being aware that they were reading from a foundational book of Adventism, E. G. White's *The Great Controversy*. Wilkinson, while quoting from White, dropped (following the words "hatred and persecution") White's description of the Waldenses as those "who kept the true Sabbath," which would have warned the reader that something was not right (*The Great Controversy*, page 62; page 65 in other editions). Wilkinson, of course, was not disagreeing with White or concealing his true views, just shortening a quotation--a different intent than Fuller! This is not the only place where Fuller deleted a Wilkinson reference to White. On pages 60-61 of *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, Wilkinson quoted two lengthy paragraphs from White's *The Great Controversy*. Had Fuller not deleted both this quotation and the corresponding footnote, they would have appeared on page 233 of *Which Bible?* immediately before the first full paragraph on that page." (Kutilek)

- So, David Otis Fuller purposefully concealed the identity of Wilkinson from his Fundamental Baptism readership. Meanwhile, Fuller's actions moved the "two streams of Bibles" paradigm of transmission into the mainstream of King James Only argumentation.
- Fuller's shenanigans aside, note Ellen G. White's view of the Waldensians from the above citation as those "who kept the true Sabbath." Herein lies a clue as to why Wilkinson erected a dichotomy between Old Latin (Waldenses Bible) and the Latin Vulgate (the Catholic Bible). Ellen G. White, a founding prophetess of the SDA movement, viewed the Waldensians as the spiritual forebears of the Adventist movement. If the Waldenses kept the "true sabbath," according to White, then perhaps they also used a "pure Bible" as argued by Wilkinson.
- Chapter 2 of Wilkinson's book is titled "The Bible Adopted by Constantine and the Pure Bible of the Waldenses." It is in this Chapter that Wilkinson moves to establish his dichotomy between the Old Latin and Latin Vulgate. Note the following citation:
  - "The Latin Vulgate, the Sinaiticus, the Vaticanus, the Hexapla, Jerome, Eusebius, and Origen, are terms for ideas that are inseparable in the minds of those who know. The type of Bible selected by Constantine has held the dominating influence at all times in the history of the Catholic Church. This Bible was different from the Bible of the Waldenses, and, as a result of this difference, the Waldenses were the object of hatred and cruel persecution, as we shall now show. In studying this history, we shall see how it was possible for the pure manuscripts, not only to live, but actually to gain the ascendance in the face of powerful opposition." (Wilkinson, 19)
- Later in the same Chapter (2) on pages 28 and 29, Wilkinson quotes Fredrick Nolan's 1815 work *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate* regarding the Waldensian Bible just before he presents his dichotomous chart of "Two Parallel Steams of Bibles" on page 30. Recall that it was on this chart that Wilkinson placed the Old Latin Bible of the Waldenses in the pure stream and the Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate in the corrupt stream. These placements were not based upon

any discussion of the textual evidence seeing that Wilkinson provided zero textual justification for placing them as he did.

### *Summary*

- Benjamin G. Wilkinson, author of *OABV* (1930) was an active member of the SDA church during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In 1970, Fundamental Baptist David Otis Fuller included an edited version of ten Chapters from Wilkinson’s book in *Which Bible?*. Fuller purposely moved to obscure Wilkinson’s identity as an Adventist from his readership through selectively editing the extracts that were reproduced in *Which Bible?*.

### **SDA Criticism of the “Two Streams” Paradigm**

- In 1931 fellow Adventist Warren Eugene Howell wrote an 125-page review of Wilkinson’s book titled *A Review of “Our Authorized Bible Vindicated,” by Benjamin G. Wilkinson*. Howell’s book is available for free on the [Ellen G. White Writings](#) website. In his book Howell takes Wilkinson to task on many different aspects of this argumentation. For the sake of time and space we will only deal with those aspects of Howell’s refutation that deal directly with the “two streams of Bibles” paradigm. Please note that the website presents Howell’s review in a series of thirty different screens. For documentation purposes, I have followed the screen numbering utilized by the Ellen G. White Writings website.
- The first objection offered by Howell establishes beyond doubt that Wilkinson was a member of the SDA Church. Howell chides him for failing to publish *OABV* via an accredited SDA publishing house as well as for not abiding by the request of the SDA General Conference to cease discussing the Bible version question.
  - “Two vital facts immediately appear upon opening the volume to the title page. The first is the hidden identity of the printers, as there is no imprint of any publisher whatsoever. It is significant that the manuscript was neither submitted to nor published by any accredited Seventh-day Adventist publishing house. In other words, the authorization of the book itself is not vindicated as an approved denominational production. It was published in disregard of General Conference counsel, and over the plea of the executive officers that agitation of this question should cease.” (Howell, 3 of 30)
- Regarding the establishment of “Two Parallel Streams of Bibles” paradigm, Howell calls it “arbitrary” and a creation of Wilkinson that does not “rest upon historical authority.”
  - “Two Parallel Streams of Bibles” (p. 43), arbitrarily created by the author, are formed for a purpose, and do not rest upon historical authority.” (Howell, 7 of 30)
- Second, Howell sees Wilkinson’s book as a revival of the arguments put forth over one hundred years earlier by Fredrick Nolan in his 1815 book *An Inquiry Into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, or Received Text of the New Testament; in Which the Greek Manuscripts are Newly Classed, the Integrity of the **Authorized Text Vindicated**, and the Various Readings Traced to Their Origin*. Howell even points out the similarities between the titles of the two volumes.

- **“It is decidedly informative to discover that this contention of the author is simply the revival of an effort made more than a hundred years ago to establish this same claim. A book was printed in 1815** (the author being “The Rev. Frederick Nolan, a Presbyterian of the United Church”), with the title, “An Inquiry Into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, or Received Text of the New Testament; in Which the Greek Manuscripts are Newly Classed, the Integrity of the Authorized Text Vindicated, and the Various Readings Traced to Their Origin.”

**In passing, it may be remarked that the striking similarity in objective, between the two books of 1930 and a century previous, as well as the very expression on the title page of the 1815 volume,—“The Authorized Text Vindicated,”—is to say the least a singular coincidence.**

This work by Mr. Nolan is lauded by the author on pages 40 and 41, and is again referred to on pages 42 and 49. Great confidence is reposed by the author in Mr. Nolan’s contentions, and he says, relative to the conviction of his precursor:

“He felt certain that researches in this direction would demonstrate that the Italic New Testament, or the New Testament of those primitive Christians of northern Italy whose lineal descendants the Waldensians were, would turn out to be the Received Text.” (p. 40.)” (Howell, 8 of 30)

- In a section titled “The Argument Upon the “Itala”” Howell deals with Wilkinson’s dichotomous argument that the Old Latin of the Waldensians is “pure” whereas Jerome’s Latin Vulgate is “corrupt.”
  - “One of the arguments used by the author to establish his claim of transmission of the pure apostolic text by the early Christians of northern Italy is this:

“It is held that the pre-Waldensian Christians of northern Italy could not have had doctrines purer than Rome unless their Bible was purer than Rome’s; that is, was not of Rome’s falsified manuscripts.”—Page 31.

The utter unsoundness of this argument will readily appear when we apply it to our own movement. According to this view, it would be impossible for us to hold any purer view concerning Christian doctrine than that which is held by the other churches unless we had a purer Bible than they. But we use identically the same Bibles, whether King James or Revised. And it is a great satisfaction to take the very Bibles in the hands of the other denominations and from them establish our distinctive doctrines. Not only so, but the very prophecies which we use to establish our claims concerning the apostasy of the Roman Catholic Church are found in the officially authorized Catholic text. The contention utterly collapses in the light of Luther’s experience, and of every marked spiritual advance or reform through the centuries.

The basis of the argument that the pre-Waldensian Christians had a purer Bible in their possession is the repeated contention that their text known as the Italic or Itala, was transmitted in a pure form direct from Palestine to them. (Pages 23-43.) This assertion

seems **to make necessary the submission of documentary evidence concerning this manuscript and its origin**, even though it be a bit technical.

. . . The claim of the author is that the Waldenses had a pure text of the Bible, transmitted direct to them from Palestine, and that this text was the foundation of the Textus Receptus. But the testimony here submitted shows that the Waldensian Bible was in all likelihood a revision of the Old Latin text originating in northern Africa, and that it was doubtless the last revision of the Old Latin text previous to, and leading up to, the Vulgate edited by Jerome. And some even believe that it was identical with the Vulgate, and that the Bible of the Waldenses was the Vulgate itself. Therefore the effort to establish the claim that the Waldensian Church possessed manuscripts directly descended from the apostolic originals, collapses. Neither Mr. Nolan in 1815, nor the author of the book under review in 1930, is able to convince any textual critic that this claim is a sound one. **But when this claim is overthrown the very foundation of the book under review is removed, and the conclusions which are based upon it are rendered untenable.**" (Howell, 9 of 30)

- In short, Howell acknowledges that Wilkinson provided no textual evidence to support his arguments regarding the Old Latin. Consequently, Wilkinson's conclusions regarding the Old Latin/Latin Vulgate dichotomy upon which the "two streams of Bibles" paradigm was founded are untenable due to a complete lack of textual evidence.
- Later in a Chapter titled "An Epitome of the Findings of This Section" Howell summarizes his findings from Section One of his book. Please consider the following pertinent points of summation:
  - "The book before us is manifestly not an unbiased examination of facts; instead, **there is hopeless confusion of fact, conjecture, and assertion. There are many fine passages, but the author often rises to a grandiloquent style to dazzle and impress, forgetting that assertion or inference is not proof. The volume abounds in illogical conclusions clothed in oratorical garb.** Constructive textual criticism is confused with destructive higher criticism in unwarranted and fantastic ways. In many places the argument is **plainly built upon an appeal to religious and denominational prejudice rather than upon solid facts or a legitimate appeal to reason. It takes advantage of the unfamiliarity of the average reader with the facts alleged, and to which the average reader cannot possibly have access.**

The "vindication" unquestionably represents a large amount of research. But no matter how vast one's examination, if his premises and operating principles are not sound, his conclusions are necessarily faulty, and an intensified study of his character can easily become an obsession. Many authorities are cited in the reference footnotes. But their often claimed support is frequently misleading because citations are often used to support an unwarranted inference, instead of sound facts, and are sometimes perverted to support such claims. Instead of a "systematic depravation of Scripture" by the Revisers, as the author claims, there is in fact a systematic misuse of evidence by the author. . .

**5. The author’s arbitrarily created “two parallel streams of Bibles” is shown not to rest upon historical authority, . .**

**6. The contention upon the “Itala,”—as the pure Bible of the Waldenses, and descended from apostolic origin,—is shown to be untenable.**

The triple contention of the author, (1) that the Greek text upon which the A.R.V. is based is seriously corrupted by papal influence; (2) that the translated product is dangerously pro-papal or clearly biased toward Modernism, and (3) that the Received Text is the pure, uncorrupted, apostolic Scripture transmitted without substantial change through the centuries, is, on the basis of this general survey of the volume, clearly overturned. But the findings of this division will be strongly augmented in Sections II and III, where critical and cumulative evidence is presented completely, and we believe conclusively, covering the basically fallacious argument on the “pure Greek text of Erasmus,” as well as the technical features relating to the texts cited in chapters VI, XI, and XII.” (Howell, 18 of 30)

- At the beginning of “Section II: On the Bible MSS In General” Howell states the following about how Wilkinson staked his entire argument on the “pure steam” of MSS in contradistinction to the corrupt Catholic line of MSS.
  - “On Catholic influence—So much is said by the author about **the “pure Greek text of Erasmus,”** about the mutilating and corrupting of other texts, and especially about Romanizing and Modernizing influences being manifest in the MSS used and the translation made by the Revisers of the King James Version of the Bible, that it is necessary to give some attention to Greek MSS in general before dealing with the scriptures cited by the author to prove his contention. **He stakes all on the pureness and integrity of Erasmus’ Greek Testament, endeavoring to show that Greek MSS came down uncorrupted through the centuries from the apostles by way of Syria, Constantinople, and the Waldenses, into the hands of Erasmus, while another stream of mutilated and corrupted MSS came down via Rome and the papacy.”** (Howell, 19 of 30)
- Therefore, we see in Wilkinson the origin of the dichotomous placement of Old Latin and Latin Vulgate in opposite streams of transmission. The placement of the Vulgate in the corrupt stream was based upon its connection to the Catholic Church rather than an evaluation of variant readings and textual data.
- The final section of Howell’s book is titled “General Summary.” In this section Howell makes the following pertinent statements regarding our consideration of the “two streams” paradigm:
  - “A. 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.” (Howell, 30 of 30)
- Much more could be said about Howell’s review of *OABV* that is beyond the scope of our current topic. Readers should not infer from my citations of Howell’s *Review* in this Lesson that I agree with his conclusions about other matters related to the transmission/textual debate because I do not. That being said, Howell, a fellow member of the SDA Church, took Wilkinson to task over his Old Latin/Latin Vulgate dichotomy and his resultant “two streams of Bibles” model of transmission.

### *Summary*

- In 1931 Warren Eugene Howell a member of the SDA Church wrote an 125-page review of Wilkinson’s book titled *A Review of “Our Authorized Bible Vindicated,”* by Benjamin G. Wilkinson. Howell’s criticism of Wilkinson can be summed up as follows:
  - *OABV*’s “Two Parallel Streams of Bible” is an arbitrary creation of the author. It is not built upon a factual textual analysis but upon the cobbled together summative quotations from so-called authorities.
  - *OABV* is a revival of arguments first put forth by Nolan in 1815.
  - *OABV* fails to prove, on the basis of textual evidence, the dichotomous division of the Old Latin and Latin Vulgate into opposing streams of transmission.
  - *OABV* fails to prove the existence of “two parallel streams of Bibles.” As a result, the book’s foundation is removed and its conclusions are rendered untenable.

### **The Spirit of Prophecy: Wilkinson’s Defense**

- At some point, the exact timing of which is unclear, Benjamin G. Wilkinson responded to Howell’s *Review* by penning, *Answers to the Objections a Reply to the “Review” of My Book “Our Authorized Bible Vindicated.”* According to my copy of Wilkinson’s *Reply*, the SDA General Council asked that it not be published in the 1930s due to the fact that “feelings and rivalry were running high.”
  - “Back in 1930 B. G. Wilkinson published ‘OUR AUTHORIZED BIBLE VINDICATED’. Some of his college colleagues took exception to his book and criticized it publicly, Since Wilkinson, who was a professor in one of our colleges, was having his scholarship questioned, it was mandatory that he reply.

This book is his reply to their "review" and criticism. It literally "downs" them on every argument. Since feelings and rivalry were running high, the General Conference of those days requested Wilkinson to not publish this work. He agreed." (Wilkinson, *Reply*, 1)

- Wilkinson's *Reply* is quite long and addresses many topics that are beyond the scope this Lesson. Therefore, we will only focus on two aspects of Wilkinson's *Reply*: 1) SECTION III- The Itala and the Bibles of the Waldenses and 2) SECTION VII – General Arguments

### *SECTION III- The Itala and the Bibles of the Waldenses*

- As the title suggests this section deals with Howell's claim that the foundation for Wilkinson's book was "overthrown" via his failure to factually establish that the Old Latin was the pure Bible of the Waldensians that had been translated from the Received Text.
  - "I have reserved a special chapter for the Itala, and the Bible of the Waldenses. I do it particularly because my Reviewers announce (Section I p.15) that "the decisive consideration is whether the Itala was translated direct from Palestine, or whether it originated in North Africa." In fact they make it so decisive that they say:

"When this claim is overthrown, the very foundation of the book under review is removed, and the conclusions which are based upon it are rendered untenable," (Section I p. 17.)

I accept the challenge." (Wilkinson, *Reply*, 11)

- In this Section, Wilkinson mixes an impressive bevy of quotations from textual critics and church historians such as Fredrik Nolan, B.F. Westcott, Fredrick Kenyon, Dean Burgon, Edward Miller, Cardinal Wisemen, August Neader, the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia and many more with the SDA notion of the "Spirit of Prophecy" along with the writings of Ellen G. White to prove that the Old Latin was a translation of the Received Text. The section is long. For now, please consider the more pertinent aspects of Wilkinson's reply in the following citations:
  - "But we have some more splendid testimony concerning the Waldensians and their Bible other than is left entirely to the speculation of higher critics. I read from the earlier edition of "Great Controversy:
    - "The Waldenses were the first of all the people of Europe to obtain a translation of the Scriptures. Hundreds of years before the Reformation, they possessed the entire Bible in manuscript in their native tongue. They had the truth unadulterated, and this rendered them the special objects of hatred and persecution.... Here the lamp of truth was kept burning during the long night that descended upon Christendom. Here for a thousand years they maintained their ancient faith." "Great Controversy," pp. 70,71, (1884 edition)

**The Spirit of Prophecy emphasises the fact that the Waldenses were the first people to have the Scriptures translated from the original into their native tongue. She said**

**they had the entire Bible, and whatever Bible they had, it was pure and unadulterated.**" (Wilkinson, *Reply*, 15)

- "Furthermore, **the Spirit of Prophecy says that the Scriptures of the Waldenses were pure and unadulterated.** To us speaks again "Great Controversy";

"Some manuscripts contained the whole Bible..."

By patient, untiring labor, sometimes in the deep, dark caverns of the earth, by the light of torches, the Sacred Scriptures were written out, verse by verse, chapter by chapter ... Angels of Heaven surrounded these faithful workers. "

"Satan had urged on the papal priests and prelates to bury the word of truth beneath the rubbish of error, heresy, and superstition; but in a most wonderful manner it was preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness. "Great Controversy", pp. 68, 69.

Does **Sister White** say here that angels held back the hand of the papists from corrupting their own Bible? No, she does not. She says that Satan urged them on to bury it in error, later she says that Wycliffe's Bible was translated from the Latin (Vulgate) which contained many errors. (See "Great Controversy", page, 245, edition 1911)." (Wilkinson, *Reply*, 16)

- "I submit to my hearers if I have not established the chain from the Apostles down to Vigilantus, 400 A.D. I have already given a testimony to show that these same followers stretch from Vigilantus to Claude of 820 A.D. My Reviewers accuse me of not bridging the gaps. How much more testimony is necessary to bridge the gaps? **Add to this the statement of Sister White, that they had the Bible entire and uncorrupted; then place alongside of this the facts already given, that their Bible could not have been the Vulgate, but was the Old Latin, which never bowed the knee to the Vulgate, then the chain respecting the Bible is also complete. . . Is it not strange, brethren, that I must stand before Seventh-Day Adventists to defend the Waldenses and the Waldensian Bible? Is it not strange that I must stand before Seventh-Day Adventists to prove that the Waldensian Bible was not the corrupt Scriptures of Rome?**" (Wilkinson, *Reply*, 18)

- Wilkinson concludes this section of his *Reply* by presenting something he calls "The Completed Chain A Short Review of Authorities." This section summarizes the authorities that he believes establish his argument regarding the Old Latin Bible of the Waldensians.

- "The Completed Chain.

A short review of authorities here;

Please note again the quotation I have already given that "In the very earliest times translations must have been made from Aramaic or Syriac into Latin, as afterwards from Greek. Thus a connection between the Italian and Syriac churches, and also between the

teaching given in the two countries, must have lain embedded in the foundations of their common Christianity, and must have exercised an influence during very many years after." Burgon and Miller, "Traditional Text" p. 145.

**Now add to this Sister White's testimony that the Waldenses had "not a faith newly received. Their religious belief was their inheritance from their fathers,"... Great Controversy," p. 64**

"The Waldenses were the first of all the peoples of Europe to obtain a translation of the Holy Scriptures." (Old Edition, 1884, p. 65). "Some MSS contained the whole Bible." Idem, p. 68.

"In a most wonderful manner it (the Word of Truth) was preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness."...Idem, p. 69.

Add to this the testimony of many Protestant authorities and the writings of the Waldenses themselves that they never belonged to the Church of Rome, they always remained separate, and had received their religion through father and son since the days of the Apostles. Add to this the beautiful testimony of Muston that the "Vaudois are the chain which united the Reformed Churches with the first disciples of our Saviour." (Muston, Vol. I, P. 29.)

Then, finally, add to this the statement of the Vaudois themselves in the preface of their Bible translated by Olivetan which they gave to the French people that they had "always fully enjoyed that heavenly truth contained in the Holy Scriptures ever since they were enriched by them by the Apostles themselves."

**Is not the chain complete? The Spirit of Prophecy and the plain statements of history unite to tell us that we do have as represented in the Received Text the same Bible that the Waldensian Church possessed in "MSS directly descended from the Apostolic originals."**

Here I take a stand with Nolan, with the Waldensian historians themselves, and with Sister White, any textual critics to the contrary notwithstanding.

Of course we must not forget, as I presented in my book, that the Authorized Version is the legitimate descendant of another great stream, which did not pass through the Waldenses. I refer to the thousands of Greek manuscripts, which carry the Received Text. In the Authorized Version, then, the two pure streams meet: that of the Greek Received Text, and that of the Old Latin, preserved in its Waldensian descendant.

Thus, through those valleys, in which dwelt those people through the centuries, miraculously preserved by God, we are connected with the primitive churches. They handed over to us, not the Bible of Rome, but the Bible of the primitive churches, which found at last a resting place in our noble Authorized Version, under whose name and beauty, it was, like the waters of the sea, to touch all shores and refresh all nations." (Wilkinson, *Reply*, 21-22)

- Conspicuously missing from Wilkinson’s argumentation is a single textual example to substantiate his claims. Most troubling is Wilkinson’s reliance upon the SDA doctrine of the “Spirit of Prophecy” and writings of prophetess Ellen G. White. Mark well that Wilkinson cannot make his arguments regarding the “two streams of Bibles” without heavy reliance upon the doctrines of the SDA Church which most King James advocates would deem heretical.

### *SECTION VII – General Arguments*

- It is in this section of his *Reply* that Wilkinson deals with Howell’s criticism of the “two streams of Bibles” paradigm. Sub-chapter I of Section VII is titled “The Parallel Streams of Bibles.” In an effort to conserve time and space we will only deal with the most important information from this Sub-chapter in the main body of the Lesson.
- Once again, in order to sustain his transmissional model in the face of criticism, Wilkinson is forced to rely heavily on the SDA doctrine of the “Spirit of Prophecy” and the writings of prophetess Ellen G. White.
  - “My Reviewers claim, (Section I, page 9) that the "two parallel streams of Bibles" (Our Authorized Bible Vindicated, p. 43) is arbitrarily created and does not rest upon historical authority. In my book, however, I proved conclusively that both the Textus Receptus and the Vaticanus MSS were already in existence in the days of Constantine; rivals to one another and constituting opposing Bibles. I also proved, historically, in the same chapter, that the Waldensian Bible was from the Textus Receptus. **Now the Spirit of Prophecy says that the Waldensian Bible was of apostolic origin, uncorrupted, entire, and teaching apostolic Christianity.** The Reformation adopted the Textus Receptus; the Jesuit counter-Reformation adopted the Vaticanus. Both these facts I proved soundly and completely in my book. If, therefore, the Textus Receptus and Vaticanus were rivals in the days of Constantine, the Textus Receptus being of apostolic origin, and the Vaticanus being a corruption of the Textus Receptus, then the Old Latin Bible of the Waldenses from the Textus Receptus was and we proved it so, historically, the rival of the Vulgate taken from manuscripts of the Vaticanus type.

**The Spirit of Prophecy endorses this line of reasoning. I gave in my book, (page 42) that quotation from Sister White which shows that the Waldenses possessed a Bible which came from apostolic days, was entire, was unadulterated and was ever sought by the fury of the papists to be corrupted. The Spirit of Prophecy, however, tells us that angels restrained their malignant hatred and their efforts to bury the Waldensian Bible under a mass of error and superstition.**

**The Spirit of Prophecy further tells us that the Bible of Wycliffe was from the Latin (Vulgate) and contained many errors, but the Vulgate was a Catholic Bible. On the other hand, the Spirit of Prophecy tells us that the Greek Text of Erasmus corrected these errors, but the Greek text of Erasmus was the Textus Receptus. Therefore, the Waldenses had a pure Bible from the beginning, based on the Textus Receptus or in harmony with it. The reasoning then goes thus: (a) The Waldenses endorsed what was the apostolic Bible; (b) The Reformers endorsed what was the Waldensian**

**Bible; (c) Sister White endorsed the Bible of the Reformation and the Waldensian Bible; (d) the Waldenses could not have guarded the Vulgate because it contained many errors.**

Note the following testimonies from authorities showing how these two parallel streams rivaled one another at different epochs in history:

1 (a) In the first place Dr. Hort states definitely ('introduction" pp. 137,138) Jerome's antagonism to Antioch's theology as he (Hort) declares Antioch to be the home of the Textus Receptus in 350 A.D.; and then ("Introduction") p. 276) Dr. Hort places in opposition to this (Antioch's) Textus Receptus the text formed from Vaticanus and Sinaiticus types of MSS as being true apostolic text. Here is rivalry and opposition of the two Bibles in Constantine's time.

(b) Dr. Schaff ('Companion' etc. p. 113) says the Codex A or Alexandrinus occupies "an intermediate position between the oldest uncial (Vaticanus type) and the later cursive (Textus Receptus) text." Here again are the two streams at the earliest dates of their rivalry, Constantine's time.

(c) Dr. Kenyon proves- as I previously showed- that the Latin reproduction of the Vaticanus type was simply the Itala or the Latin Textus Receptus type with the variant Textus Receptus readings removed.

(d) Dr. Nolan ("Integrity" pp. 432, 434) declared that Origen's fabricated Greek Bible (Vaticanus type) tended to weaken the authority of the Authorized Greek Bible (Textus Receptus) in the Old as well as in the New Testament.

(e) And finally Dr. Swete shows that in the days of Constantine the Textus Receptus and the Eusebio-Origen Bible were rivals and opposing versions. He also mentions a third version, the Hosychian, or African Bible. This ceased to be a line of its own, came to an end, and is not represented in modern versions.

2. We proved from Dr. Jacobus that the Old Latin opposed the Vulgate for 1,000 years.

3. We proved from the preface of the Jesuit Bible that the Waldensian Bible was the opponent of the Vulgate, the Jesuits called it the "false" heretical translation" of the Waldenses, and Sister White says that the Waldenses kept the truth uncorrupted for 1,000 years.

4. We proved that the final split between the Catholics and Protestants came at the Council of Trent (1545-1563). My Reviewers made no attempt to notice or to answer the first four resolutions of that Council which I gave in my book, decreeing the Vulgate the authoritative Bible of the Papacy. Moreover, to have a Greek Manuscript in which to base authoritatively the Vulgate, the learned fathers of the Council of Trent, after searching through all the libraries of Italy, shrewdly understood the Vaticanus to be the manuscript.

5. Dr. Fulke, when writing to the Queen of England in the preface of his book, just about the very time that the Council of Trent Fathers chose the Vaticanus, said:

"In which, that I speak nothing of their insincere purpose in leaving the pure fountain of the original verity, to follow the crooked stream of their barbarous vulgar Latin translation, which (beside all other manifest corruptions) is found defective in more than an hundred places, as your majesty, according to the excellent knowledge in both the tongues wherewith God has blessed you, is very well able to judge." (Emphasis mine). p. 5.

6. Later in my book I presented the struggle between the Jesuit Bible of 1582 in English, and the Tyndale and Geneva Versions.

7. I presented very clearly the great struggles that were on around the Revision table for ten years between Dr. Hort and Dr. Scrivener, the one standing for the Textus Receptus and the other for the Vaticanus. Of These scenes, Bishop Ellicott, president of the committee says. "It was often a kind of critical duel between Dr. Hort and Dr. Scrivener, in which everything that could be urged on either side was placed before the Company." "Addresses" p. 61.

And finally, Hastings says:

"The ordinary English student of the Bible is able readily to appreciate the points at issue in the controversy between the Alpha (Textus Receptus) and Beta (WH) texts, because they are substantially represented to him by the differences (so far as they are differences in text, and not merely in rendering) between the AV and the RV." "Dictionary of the Bible," p. 927. (Emphasis mine).

On the quotation of the eclipse of the sun at the death of Christ, Dr. Frederick Fields says that the manuscripts began to divide on this point at the time of Origen. (Field's Notes, p. 79).

I would also recall here that Erasmus divided all Greek manuscripts into two classes; one which agreed with the Textus Receptus and the other which agreed with the Vaticanus. My Reviewers revived the old grouping made by Griesbach, into three classes, but exploded by Archbishop Lawrence. I gave these conclusions in my book. Everything which the Reviewers brought in counter argument, confirmed, but did not shake these conclusions.

**I think now that I have given evidence abundant enough for this short document, and amply backed by authorities to show the two parallel streams of Bibles."**  
(Wilkinson, Reply, Section VII- GENERAL ARGUMENTS, 1-3)

- Regarding this lengthy citation from the pen of Wilkinson, researcher Steven Avery stated the following on the Pure Bible Forum:
  - "Even putting aside, the appeal to Ellen G. White (what they call the "Spirit of Prophecy") this muddle-mess contains a boat-load of fallacies and errant claims. Basically, Wilkinson has ignored all the fundamental problems of his two streams theory,

and given a grab-bag of quotes and arguments that are interesting, but worthless to the actual point.

. . . notice how neither Wilkinson’s publication [*Our Authorized Bible Vindicated or Answers to the Objections a Reply to the “Review” of My Book “Our Authorized Bible Vindicated.”*] gives what would be the proof of the pudding. A list of a dozen of major variants where (supposedly, theoretically) the Old Latin manuscripts agree with the Received Text, while the Vulgate has Alexandrian-Vaticanus-Westcott/Hort recension readings. Wilkinson gives not dozens, not 10, not 5, not 1. The Wilkinson Old Latin good line, Vulgate bad line, theory is simply worthless. It is, however, a fine example of building a theory on hopeful reading and twisting, conjecture, and sand. And, in the Wilkinson ideation, a misplaced faith in “The Spirit of Prophecy.” (Avery, Pure Bible Forum—1/20/18)

### *Summary*

- Wilkinson has taken the conclusory statements of previous authors and assembled them in a particular manner to construct an argument. No one before Wilkinson had ever strung together this impressive line of citations to make such an argument. Next, Wilkinson added the SDA doctrine of the “Spirit of Prophecy” by appealing to the writings of Ellen G. White to corroborate his strung together chain of quotations. Therefore, Wilkinson’s argument regarding the “two parallel streams of Bibles” is a massive appeal to authority with some heretical SDA teaching mixed in for good measure. The substantive basis for the “two streams” paradigm is built upon sinking sand rather than upon an evaluation of the textual facts. The net result was the creation of a transmissional paradigm that erected a false dichotomy and presented its would be adherents with an illogical either/or dilemma.
- So how did a transmissional model from an obscure SDA author become the main paradigm of the King James Only movement? We will consider that in our next Lesson.

### Works Cited

- Avery, Steven. "[Two Lines–Two Streams–Two Trees](#)" in Pure Bible Forum.
- Fuller, David Otis. *Which Bible?* Grand Rapids, MI: Institute for Biblical Textual Studies, 1970.
- Howell, Warren Eugene. [A Review of "Our Authorized Bible Vindicated," by Benjamin G. Wilkinson.](#) 1931.
- Kutilek, Doug and Gary R. Hudson. "[The Great Which Bible? Fraud](#)" in *Baptist Biblical Heritage Vol. I, No. 2.* Summer 1990.
- Wilkinson, Benjamin G. *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated.* 1930.
- Wilkinson, Benjamin G. [Answers to the Objections a Reply to the "Review" of My Book "Our Authorized Bible Vindicated."](#) Publisher & Date Unknown.