

Sunday, June 9, 2019— Grace Life School of Theology—*From This Generation For Ever*  
 Lesson 91 The Two Streams of Bibles Model of Transmission: Its Origins & Accuracy, Part 5  
 (J.J. Ray’s Plagiarism of Wilkinson)

### Introduction

- Last week in Lesson 90 we considered the Adventism of Benjamin G. Wilkinson, the fountainhead of the “two streams of Bibles” paradigm of transmission. In doing so, we studied the following points:
  - The Adventism of Wilkinson
  - Adventist Criticism of the “Two Streams” Paradigm
  - The Spirit of Prophecy: Wilkinson’s Defense
- In summation we observed that in 1931 fellow Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) church member Warren Eugene Howell wrote a review criticizing Wilkinson’s 1930 work *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated (OABV)* on multiple fronts. Specifically, Howell took issue with Wilkinson’s arguments regarding the dichotomy between the “corrupt” Latin Vulgate of the Catholic Church and “pure” Old Latin Bible of the Waldensians and his resultant “two streams of Bibles” model of transmission. Rather than citing textual evidence to establish his alleged distinction, Wilkinson resorted to the SDA “Spirit of Prophecy” and the writings of prophetess Ellen G. White to corroborate his selective citations of textual and historical authorities.
- So how did the contents of an obscure argument within the SDA Church become a hallmark of pro-King James argumentation in some Fundamental Baptist and Pauline Dispensational circles? The question is particularly perplexing when one considers that both groups reject SDA doctrine in general and the “Spirit of Prophecy” specifically as heretical.
- I believe that the answer is found in James Jasper Ray’s plagiarism of Wilkinson. J.J. Ray was a Fundamental Baptist whose book, *God Wrote Only One Bible (GWOOB)*, moved the arguments of Wilkinson out of SDA obscurity and into the mainstream of Fundamentalist discourse in America.
- In this Lesson we will consider the following points:
  - J.J. Ray’s Plagiarism of Wilkinson
  - Ray’s Other Errors
  - Fuller and Ruckman Utilize and Endorse Ray
  - The Error of Kutilek & Hudson

### J.J. Ray's Plagiarism of Wilkinson

- The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines plagiarism as: “The action or practice of taking someone else's work, idea, etc., and passing it off as one's own; literary theft.” In academic circles, plagiarism is considered intellectual shoplifting and is condemned in the strongest possible terms. Therefore, charging Ray with plagiarizing Wilkinson is not a small matter.
- At the outset it is important to note that there are multiple editions of *GWOOB*. The first was published in 1955 by The Eye Opener Publishers in Junction City, Oregon. The copyright was renewed in 1970 and again in 1983. The first edition from 1955 did not contain footnotes at the bottom of the page. Rather, it utilized a numbered parenthetical reference system that corresponded to a numbered Bibliography in the back of the book. More recent editions have placed numbered footnotes at the bottom of the page.
- In the “Introduction” Ray informs his readers that his book was the result of his own original extensive research.
  - “For years the writer was held in this net of diabolical trickery [“Textual Criticism” in context]. Then, one wonderful day, God opened his eyes to behold a ray of light which led out of the dark dilemma. Months and years of research followed, and this book is the result. Conclusions are not based upon the author’s judgment, but upon the investigation of more trustworthy sources which are referred to in the Bibliography given on pages 101-102 [Later version from 1983 said “foot-notes where applicable.”].” (Ray, unnumbered Introduction)
- This statement, along with clear evidence of academic dishonesty, reveal that Ray’s deception was very deliberate. He clearly wanted his readers to believe that his book was the fruit of his own research.

#### *Footnotes Betray Ray's Plagiarism*

- In an article for the *Baptist Biblical Heritage* from the Spring 1991 titled “THE REAL EYE OPENER: J. J. Ray's Plagiarism Of Benjamin G. Wilkinson” Gary R. Hudson discussed how Ray’s footnote citations betray his plagiarism of Wilkinson.
  - “As previously mentioned, Ray’s plagiarisms of Wilkinson surfaced initially as I was reading the footnotes in his book. Many of these footnotes, giving the appearance of being the result of the author’s (Ray’s) research, were obviously copied from the pages of Wilkinson’s work. The eight footnotes on page 19 by Mr. Ray are perhaps the best example of this, where seven out of eight were taken directly from Wilkinson. Footnotes numbering 1-7 of *God Wrote Only One Bible* are copied directly from seven footnotes in *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, pp. 20, 21, and 22.” (Hudson)
- Please consider the evidence presented in the following table.

<i>OABV—Wilkinson</i>	<i>GWOOB—Ray</i>
Footnotes from pages 20, 21, & 22 1. N.B Swete. <i>Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek</i> , pp.76-88. 2. Hort’s Introduction, p. 138. 3. Dr. Ira M. Price, <i>The Ancestry of Our English Bible</i> , p. 70. (See 4) 4. A.T. Robertson, <i>Introduction to Textual Criticism of the NT</i> , p. 80. (See 5) 5. Dr. Gregory, <i>The Canon and Text of the N.T.</i> , p. 345. (See 3) 6. <i>Catholic Encyclopedia</i> , Vol. 4, p. 86. (See 2) 7. Burgon and Miller, <i>The Traditional Text</i> , p. 163. (See 1) 8. Dr. Philip Schaff, <i>Companion to Greek Testament</i> , p. 115. (See 6) 9. Dr. Scrivener, <i>Introduction to the Criticism of the N.T.</i> , Vol. 2, p. 270. (See 7)	Footnotes from page 19 1. Burgon and Miller, <i>The Traditional Text</i> , p. 163. 2. <i>Catholic Encyclopedia</i> , Vol. 4, p. 86. 3. Gregory, <i>The Canon and Text of the New Testament</i> , p. 345. 4. Dr. Ira M. Price, <i>Ancestry of the English Bible</i> , p. 70. 5. A.T. Robertson, <i>Introduction to the New Testament</i> , p. 80. 6. Dr. Philip Schaff, <i>Companion to Greek Testament</i> , p. 115. 7. Dr. Scrivener, <i>Introduction to New Testament</i> , Vol. 2, p. 270. 8. Hurst, <i>History of the Christian Church</i> , Vol. 1 pp. 36-37.

- In the next paragraph Hudson offers additional proof of Ray’s plagiarism of Wilkinson by citing additional examples from the footnotes.
  - “This same phenomenon occurs with other footnotes in Ray’s book. Footnotes #1 and #3 on page 18, read, “Encyclopedia, Tatian.” This was taken from Wilkinson, page 16, footnote #19, which reads, “Encyclopedia, ‘Tatian’.” Like Wilkinson, Ray does not give the page number nor reveal the “Encyclopedia” used. Apparently, Mr. Ray simply took the Adventist’s word rather than checking the reference for himself. Footnote #2 of Ray on page 18 reads, “Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, Book 5, chap. 28,” obviously taken from footnote #18 of Wilkinson on page 15, which reads, Eusebius, Eccles. History, Book V., Chap 28.” On this last point, Ray not only took the footnote from Wilkinson but transposed two of Wilkinson’s statements on page 15 of *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* (which Ray put on page 18 of his book), slightly altering some of the wording regarding Wilkinson’s use of the reference. Other instances include footnotes #1 and #2 on page 20 of Ray that were taken from footnotes #5 and #32, pages 21 and 33 of Wilkinson; and footnotes #2 and #3 on page 98 of Ray were taken from footnotes #43 and #44, page 37 of Wilkinson. Again, Mr. Ray didn’t do his homework--not his own, at least!” (Hudson)

#### *Clear Examples of Plagiarism*

- Please consider the following table comparing Wilkinson’s use of the citation by Eusebius with Ray’s in the original edition of *GWOOB* from 1955.

<i>OABV—Wilkinson</i>	<i>GWOOB—Ray</i>
“It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that <b>the worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected, originated within a hundred years after it</b>	“ <b>The worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected, originated within a hundred years after it was composed. The African Fathers, and the whole western,</b>

<p><b>was composed; that Irenaeus (A. D. 150), and the African Fathers, and the whole Western, with a portion of the Syrian Church, used far inferior manuscripts to those employed by Stunica, or Erasmus, or Stephens thirteen centuries later, when molding the Textus Receptus.”</b> (Wilkinson, 16)</p> <p>“Eusebius is witness to this fact. He also relates that <b>the corrupted manuscripts were so prevalent that agreement between the copies was hopeless; and that those who were corrupting the Scriptures, claimed that they really were correcting them</b> (Eusebius, <b>Ecclesiastical History, Book V., chap. 28).</b>” (Wilkinson, 15)</p>	<p><b>with a portion of the Syrian Church, used far inferior manuscripts to those employed by Erasmus, or Stephens thirteen centuries later when modeling the Textus Receptus</b> (Encyclopedias, ‘Tatian’).</p> <p><b>Those who were corrupting Bible Manuscripts said that they were correcting them. Corrupted copies were so prevalent that agreement between them was hopeless</b> (Eusebius, <b>Ecclesiastical History, Book 5, chap. 28).</b>” (Ray, 18)</p>
--	---

- Examples of plagiarism on the part of Ray can be seen throughout his book. Consider a few more examples:

<i>OABV—Wilkinson</i>	<i>GWOOB—Ray</i>
<p><b>“The Latin Bible, the Italic, was translated from the Greek not later than 157 A.D. We are indebted to Beza, the renowned associate of Calvin, for the statement that the Italic Church dates from 120 A.D. . . That Rome in early days corrupted the manuscripts while the Italic Church handed them down in their apostolic purity, Allix, the renowned scholar, testifies.”</b> (Wilkinson, 26-27)</p>	<p>One of the first of these Latin Bibles was for the Waldenses in Northern Italy, <b>translated not later than 157 A.D. and was known as the Italic Version. The renowned scholar Beza, states that the Italic Church dates from 120 A.D. Allix, an outstanding scholar testifies that enemies had corrupted many manuscripts, while the Italic Church handed them down in their apostolic purity.”</b> (Ray, 98)</p>
<p><b>“Westcott writes from France to his fiancée, 1847:</b></p> <p><b>“After leaving the monastery, we shaped our course to a little oratory which we discovered on the summit of a neighboring hill... Fortunately we found the door open. It is very small, with one kneeling-place; and behind a screen was a ‘Pieta’ the size of life (i.e. a Virgin and dead Christ)... Had I been alone I could have knelt there for hours.”</b> (Wilkinson, 93-94)</p>	<p><b>Westcott writes from France to his fiancée, 1847:</b></p> <p><b>“After leaving the monastery, we shaped our course to a little oratory which we discovered on the summit of a neighboring hill... Fortunately we found the door open. It is very small, with one kneeling-place; and behind a screen was a ‘Pieta’ the size of life (i.e. a Virgin and dead Christ)... Had I been alone I could have knelt there for hours.”</b> (Ray, 29)</p>

- Regarding this last example of plagiarism, Gary R. Hudson makes the following observation:
  - “Let the reader note several points on the above. First, Ray quotes his information and words from Westcott in the identical way of Wilkinson, even to the point of using four

periods (“...”) to indicate partial quotation in the same places Wilkinson did. Secondly, the words in parenthesis, “i. e. a Virgin and a dead Christ” are Wilkinson’s, not Ray’s! Thirdly, in the footnotes at the bottom of Ray’s above page, he miscopied “Life of Westcott, Vol. I, p. 51” from Wilkinson. This last point is evident by looking at Wilkinson’s footnotes where the first part, “Life of Westcott, Vol. I” is correct, but instead of “p. 51” Wilkinson has “p. 400”: Ray mistakenly took “p. 51” from Wilkinson’s lower footnote reference to “Life of Hort, Vol. II” given as “p. 51”! THAT is sure proof that Ray copied Wilkinson’s footnotes and material rather than investigated Wilkinson’s references firsthand.” (Hudson)

- Most importantly for our purposes, Chapter 2 of Ray’s book is titled “Historically Only Two Streams of Bibles Have Come Down to Us.” (Ray, 15) Where did Ray get the title for this Chapter? It was clearly borrowed from Chapter 1 of Wilkinson’s book which contains a section titled “Fundamentally, There Are Only Two Streams of Bibles.”
- The evidence suggests that instead of investing “months and years” to research, Ray simply read the obscure out of print book by the SDA Wilkinson and passed off its core ideas to his Fundamental Baptist readers as though they were his own.
  - “No, Mr. Ray did not take many years of his own time and research to produce his book. It took him no longer to do “research” than it took him to read an older, out-of-print, 1930 work written by a Seventh-day Adventist! This was his “ray of light” that hit him one day. Mr. Ray’s story about how “God opened his eyes” was actually his “Damascus Road experience” with a book by an Adventist!” (Hudson)
- While I do not agree with everything Gary R. Hudson says, I believe he has correctly identified the origins of the “two streams of Bibles” paradigm as thoroughly “Wilkinsonian.”
  - “When anyone of this group [Ray, Fuller, Waite, Ruckman, Bynum, Riplinger, David Cloud, Jewell Smith, Sam Gipp, Jack Chick, Jack Hyles, Bob Gray, Bruce Lackey, or Mickey Carter, etc.], makes the claim that the “Old Latin Bible” was the “Received Text of the Waldenses” it is Wilkinsonian. When anyone of this group claims the Syriac Peshitta as “matching” or “nearly the same” as the “Textus Receptus” it is Wilkinsonian.” (Hudson)

### Ray’s Other Errors

- In addition, to advancing Wilkinson’s notion of “two streams of Bibles”, J.J. Ray added some questionable if not heretical information of his own into the thought stream. Specifically, Ray seems to make the Textus Receptus essential to “saving faith” and “regeneration” by answering that modern version “cannot save.” (Hudson)
  - “Suppose a mixture of truth and error, **a Bible of man’s own making through a clever process of faulty textual criticism is used.** What then? The inevitable result would be as follows: A girdle with a mixture of truth and error; a breastplate of righteousness like filthy rags, (Isaiah 64:6); a gospel of peace mingled with distrust and discord; a plastic shield through which the fiery darts of the enemy can pass; a sieve-like helmet for the

head through which conflicting ideas may enter and destroy assurance of salvation; and a sword which has no power to pierce and destroy the enemy. Therefore, a man-made substitute, although used in all sincerity, **cannot save a soul.**” (Ray, 2-3)

- “Therefore, since the Word of God did not come by the will of man, any portion changed by the will of man must result in corruption. Only an unaltered Bible can produce a perfect, **soul-saving faith** [Note that Ray’s unstated standard his verbatim identity.]” (Ray, 10)
- “It is impossible to be saved without “FAITH,” and perfect-saving-faith can only be produced by the “ONE” Bible God wrote, and that we find only in translations which agree with the Greek Textus Receptus refused by Westcott and Hort.” (Ray, 122)
- In addition to limiting God’s ability to justify a sinner to a particular Bible version, Ray made many other errors of fact. One glaring problem pertains to Ray’s placement of “Jerome’s Vulgate” (382) on the “corrupt” tree of Bibles on page 57 and “Wycliffe’s Bible” (1382) on the good tree of Bibles on page 87. As Gary R. Hudson points out in his article, it is a known fact that Wycliffe utilized Jerome’s Vulgate as the source for his translation. Therefore, how does it make sense to place them on opposing trees.
  - “Opening and thumbing-through to the charts on pages 71 and 109, my eyes immediately fell on a problem. On page 71, Ray has a chart of the “corrupt” line of Bibles which includes Jerome’s Latin Vulgate of 382 A. D. and the Douay version of 1582. Then on page 109, Ray includes the Wycliff translation of 1382 in his “pure stream” that allegedly descends from the “Original Textus Receptus.” Ray has not done his homework. A smattering of knowledge on the history of the English Bible would reveal to anyone that Wycliff’s Bible was translated directly from the Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate, as was the Douay. Such carelessness on basic information is inexcusable.” (Hudson)
- It is important to note that Peter S. Ruckman followed Ray’s erroneous placements of the Vulgate and the Wycliffe’s translation in his 1964 book *The Bible “Babel”*. This point was already noted in Lesson 88, but it bears repeating in this context of yet another example of how parroting and uncritical borrowing of ideas took place in the early stages of the modern King James Only movement.

### **Fuller and Ruckman Utilize and Endorse Ray**

- In Lesson 90 we discussed how David Otis Fuller included ten Chapters of Benjamin G. Wilkinson’s *OABV* in his 1970 book *Which Bible?*. Furthermore, we proved beyond doubt that Fuller selectively edited “Which Bible?” to obscure from his readers the fact that Wilkinson was SDA. In addition, there is indubitable evidence that Fuller was also influenced by Wilkinson’s chief plagiarizer J.J. Ray.
- In the “Acknowledgements” in the front of *Which Bible?* Fuller states the following regarding J.J. Ray:

- “Jasper James Ray, who kindly permitted quotations from his excellent book, “God Wrote Only One Bible” (Eye Opener Publishers, Box 77, Junction City, Oregon 97448).”
- Chapter One of Fuller’s *Which Bible?* is titled “Why This Book?” In this Chapter Fuller praises Ray’s “splendid book *God Wrote Only One Bible.*”
  - “Jasper James Ray, missionary and Bible teacher, in the splendid book, *God Wrote Only One Bible*, says – [quotes lengthy passage from Ray]” (Fuller, 2)
- Fuller quotes Ray’s work three more times in Chapter One, once more on page two, once on page three, and again on page four. *Counterfeit or Genuine?* (1975), one of Fuller’s sequels to *Which Bible?* is dedicated to J.J. Ray.
  - “DEDICATED TO: Jasper James Ray, Missionary Scholar of Junction City, Oregon, whose book, *God Wrote Only One Bible*, moved me to this fascinating, faith-inspiring study.”
- Regarding the Wilkinson/Ray/Fuller connection, Doug Kutilek states the following in his article for *Christian Answers* titled “The Unlearned Men: The True Genealogy and Genesis of King-James-Version-Onlyism”:
  - “I imagine the scenario went something like this: Fuller reads Ray; Fuller writes Ray for more information; Ray directs Fuller to Wilkinson; Fuller reads Wilkinson, is led astray, then reprints Wilkinson in *Which Bible?*” (Kutilek, 1)
- The writings of Peter S. Ruckman also furnish indisputable evidence of having been influenced by Ray’s book. As noted above, in his 1964 book *The Bible “Babel”* Ruckman reproduced Ray’s charts on the “two trees of Bibles” in nearly verbatim fashion, even including Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (“corrupt”) and Wycliffe’s translation (“pure”) on opposing trees. Moreover, the following statement can be found on page 37 of *The Bible “Babel”*:
  - “There will not be time to go into each of the 162 changes in detail (and again, these are only the major changes made by the new “bibles”). A complete list of these 162 deviations will be found in *God Only Wrote One Book* [should say Bible], J.J. Ray, 1955.” (Ruckman, *The Bible “Babel”*, 37)
- So, *The Bible “Babel”* (1964), arguably Ruckman’s first book on the Bible version controversy, prompts its readers to see Ray’s book for further information, thereby furnishing clear evidence that Ruckman had read Ray prior to 1964.
- Moving forward in time, Ruckman wrote the first edition of *The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* in 1970. In the Preface dated September 1969, Ruckman stated the following regarding Ray’s book:
  - “Today, there is no new material available for those students, and this is abundantly clear from the citations which will appear in this manual, for we have used as a point of reference the books printed since 1940 on “Bible translations,” and “Bible translators.” It

will be seen at a glance (from studying these “new” books) that all of the authors, with the exception of Dr. Edward Hills, and J.J. Ray, have been following a false lead which was instituted nearly 100 years ago.” (Ruckman, *Handbook*, I)

- Further evidence of Ray’s influence on Ruckman can be observed through a consideration of the Endnotes provided in the back of *The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*. Ray’s book is cited in footnotes 47 (pages 204-205) and 78 (page 209). Lastly, the cluster of sources cited by Ruckman in Endnote 20 on pages 181 and 182 is eerily like Ray’s plagiarism of Wilkinson’s footnotes discussed on pages 2-3 of this Lesson. The following table compares the citations of Wilkinson, Ray and Ruckman in parallel columns. Bolded entries indicate references used by Wilkinson that were copied by Ray and Ruckman.

<b>OABV—Wilkinson</b>	<b>GWOOB—Ray</b>	<b>Handbook—Ruckman</b>
Footnotes from pages 20, 21, & 22	Footnotes from page 19	Endnotes 20 from pages 181 & 182
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. N.B Swete. <i>Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek</i>, pp.76-88.</li> <li>2. Hort’s Introduction, p. 138.</li> <li>3. <b>Dr. Ira M. Price, <i>The Ancestry of Our English Bible</i>, p. 70.</b> (See 4)</li> <li>4. A.T. Robertson, <i>Introduction to Textual Criticism of the NT</i>, p. 80. (See 5)</li> <li>5. <b>Dr. Gregory, <i>The Canon and Text of the N.T.</i>, p. 345.</b> (See 3)</li> <li>6. <b><i>Catholic Encyclopedia</i>, Vol. 4, p. 86.</b> (See 2)</li> <li>7. <b>Burgon and Miller, <i>The Traditional Text</i>, p. 163.</b> (See 1)</li> <li>8. Dr. Philip Schaff, <i>Companion to Greek Testament</i>, p. 115. (See 6)</li> <li>9. Dr. Scrivener, <i>Introduction to the Criticism of the N.T.</i>, Vol. 2, p. 270. (See 7)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Burgon and Miller, <i>The Traditional Text</i>, p. 163.</b></li> <li>2. <b><i>Catholic Encyclopedia</i>, Vol. 4, p. 86.</b></li> <li>3. <b>Gregory, <i>The Canon and Text of the New Testament</i>, p. 345.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Dr. Ira M. Price, <i>Ancestry of the English Bible</i>, p. 70.</b></li> <li>5. A.T. Robertson, <i>Introduction to the New Testament</i>, p. 80.</li> <li>6. Dr. Philip Schaff, <i>Companion to Greek Testament</i>, p. 115.</li> <li>7. Dr. Scrivener, <i>Introduction to New Testament</i>, Vol. 2, p. 270.</li> <li>8. Hurst, <i>History of the Christian Church</i>, Vol. 1 pp. 36-37.</li> </ol>	<p>“20. See Gregory, <i>The Canon of the New Testament</i>, p. 345  <i>The Catholic Encyclopedia</i>, Vol. 4, p. 86,  <b>Burgon and Miller, <i>The Traditional Text</i>, p. 163,</b>  and  <b>Ira M. Price, <i>The Ancestry of the English Bible</i>, p. 70.”</b></p>

- Writing in 1987, Dr. Samuel C. Gipp a follower of Peter S. Ruckman, wrote *An Understandable History of the Bible* which contains an “Introduction” authored by Dr. David Otis Fuller. Checking the footnote citations reveals one reference to J.J. Ray’s book by Dr. Gipp. More astounding is the twenty-six citations of Wilkinson’s *OABV* found in the footnotes of Dr. Gipp’s

book. In addition, Gipp mentions “Dr. Wilkinson” by name in his volume many times, never informing his readers that the man he is quoting is a member of SDA church.

### **The Error of Kutilek & Hudson**

- Doug Kutilek and Gary R. Hudson did an excellent job of chronicling the factual errors, SDA influence/concealment, and academic dishonesty of Wilkinson, Ray, Fuller and, to a lesser extent, Ruckman. Kutilek’s piece “The Unlearned Men: The True Genealogy and Genesis of King-James-Version-Onlyism” traces the geological development of the movement through three successive generations of authors back to Wilkinson whom he views as the originator of the heresy.
  - 1<sup>st</sup> Generation—Wilkinson
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation—Ray
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> Generation—Fuller & Ruckman
    - Samuel C. Gipp and many others would slot into successive generations underneath Fuller and Ruckman
- As noted above, Gary R. Hudson coined the phrase “Wilkinsonian” to describe the ideas regarding the King James Bible that originated with the SDA Wilkinson and matriculated into Fundamentalism (especially Baptist Fundamentalism) through the writings of Ray, Fuller, and Ruckman.
- While Kutilek and Hudson have accurately identified Wilkinson as the source of many of “King-James-Version-Onlyism” arguments such as the “two streams of Bibles” paradigm, they have erred in hanging the origin of the pro-King James position on Wilkinson alone. Many before Wilkinson argued for superiority of the Authorized Version over Modern Versions and/or believed that their King James Bible was the infallible word of God in the English Language. Hanging the origin of the entire pro-King James position on Wilkinson serves to create the sensational argument that “King-James-Version-Onlyism” is heretical because Wilkinson was a member of the SDA church. Such an argument ignores the contents of the thought stream that existed before Wilkinson wrote *OABV* in 1930.
- Why do Kutilek and Hudson never mention the 1924 pro-King James publication of Philip Mauro titled *Which Version? Authorized or Revised?* Because it does not fit their paradigm of pigeonholing the entire pro-King James platform on Wilkinson. The fact is that many before 1930 rejected Modern Versions in favor of the Common English Bible (KJB) and/or believed it to be God’s infallible word in the English language.
- In 1885, J.H Spencer published *A History of Kentucky Baptists from 1769 to 1885*. As the title suggests, this two-volume work chronicles the history of the Baptist denomination in Kentucky for over one hundred years. Pages 507 through 509 give the history of the “Bethlehem Association of Regular Baptists.” The Association was formed on the 17th of November 1838, on which day they drafted and signed a Constitution which stated the following in Article 2d:

- “We believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as translated by King James, to be the Word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice.” (Spencer, 508)
- Did this group of simple Baptists believe that the English Bible they held in their hand “as translated by King James” was “the Word of God?” Absolutely they did. Given more time and space statements like this one could be multiplied many times over. For now, suffice it to say that throngs of English-speaking Christians held to the firm belief that the Authorized Version was God’s Word in their language for centuries before Wilkinson wrote anything in 1930.
- The chief error of Kutilek and Hudson is making out like this notion was invented by Wilkinson in 1930. Wilkinson introduced new ideas into the thought stream, to be sure, that were picked up and moved forward by the unscrupulous scholarship of Ray, Fuller, and Ruckman. Wilkinson was the fountainhead of the “two streams of Bibles” paradigm of transmission but he was not the first King James Bible Believer.
- Finally, King James advocates need to distinguish in their thinking the pre and post 1930 enunciation of their position. With the possible exceptions of Dr. Edward F. Hills and Dr. Theodore P. Letis, nearly all pro-King James arguments have possessed the leavening influence of Wilkinson. In the mid to late 1970s when the Dean Burgon Society was being formed, D.A. Waite asked Dr. Hills to join the group as a founding member. On October 3, 1978 Dr. Hills sent a letter to Theodore Letis explaining the reasons why he would not be joining the Dean Burgon Society.
  - “. . . They ought to call the society the Wilkerson [I believe he meant Wilkinson] Society. Most of them are following Wilkinson’s 7th Day Adventist approach, [i.e.] the true text was corrupted by Constantine and the Roman Catholic Church. The true text was preserved by the Bogomiles, the Albigensians, and the Waldensians. But this 7th Day Adventist approach does not agree with the fact that the King James Version is a translation of the Textus Receptus which is the text preserved by the medieval Greek Church plus a few readings from the Latin Vulgate which is the text preserved by the medieval Roman Church. Hence, when Baptists try to defend the King James Version, they are up a tree, scholastically speaking. . . . In short, these Baptist defenders of the KJV are terribly confused. Sometimes they follow Wilkinson, sometimes Burgon, sometimes they follow [Zane] Hodges, who ignores the special providence of God altogether. If I went to the meeting, I would probably try to straighten these Baptists out and make enemies. So, I will just keep quiet and try to uncurl their crooked thinking with my books. . . .” (Letis, [\*The Revival of the Ecclesiastical Text and the Claims of the Anabaptists—Revisited\*](#))
- It is high time that we purge out the old leaven and start a new lump that is devoid of the errors of Wilkinson.

### Works Cited

- Fuller, David Otis. *Which Bible?* Grand Rapids, MI: Institute for Biblical Textual Studies, 1970.
- Fuller, David Otis. *Counterfeit or Genuine Mark 16? John 8?* Grand Rapids, MI: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975.
- Hudson, Gary R. “The Real Eye Opener: J.J. Ray’s Plagiarism of Benjamin G. Wilkinson” in *Biblical Baptist Heritage*, Spring 1991.
- Kutilek, Doug. “The Unlearned Men: The True Genealogy and Genesis of King-James-Version-Onlyism” in *Christian Answers Vol. 2 Num. 4*.
- Letis, Theodore P. [\*The Revival of the Ecclesiastical Text and the Claims of the Anabaptists—Revisited\*](#).
- Ray, James Jasper. *God Wrote Only One Bible*. Junction City, OR: The Eye Opener Publishers, 1955.
- Ray, James Jasper. *God Wrote Only One Bible*. Junction City, OR: The Eye Opener Publishers, 1983.
- Ruckman, Peter S. *The Bible “Bable”*. Pensacola FL: Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1964.
- Ruckman, Peter S. *The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*. Pensacola, FL: Pensacola Bible Press, 1970.
- Spencer, J.H. *A History of Kentucky Baptists from 1769 to 1885 Vol. II*. Cincinnati, OH: J.R Baumes, 1886.