

A young Christian had heard in Sunday School that the world and the Devil so hated God's word that they would confiscate and destroy every copy. "It would happen in his life time!" he was told. He took and hid his Sunday School award Bible up in his attic and said, "They will never take away my Holy Bible!"

When he was all grown and a junior in seminary he became troubled when an old Baptist preacher gave him a flier that listed the twenty verses ripped out of modernist bibles. When he looked, he found that those verses were not in his Bible. The Bible student scoured through his whole seminary looking for a King James Authorized Bible to see what they said and found none on the premises. He took a bus to his father's old house, climbed up into the attic, and retrieved his old Sunday School award Bible, and there were all twenty of those verses. He made this profound observation, "The Devil never did come and confiscate our Bibles, Christians just forsook them and turned them over for new modernist versions that do not reflect the infallible, inerrant, verbally inspired Words of God."

The truth in that scenario shows subtle power of this diabolical deception. Ecumenical bibles do indeed change doctrine. Baptists, true Baptists, only use the Authorized King James Bible.

A new chapter of Bibliology needs to be penned. The Bible colleges and seminaries of our day are swallowed in this compromise and they cannot write it. A significant portion of this work is used to expose the diabolical compromise which in these last of the last days is engulfing Christendom and leading honest God fearing Christians down the dangerous path of using modernist, ecumenical bibles.

While holding an Authorized King James Bible in my hand I can state with bold assurance, "I hold in my hand the verbally inspired, inerrant, infallible word of God."

Dr. Gaussen's superb defence of inspiration is given in its entirety in Chapter 4 of this work, but after dealing with "various readings", which modernist scholars call "errors in the texts", Dr. Gaussen, in 1850, wrote a very similar statement:

"Not only was the Scripture inspired on the day when God caused it to be written, but that we possess this word inspired eighteen hundred years ago; and that we may still, while

holding our sacred text in one hand, and in the other all the readings collected by the learned in seven hundred manuscripts, exclaim, with thankfulness, I hold in my hands my Father's testament, the eternal word of my God!"<sup>1</sup>

This bold assurance of holding a verbally inspired, inerrant, infallible Bible in my hand, in this twenty-first century, is not to be mucked up by naysayers supposing that "only the original autographs were inspired." It is not to be refuted by double-tongued Johnny-come-lately naysayers accusing a KJV-onlyism of a "Double Inspiration Heresy." Dr. John M. Asquith gives excellent argument against such double-talk:

"When anyone drops the charge of double inspiration on a King James Bible Believer, the best response is to ask them if they believe in single inspiration. I make no bones about it, I believe and teach that the King James Bible is inspired. That draws a pretty quick response from some who have a pretty muddled understanding of inspiration."<sup>2</sup>

Double inspiration, loosely defined, might be "The authors of the Holy Bible were inspired, AND the King James translators were ALSO inspired." The late Dr. Peter Ruckman seems to have started all the "double inspiration" cloud of dirt swirling around, but even Dr. Ruckman did not consistently hold to such a teaching.<sup>3</sup>

- 
- 1 L. Gaussen, *Theopneustia: The Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures*, Edinburgh & London: Johnstons & Hunter, 1850, Chapter IV Examinations of Objections, Section III. The Various Readings, closing paragraph, citation from authors "21cent\_vol02Bibliology", pg 194
  - 2 Dr. John M. Asquith, Nov 11, 2019, 3 min read, from <https://www.purecambridgetext.com/post/2019/11/09/double-inspiration> accessed 3/27/2022. Dr Ascuith authored "Further Thoughts on the Word of God", The Black Creek Baptist Church, Black Creek, NY, see [www.purecambridgetext.com/](http://www.purecambridgetext.com/)
  - 3 From <https://www.ruckmanism.org/doubleinspiration>, "Our mission is to warn about the dangers of Ruckmanism while upholding the trustworthiness of the KJV", accessed 3/27/2022, Quote, "While reading Ruckman's books we do not recall a case in which Ruckman stated something to the effect that the KJV was an extra inspiration, but he strongly implies such by applying the double inspiration argument to those who say the KJV cannot be inspired. Adding to the complexity in the analysis of Ruckman's views is that he at times denies what he seems to

While teaching my grandson's Bible Preservation class at Vision Baptist College, Solid Rock Baptist Church, Berlin, NJ, Dr. James Alter highlighted several quotes from their assigned text that highlighted the truth, "With an Authorized Version in hand we are holding the verbally inspired, inerrant, infallible Word of God."

In that course text, "King James, His Bible, and its Translators", in Chapter 19, "The Authorized Version and the 'Originals'" Laurence M. Vance superbly captures and documents that the Authorized Version, and the Authorized Version alone, captures the originals with a transparency that allows the English reader to hold and grasp their very content and form. Some excerpts of that documentation are given below:

Robert Alter (not James Alter's father), in the preface to his recent translation of Genesis, relates that "The King James Version, as Gerald Hammond, an eminent British authority on Bible translations, has convincingly argued, remains the closest approach for English readers to the original." Hammond himself maintains that "at its best, which means often, the Authorized Version has a kind of transparency which makes it possible for the reader to see the original clearly ... Through its transparency the reader of the Authorized Version not only sees the original, but also learns how to read it."<sup>4</sup>

Dr. Vance continues in that vein:

Some have gone a step further, equating the Authorized Versions in some way to the "originals." The Authorized Version is "the acknowledged representative of the originals," wrote William Smith in his 1814 work on Metre Psalmody. In a

---

affirm about double inspiration of a translation: "We cannot claim direct inspiration in the original Biblical sense for the King James text..." (Ruckman, Peter. Theological Studies. Booklet 15, 1988, p. 15). This seems contradicted by the following, which implies a second inspiration occurred with the KJV: "The Holy Spirit has thrust Himself into the AV committee of 1611 and said, 'WRITE...!'" (Ruckman, Peter. The Book of Acts. 1974, 1984, p. 356)."

- 4 Vance, Laurence M., "King James, His Bible, and its Translators", Vance Publications, Orlando Florida, 2006, 2016, pg 224.

sermon on “The English Bible” preached by John Nevin (1803-1886) of the Western Theological Seminary in 1835, that was published in the *Presbyterian Preacher* in 1836, he said that “perhaps no translation, take it altogether, ever represented more fully and happily the rich and expressive features of the sacred original.” “Time has rendered it sacred,” wrote bishop and Greek grammarian Thomas Middleton (1769-1822). The style of the Authorized Versions, according to Ira Price (1856-1939), late Professor of the Semitic Languages and Literatures in the University of Chicago, “to an astonishing degree is merely the style of the original authors of the Bible....”<sup>5</sup>

Dr. Vance goes on for another page with these hundred year old references validating that the Authorized Version is translated into English with such clarity that its style, wordings, and verbiage completely capture the original Greek and Hebrew style, wordings and verbiage. This attribute of the Authorized Version, its transparency into the originals, is the quality that makes it irreplaceable. Modernist, ecumenical, copyright versions, with their “more understandable” dummed down English, cannot hold a candle to what we have in an Authorized Version! But please allow here a couple more citations where even the critics justify such a brash thesis. Before citing Alexander Roberts in his lecture Dr. Alter first clarified that Robert's book, on its first page, quotes the Authorized Version's translation of 1Peter 1:21 because Robert's beloved *Revised Version* evidently mistranslates it!<sup>6</sup> Here then is Dr. Vance's citation of God's critic, Alexander Roberts:

---

5 Ibid.

6 1Peter 1:20 *Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. 21 For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.* The 1881 Revised Version, and its 1901 American Standard Version translates these verses “knowing this first, that no prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost (ASV Spirit).” Note that the latter does not give transparency to the original in style (“no prophecy ever came...” vs *prophecy came not in old time...*), in wording (RV completely dropped *holy*), or in verbiage (“men spake from God, being moved...” vs *holy men of God spake as they were moved...*). It is little wonder that Roberts opens his book quoting the Authorized Version and not his beloved Revised Version!

It is not surprising, then, that it has been recognized – even by the critics – that the Authorized Version is no ordinary translation. Alexander Roberts (1826-1901), one of the translators of the *Revised Version*, wrote in his *Companion to the Revised Version of the New Testament* (1881) about the very book he took apart in revising: “It (The AV) is probably the best version ever made for public use. It is not simply a translation but a living reproduction of the original Scriptures in idiomatic English, by men as reverent and devout as they were learned. It reads like an original work, such as the prophets and apostles might have written in the seventeenth century for English readers.” ...

... Another translator of the *Revised Version*, Archbishop Richard Chenevix Trench (1807-1952), maintained in his *On the Authorized Version of the New Testament in Connection with some Recent Proposals for Its Revision* (1858) that “we must never leave out of sight that for a great multitude of readers the English Version is not the translation of an inspired Book, but is itself the inspired Book.”<sup>7</sup>

I dare not give Vance's whole chapter here, his documentation is indeed overwhelming, but Dr. Alter's lecture highlighted enough of it to elicit a hearty “Amen and Amen” (Greek) or even a “Verily, Verily” (English) from anyone who has called this King James Bible inerrant, infallible, and inspired. Vance does continue on the next page:

It is only natural that language equating the Authorized Version with the originals would also include explicit references to what some Christians believed to be its divine status. The poet William Blake (1757-1827) who claimed to be able to “read Greek as fluently as an Oxford scholar,” in his only recorded mention of the Authorized Versions, remarked that “astonishing indeed is the English translation, it is almost word for word, and if the Hebrew Bible is as well translated, which I do not doubt it is, we need not doubt of its having been

---

7 Ibid. pg 225-226.

translated as well as written by the Holy Ghost.” ... The Irish playwright George Bernard Shaw (1856-195) remarked that the translators of the Authorized Version “made a translation so magnificent that to this day the common human Britisher or citizen of the United States of North America accepts and worships it as a single book by a single author, the book being the Book of Books and the author being God.”<sup>8</sup>

The documentation continues for several more pages. It is documentation which affirms that this belief in an inspired English Bible is as old as the Authorized Version itself, and it will not be dismissed by a few naysayers trying to market their modernist, ecumenical, copyright bibles. Let this excerpt be summarized by Vance's aforementioned James Barr who tells us that:

in much popular fundamentalism there was practically no awareness of an original text at all, much less of any variations within that original: what functioned as the inspired text was the English of the Authorized Version. Officially, no doubt, there was some awareness that the translation was not the original, but in practice this made little or no difference, since for all all practical (i.e. all religious) purposes the English translation was a precise transcript of the will of God. This Authorized Version fundamentalism still continues in many quarters.<sup>9</sup>

The book you are holding, and the other 11 volumes of this *Systematic Theology for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, is written from one of those fundamental quarters. Dr. Vance interrupts his superb documentation to say, “Every generation of scholars since the Authorized Version made its appearance, has been responsible for perpetrating two myths.” Those said in a more folksy way, every generation thinks they are wiser than their grandpa. They are generally very wrong, mistaking more knowledge for more wisdom. The second myth is that the original Greek and Hebrew languages are far superior to the English. Both myths are

---

8 Ibid., pg 227.

9 Ibid., pg 228-229.

exposed as faulty by Vance's chapter "The Authorized Version and the Originals."

This is not too much depth for this introduction, it is still introductory. Satan, and the marketers for modernist, ecumenical, copyright bibles will rail against the King James Bible from every quarter. Here be aware that their railing accusations are villainous in purpose and they are vain. In his Chapter 13 "Editions of the Authorized Version," Dr. Vance documents against their railing accusation, they supposing that the Authorized Version's text was significantly altered in several revisions. Dr. Vance documents each one of the changes and shows the ongoing integrity of the text. Dr. Vance's book is well worth the read for the serious Bible student. Gaussen's book "*Theopneustia*" is given in its entirety in Chapter 4 of this work and it defends well why we can call our Bible inerrant, infallible, and inspired despite "The Various Readings" of the original languages.

But let us not get the cart before the horse here. There are indeed enemies to God's exhortation that "All Scripture is given by *inspiration*," but their efforts should not be completely debunked before a viable working definition of inspiration, inerrancy, and infallibility are well grounded. Let us review some background information about the Holy Bible and then delve into Gaussen's exceptional defense of inspiration.

## Chapter 2 - The Holy Bible, Some Background

...