

[Online Donations to
DBS](#)

[Join the
DBS](#)

[DBS Video
Sermons](#)

[Missionary Representative](#)

[Why The Dean
Burgon Society](#)

The Dean Burgon Society

[In Defense
of
Traditional
Bible Texts](#)

The Authorized King James Bible has been, and continues to be, the God honored, most accurate, and best English translation of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, and preserved original language words of God.

DR. EDWARD FREER HILL'S POSITION ON THE KJB

The Dean Burgon Society's 1991 Annual Meeting

Dr. Robert Barnett, Vice President of the Dean Burgon Society

© Copyright 1999 by the author, reproduction and distribution rights assigned to the Dean Burgon Society.

[INTRODUCTION](#)

[I. HIS BACKGROUND AND EDUCATION](#)

[II. HIS CONFLICTS](#)

[III. HIS TRADITIONAL APPROACH TO BIBLE DEFENSE](#)

[IV. HOW TO STUDY DR. HILLS' BOOKS](#)

[V. HILL'S DEVELOPED DEFENSE OF THE OLD KJV](#)

[CONCLUSION: WHY BELIEVING BIBLE STUDENTS MUST USE THE KJV](#)

[BIBLIOGRAPHY](#)

INTRODUCTION

Why look today at the position of the late Dr. Edward F. Hills on the King James Bible? This paper was originally suggested by Dr. Waite as a method to encourage deeper study into the scholarship which defends our Bible among those in the Dean Burgon Society. Second, many of us who defend the 1611 KJB are often told that there are no reputable scholars who hold to our position. Dr. Hills was first a traditional critical scholar in the field of textual criticism before re-examining the evidence, and calling for a return to the traditional Bible texts. Dr. Hills' faith in the authorized King James Version cannot be easily characterized as based upon ignorance, blind faith, or un scholarly assumptions.

This paper is a brief condensation of my understanding of the position of the late Dr. Edward F. Hills

on the divine providential preservation of the Bible. Our primary goal will be to emphasize Hill's strong stand on the KJB. Having discovered many years ago that Dr. Hills had already been gifted of God to accurately articulate an excellent defense of our faith in the same 17th century approved scriptures we endorse, it seemed proper to some of us to express our God given faith in His Holy Scriptures through the same traditional system already in use by our 17th century forefathers. This same historical position was defended in the 19th century by John William Burgon, and revived in the 20th century by men like the late Dr. Edward F. Hills.

I. HIS BACKGROUND AND EDUCATION.

We acknowledge our reliance upon the writings of Theodore P. Letis for the early life of Hills. The late Edward Freer Hills, Th.D.(1912-81) spent many years in preparation before launching his defense of both the original language texts and the 1611 KJB in English. He graduated summa cum laude from Yale. Reared in a strong orthodox Presbyterian home and grounded in the Bible, Hills sided with Machen in the dispute over the drift at Princeton and the establishing of Westminster. Hills enrolled at Westminster and graduated with a Th.B. Then he applied to Columbia Theological Seminary to get his Th.M. He wanted to do his thesis on the inspiration of the Scriptures, but was turned down. He finally gained approval to write on slavery and how it related to the scriptures, the church, and present social problems.

From there Dr. Hills returned home to Chicago and tried to enter the doctoral program of the University of Chicago and study textual criticism under Ernest Cadman Colwell, a leading textual critic. Hills had planned to earn a doctorate from one of the leading liberal schools, being trained under their best professors, and earn his doctorate in textual criticism. After two years of study, they sent him a letter telling him they did not find him qualified to become a textual critic, and denied him the opportunity to write his thesis.

From there Hills went on to prove Chicago wrong by earning a Ph.D. in textual criticism from Harvard Divinity School. We gave some details of Dr. Hills' educational background as described by Theodore P. Letis, so you could see not only his qualifications, but also the challenges he overcame in preparation to oppose the naturalistic system of textual criticism enshrined in most institutions of higher learning.

II. HIS CONFLICTS

Dr. Hills labored to gain acceptance as an accomplished textual critic, yet was deprived of his reputation and acceptance as such because he believed by faith in the divine providential preservation of the original language texts of the Bible, and the resultant accuracy and authority of the 1611 KJB in English. This approach was repugnant to those who embraced Warfieldianism. Warfield, in an attempt to defend orthodox Bible authority from the threat of textual variants had devised a plan using German rationalism to isolate the inspired, inerrant, infallible Bible and identify it only as the perfect original autographs. Warfield then endorsed the use of the naturalistic Bible of Westcott and Hort as still accurate, but void of inspiration, inerrancy and infallibility. Hills rejected both this artificial Bible division by Warfield, and the 19th century enlightenment scholarship of the Westcott and Hort persuasion which discredited the traditional texts of the churches for centuries.

Dr. Hills represented an important 20th century link in the contingency which unites us with Burgon, Owen, Beza and other giants in each generation of an unbroken line, going back to the original

infallible autographs. - Believing Bible Study, pp. 194-205. Dr. Hills defended the old KJB not as just another good translation, but as representative of an established standard or canon of Holy Scriptures which we in the 20th century have no divine right or authority to replace.

Hills was rejected by his peers in textual criticism because he abandoned the "neutral" approach of the 19th century Enlightenment, for the historical 17th century "theological" approach to Bible defense. Hills believed our relationship to the divine author of the Bible, must take preeminence over scientific theories and presuppositions of human scholars who have attempted to undermine the credibility and authority of the Bible. Instead of following his peers and their scholarship, he followed His Lord and exposed scholarly unbelief to Bible believers.

While trained in the 50's to defend Westcott and Hort, Hills saw through the hypocrisy, and was supporting the labors of 19th century John William Burgon before the 60's. -King James Version Defended, pp. 139. The theories of Griesbach yielded variants which had given skeptics fuel to deny any and all Bible authority. Hills saw through the Warfieldian approach which adopted Enlightenment methods to secure a Bible authority which could not be challenged, the infallibly inspired originals. -KJVD, pp. 110. Hills discovered early that the only real defensible Bible possessed by the church goes back to our 17th century canon.

III. HIS TRADITIONAL APPROACH TO BIBLE DEFENSE.

A. His Theological approach based upon faith in God and His Revelation.

Dr. Hills's apologetic system begins with God and His revelation to man as our source for knowing God and His Holy Scriptures. -BBS, pp. 1, 56; KJVD, pp. 4,87. As all traditional Calvinists, he believed knowing God through His revelation to be man's highest duty and delight. Your author received the same basic approach in apologetics through Dr. Victor Matthews at the Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary.

If it can be said that Dr. Hills had one foundational presupposition upon which his views of textual criticism rest, it would be his acceptance of God and His revelation as the source, support, and end of all true Christian thinking. In The King James Version Defended, Dr. Hills entitled chapter one, "God's Three-Fold Revelation Of Himself". He listed this Three-Fold Revelation as subtitled: "1. In Nature God Reveals Himself As The Almighty Creator God." "2. In The Scriptures God Reveals Himself As The Faithful Covenant God." and "3. In The Gospel God Reveals Himself As The Triune Savior God." Dr. Hills based his apologetic system upon this three-fold revelation of God in theology.

Dr. Hills restated this faith position on page 61: "He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him (Heb. 11:6b). If I truly believe in God, then God is more real to me than anything else I know, more real even than my faith in Him. For if anything else is more real to me than God Himself, then I am not believing but doubting. I am real, my experiences are real, my faith is real, but God is more real. Otherwise I am not believing but doubting. I cast myself therefore on that which is most real, namely God Himself. I take God and Jesus Christ His Son as the starting point of all my thinking."

How then did Dr. Hills apply this faith to his stand upon an infallible Bible? Let Dr. Hills tell us in his own words: "How do we take our stand upon divine revelation? Only in one way, namely through the logic of faith. 'For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that

whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' (John 3:16). Since this Gospel is true, these conclusions logically follow: First, the Bible is God's infallible inspired Word. This must be so, because if our salvation depends on our believing in Christ, then surely God must have left us an infallible record telling us who Jesus Christ is and how we may believe in Him truly and savingly. Second, the Bible has been preserved down through the ages by God's special providence. This also must be so, because if God has inspired the Holy Scriptures infallibly, then surely He has not left their survival to chance but has preserved them providentially down through the centuries. Third, the text found in the majority of the biblical manuscripts is the providentially preserved text. This too must be true, because if God has preserved the Scriptures down through the ages for the salvation of men and the edification and comfort of His church, then He must have preserved them not secretly in holes and caves but in a public way in the usage of His Church. Hence the text found in the majority of the biblical manuscripts is the true, providentially preserved text. Fourth the providential preservation of the Scriptures did not cease with the invention of printing. For why would God's special, providential care be operative at one time and not at another time, before the invention of printing but not after it? Hence the first printed texts of the Old and New Testament Scriptures were published under the guidance of God's special providence."

"Thus when we believe in Christ, the logic of our faith leads us to the true text of holy Scripture, namely, the Masoretic Hebrew text, the Textus Receptus, and the King James Version and other faithful translations. It is on this text, therefore, that we take our stand and endeavor to build a consistently Christian apologetic system." - KJVD pp. 86. So Dr. Hills did not base his faith upon blind assumptions, "circular reasoning", or "unproven assertions" as some have charged, but upon God and His divine revelation. Dr. Hills' use of presuppositions was his philosophical method of defending his apologetic system from attacks by naturalistic critics. Again Dr. Hills was following a faith position used by Bible-believers over many generations to defend their faith from attacks from the philosophical false logic and reasoning of unbelief.

Furthermore, Dr. Hills believed all principles about Bible Preservation must come from God and the Bible. "In New Testament textual criticism, therefore, we must start at the highest point. We must begin with God, the supreme and eternal Truth, and then descend to the lower, temporal facts which He has established by His works of creation and providence. We must take all our principles from the Bible itself and borrow none from the textual criticism of other ancient books. It is only by following this rule that we will be able to distinguish facts from the fictions of unbelievers." -KJVD pp.115. Notice how Dr. Hills placed "temporal facts" at the bottom, while modern critical scholars start with this tangible evidence and search their way through the variant filled manuscripts up to faith in God.

Dr. Hills believed that if we begin all our thinking with God and His revelation, then His Son Jesus Christ will become our teacher and model on how we should approach scripture. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast (Eph. 2:8,9). If we have received from God the gift of faith and if we have taken Jesus Christ, God's Son, as the starting point of all our thinking, then we must adopt the same view of Holy Scripture that Jesus believed and taught during the days of His earthly ministry. Let us therefore consider first the doctrine of our Savior concerning the Hebrew Old Testament Scriptures." Dr. Hills covered this subject in chapter #1 of Believing Bible Study. In chapter #2 of Believing Bible Study, Dr. Hills applied the promises of Jesus Christ for the New Testament to the manuscript evidence. Therefore, Dr. Hills based his approach to textual criticism in both the Old and New Testaments upon the example and teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Finally, Dr. Hills believed that our Lord Jesus Christ left us with an anointing which has guided each

generation of believers to accept truth and reject error. "But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him." (1John 2:27).

Dr. Hills believed the Holy Spirit led the church to accept the canon of Holy Scriptures and reject non-canonical books: "Thus through the Holy Spirit's guidance of individual believers, silently and gradually - but nevertheless surely - the Church as a whole was led to a recognition of the fact that the twenty-seven books of the New Testament, and only these books, form the canon which God gave to be placed beside the Old Testament Scriptures as the authoritative and final revelation of His will." -Believing Bible Study, pp. 33.

"This guidance of the Holy Spirit was negative as well as positive. It involved not only the selection of canonical New Testament books but also the rejection of many non-canonical books which were mistakenly regarded as canonical by some of the early Christians....Soon all Christians everywhere were led by the Holy Spirit to repudiate these spurious works and to receive only the canonical books as their New Testament Scriptures." -Believing Bible Study, Page 33

Finally Dr. Hills reminded us that the Holy Spirit not only led in the forming of the 66 book canon of Holy Scriptures, but also the content of each book in Bible Preservation. "Thus the Holy Spirit guided the early Christians to gather the individual New Testament books into one New Testament canon and to reject all non-canonical books. In the same manner also the Holy Spirit guided the early Christians to preserve the New Testament text by receiving the true readings and rejecting the false. Certainly, it would be strange if it had been otherwise. It would have been passing strange if God had guided His people in regard to the New Testament canon but had withheld from them His divine assistance in the matter of the New Testament text. This would mean that Bible-believing Christians today could have no certainty concerning the New Testament text but would be obligated to rely on the hypotheses of modern, naturalistic critics." Believing Bible Study, page 33.

This ministry of the Holy Spirit collectively through each believer in each generation down through the centuries is termed "the common faith" by Dr. Hills. This is the theological presupposition by which we can assert that each generation had a providentially preserved Bible upon which they could rest their faith for time and eternity. Not only has this been true collectively for the past generations of saints in history, but it is true subjectively for each saint who holds this same theological position today. Dr. Hills said, "This then is the basic reason why I know the Bible is true. The Bible is true because it is true for me. The Holy Spirit bears witness with my spirit that I am a child of God and that therefore all the promises of holy Scripture are true in my case With Jesus Christ I am join heir, because His death by faith is mine (Rom. 8:17), But what more precisely do I mean when I say that the Bible is true? The Bible itself tells me that I mean four things. First, the Bible is God's revelation of Himself. Second, the Bible is eternally established. Third, the Bible is infallibly inspired. Fourth, the Bible is providentially preserved." -Believing Bible Study, pages 59,60.

Dr. Hills defended all the verses in the KJB. He reminded us that God used the Old Testament priesthood, and not the Roman Catholic church to preserve the Old Testament canon for us. - BBS, pp. 12,62. This is a scriptural fact. "What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." (Romans 3:1,2). Dr. Hills reminded us that God used the common faith of the believer priests in the New Testament to validate the canon both in scope and content. -BBS, pp. 30,50,51.

B. Hills defended the 17th Century English Canon.

John William Burgon had defended the authorized KJB as an established canon. However, concerning the Greek Textus Receptus, he advocated a much more accurate future course for any future textual criticism of the original New Testament text. His methodology, if implemented, would have extensively and more fairly evaluated all the historical evidence. It would have provided a much more accurate naturalistic model than the critical text model of Westcott and Hort. -KJV, pp. 192. Both Burgon and Hills believed any variants claimed to be in the Textus Receptus and/or the Authorized Version should be placed in the footnotes or elsewhere, but not in the text of the Authorized Version. While Burgon supported a naturalistic approach to the TR which honestly evaluated all the evidence, he did not believe any results which might challenge the TR should be used to alter the text of the authorized English KJV. However, an often ignored fact is that, Burgon did not believe the 19th century even possessed the men and resources to carry out such a revision. Dr. Waite as president of the Dean Burgon Society has publicly stated that the 20th century is no more able to meet Burgon's standards for revision of the TR now, than was the 19th century. Neither century has had available the quality or quantity of scholars possessed in the 17th century.

Dr. Hills in the tradition of Burgon defended the authorized KJV from future textual change, but he also went beyond the high church Anglican position of Burgon and defended the 17th century creedal statements of faith which declared the infallible authority of the traditional Hebrew and Greek texts underlying the KJV as canonical standards as well. It is this difference in Hills which also sets him in conflict with the modern "critical" New Majority Greek Text of Dallas. (The Greek New Testament According to The Majority Text by Zane C. Hodges/Arthur L. Farstad).

We have observed the error of Dallas for abandoning the 17th century theological approach. In place of defending an established 17th century canon of Holy Scriptures, Dallas moved to defend the original autographs through "statistical probability." (Statistical Probability is the belief that the original autographs would have been used to produce the first mass of copies, and then would have existed long enough to assure us that the continuing majority would perpetuate the text of the originals). As a result, Dallas could not fully support the 17th century statement of faith on the Holy Scriptures. While Dallas claims to have followed Burgon's philosophy toward the underlying Greek text, they did not follow Burgon's recommended methods, and therefore cannot claim their product would receive his endorsement.

Accepting by faith the 17th century Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek text underlying the Authorized KJV, as final canon, Hills would not have been open to more naturalistic approaches which would in the future alter that established canon.

IV. HOW TO STUDY DR. HILLS' BOOKS.

Because of the depth and diversity of Dr. Hills' writing, the average person may gain more interest in Dr. Hills by digging into specific areas of his Bible defense. For example, if you have questions about a particular verse called into question by other Bible versions, you will find it defended in Dr. Hills' books. But to begin a general study of Dr. Hills, I would suggest that you start by reading Believing Bible Study, you may wish to skip chapter #6 on your first reading. As you read, high-light or mark those sentences and paragraphs which teach you important truth. As you begin study of The King James Version Defended, I would suggest that you skip the first three chapters, (unless you understand the history of philosophy well), and start with page 85. Studying Hills can be like panning for gold, if you are willing to patiently persevere and slowly learn well his defense of God's Holy Scriptures. Don't become discouraged if Hills at first seems difficult. Don't become side-tracked and bogged down in details which may not be important to you at this time in defending

your Bible. Study Dr. Hills with the intention of gleaning some of the basic fundamentals of defending your KJB. You will gradually assimilate more and more of Dr. Hills' approach as you study.

V. HILL'S DEVELOPED DEFENSE OF THE OLD KJV.

A. Latin forerunners influencing our KJV.

Under "The Forerunners of the King James Version" Dr. Hills reminded us of the early portions of the Bible first translated into English from the Latin Vulgate. He spoke of the work of Caedmon (d.680), Bede (672-735), King Alfred (848-901), and finally John Wycliff (d.1384), who translated the entire Latin Bible into the English of his day. -KJV Defended, pp.213; -BBS, pp. 109,196. It was no doubt from these early English scriptures that the Holy Spirit led our forefathers to glean by faith from the western line of Bible texts knowledge resulting in a common faith which would cause them to insist that certain verses be retained in any future English Bibles. -BBS, pp. 111.

Just as Hills believed the Apostles respected the Septuagint as God's "...providentially approved translation of the Old Testament into Greek", he also believed we should respect the Latin Vulgate in spite of its errors as "the providentially appointed Bible version for Christians of Western Europe during the medieval period." -BBS pp.82.

Dr. Hills reminded us that the first English translation of the New Testament from the original Greek as preserved in the East, was by William Tyndale in 1525-26. While describing the versions between Tyndale and the authorized KJV, Dr. Hills reminded us that "...five sixths to nine tenths of the latter is derived from the martyred translator's work." The common faith which guided the final preparation of the canon for print brought a merger of the two lines of preserved Bibles from the East and West. In Hills words: "In the days of Erasmus, therefore, it was commonly believed by well informed Christians that the original New Testament text had been providentially preserved in the current New Testament text, primarily in the current Greek text and secondarily in the current Latin text. Erasmus was influenced by this common faith and probably shared it, and God used it providentially to guide Erasmus in his editorial labors on the Textus Receptus." -KJV Defended, pp. 107, 197; -BBS, pp. 187.

Dr. Hills reminded us that the reformation Bible reflected the primary authority of the Greek text of the East, and the secondary authority of the Latin text of the West. He said the Eastern text was more pure because the Greeks followed corrupt Greek philosophy and left the Bible text intact, while the West maintained purer doctrine through men like Tertullian and Augustine, but altered their Bible text more. BBs pp.111. Hills proved over and over by examples from the reformers like Calvin, Beza, Luther, etc., that the common faith of the believers determined the final form of the text which merged the best of the East and West into a common canon of faith. Dr. Hills believed the 17th century Bible canon resulted from the divine merging of two existing lines of Bible texts, and not advanced revelation, or double inspiration of the reformation Bibles.

Hills believed there is a holy war going on between Christ and Satan over the Holy Scriptures. Satan is constantly striving to corrupt them, and Christ has been continually correcting the corruption and preserving His word. -BBS, pp. 53. -KJVD, pp. 231. The worst corruption was during the first two centuries. -BBS, pp. 114. The purifying and preserving of the text reached the highest point in the 17th century canon which merged the purist forms of both providentially preserved texts from the

East and West, and which resulted in the reformation. Hills believed the battle has intensified since the 17th century with Satan striving to counter the canon of scripture by flooding the world with modern corrupted Bibles.

Hills believed the common faith of the reformers was given by the ministry of the Holy Spirit who guided these men bearing witness to the truth in their hearts. -BBS, pp. 59. "Three principles of believing Bible study are included in this conviction which we receive from the Holy Spirit that the Bible is truly God's Word. These are as follows: first, the infallible inspiration of the Scriptures; second, the eternal origin of the Scriptures; third, the providential preservation of the Scriptures. -KJVD, pp. 88,89. One cannot logically claim to possess an infallible Bible from God without holding firmly to all three points.

B. The KJV a God guided translation.

Dr. Hills concluded of the finished work on the KJB: "Surely this is a God-guided translation on which God, working providentially, has placed the stamp of His approval." -KJV Defended, pp. 216. It was this text behind the KJB which produced the reformation. BBS 62,63. Dr. Hills believed that even the English words and language style used in the authorized KJB were not contemporary, but biblical, deriving much of their form and style from the original Hebrew and Greek texts. -KJV Defended pp.213.

Hills reminded us that biblical English was developed providentially for the express purpose of praising God. For those who don't pray using such English, Dr. Hills asked if the problem is not lack of reverence for God rather than problems with the language. Such an argument makes a good point, in light of the fact we still don't seem to mind singing old hymns of worship in old biblical English. -BBS pp. 85.

While Dr. Hills did not believe in secondary inspiration of the authorized KJB, he did believe the translators were providentially guided even in the marginal notes in the KJB. -BBS 65. He pointed out that the many revisions of the KJB between 1611 and 1769 dealt first with mistakes in printing, and later as English spelling and punctuation became standardized, changes were made in the authorized version to reflect these English changes. -KJV Defended 217. -BBS pp.66. (For those interested in more such details, we would recommend The King James Version of 1611 the Myth of Early Revisions, by Dr. David F. Reagan. Available from Trinity Baptist Temple Bookstore, 5709 N. Broadway, Knoxville, Tenn. 37918.)

C. The KJB an independent variety of the Textus Receptus.

Dr. Hills believed the authorized KJB was not merely an accurate translation of the Textus Receptus, he believed it was an independent variety of the Textus Receptus: "The translators that produced the King James Version relied mainly, it seems, on the later editions of Beza's Greek New Testament, especially his 4th edition (1588-9). But also they frequently consulted the editions of Erasmus and Stephanus and the Complutensian Polyglot. According to Scrivener (1884), out of the 252 passages in which these sources differ sufficiently to affect the English rendering, the King James Version agrees with Beza against Stephanus 113 times, with Stephanus against Beza 59 times, and 80 times with Erasmus, or the Complutensian, or the Latin Vulgate against Beza and Stephanus. Hence the King James Version ought to be regarded not merely as a translation of the Textus Receptus but also as an independent variety of the Textus Receptus."

As to questions about differences between the various forms of the Textus Receptus. Dr. Hills said, "The texts of the several editions of the Textus Receptus were God-guided. They were set up under the leading of God's special providence. Hence the differences between them were kept down to a

minimum. But these disagreements were not eliminated altogether, for this would require not merely providential guidance but a miracle. In short, God chose to preserve the New Testament text providentially rather than miraculously, and this is why even the several editions of the Textus Receptus vary from each other slightly." KJV Defended, pp. 222.

D. The KJB God's providentially appointed English Bible.

Not only did Dr. Hills believe the authorized KJB to be an independent form of the TR, but he believed it to be God's providentially appointed English Bible. -KJV Defended, pp. 229. Hills suggested we hold the same view of the KJB as the apostles maintained toward the Greek Septuagint. Hills illustrated this saying, "In their Old Testament quotations the Apostles never made any distinction between the Septuagint and the Hebrew Scriptures. They never said, 'The Septuagint translates this verse thus and so, but in the original Hebrew it is this way.' Why not? Why did they pass up all these opportunities to display their learning? Evidently because of their great respect for the Septuagint and the position which it occupied in the providence of God." We remind our readers that the record bears witness that our Lord Jesus Christ never corrected any Bible text with the originals either. (Some believe the Septuagint was not available at all at that time, but was probably Origen's fifth column.)

E. The KJB the only Authoritative English Bible.

Not only did Dr. Hills believe the authorized KJB to be God's providentially appointed English Bible, but consequently, he believed it to be "The Only Authoritative English Bible." He said, "Of all the English Bibles now in print only the King James Version is found on the logic of faith. Therefore only the King James Version can be preached authoritatively and studied believingly...How can you be sure that you have the true New Testament text? Only by beginning your thinking with Christ and the Gospel and proceeding according to the logic of faith...Hence the formation of the Textus Receptus was God-guided. The Textus Receptus, therefore, is a trustworthy reproduction of the infallibly inspired original New Testament text and is authoritative. And so is the King James Version and all other faithful translations of the Textus Receptus." -B.B.S. page 87.

F. Is the King James Version Perfect? - Not Ideally but Practically.

"Admittedly the King James Version is not *ideally* perfect. No translation ever can be. But it is the product of such God-guided scholarship that it is *practically* perfect." -B.B.S. page 83. (While Dr. Hills admitted possibly three small errors, your author still concurs with the late Dr. David Otis Fuller that it is better to term such as "problems" rather than "errors".)

G. "How to Defend the King James Version - Make Assailants Prove Their Point."

Dr. Hills reminded us not to treat the KJB like just another version: "When we defend the King James Version, we do not place it on a level with other English Bible versions and then try to find out which version has the fewest mistakes. This would be too subjective. We must start out rather with the objective fact that the King James Version is preeminently the English Bible translation on which God, working providentially, has placed the stamp of His approval. Hence the King James version must be regarded as correct unless it can be conclusively shown to be otherwise. Those that assail it must be required to prove their point. By demonstrating that they cannot do so we defend our historical English Bible." -B.B.S. page 81. Even when people go to great lengths in attempting to disqualify the old KJB, we should simply remind them that we support it in the same manner as our 17th century forefathers as our established canonical English standard which is not subject to change.

CONCLUSION: WHY BELIEVING BIBLE STUDENTS MUST USE THE KJV--A RECAPITULATION

"In regard to Bible versions many contemporary Christians are behaving like spoiled and rebellious children. They want a Bible version that pleases them no matter whether it pleases God or not. 'We want a Bible version in our own idiom' they clamor. 'We want a Bible that talks to us in the same way in which we talk to our friends over the telephone. We want an informal God, no better educated than ourselves, with a limited vocabulary and a taste for modern slang.' And having thus registered their preference, they go their several ways. Some of them unite with the modernists in using the R.S.V. or the N.E.B. Others compromise by using the N.A.S.V. or the N.I.V. Most of them, however, go all out for the T.E.V. or Ken Taylor's Living Bible. And they do not stop there. More and more in 'evangelical' circles the trend is to do without the Scriptures altogether and to rely on gospel music, Christian films, tapes, counseling and psychology to do the work that only the Bible can do."

"But God is bigger than you are, dear friend, and the Bible version which you must use is not a matter for you to decide according to your whims and prejudices. It has already been decided for you by the workings of God's special providence. If you ignore this providence and choose to adopt one of these modern versions, you will be taking the first step in the logic of unbelief. For the arguments which you must use to justify your choice are the same arguments which unbelievers use to justify theirs, the same method. If you adopt one of these modern versions, you must adopt the naturalistic New Testament textual criticism upon which it rests. This naturalistic textual criticism requires us to study the New Testament text in the same way in which we study the texts of secular books which have not been preserved by God's special providence. In other words, naturalistic textual criticism regards the special, providential preservation of the Scriptures as of no importance for the study of the New Testament text. But if we concede this, then it follows that the infallible inspiration of the Scriptures is likewise unimportant. For why is it important that God should infallibly inspire the Scriptures, if it is not important that he should preserve them by His special providence? And this leads to the conclusion that the Gospel is not important. For why is the Gospel important, if it is not important that the Bible which contains the Gospel should be infallibly inspired and providentially preserved? Are you not willfully blind, then, dear brother, if you refuse to admit that the use of these modern Bible versions leads to modernism?"

"How, then, do we find the Bible version that pleases God? By reversing the process and naturalistic reasoning, by beginning with Christ and the Gospel and proceeding according to the logic of faith. Since the Gospel is true, the Bible which contains this Gospel is infallibly inspired. And since the Bible is infallibly inspired, it has been preserved down through the ages by God's special providence, not secretly in holes and caves and on forgotten library shelves, but publicly in the usage of God's Church, the Old Testament through the Old Testament priesthood, and the New Testament through the New Testament priesthood, namely, the universal priesthood of believers. Moreover, the providential preservation of the Scriptures did not cease with the invention of printing, for why would God preserve the sacred text at one time and not at another time? Hence the formation of the Textus Receptus was God-guided, and this text is therefore a trustworthy reproduction of the divinely inspired original text. And so is the King James Version and all other faithful translations of the Textus Receptus. Hence today and for the foreseeable future the King James Version is the English Bible that truly pleases God."

"Taking our stand, therefore, on this true Bible text, we make God and His revelation of Himself in holy Scripture the starting point of all our thinking and all our actions. In the realms of biblical textual criticism, biblical introduction, apologetics, theology, philosophy, science, and politics we proclaim our Christian faith to all the world not as a probability but as a certainty. It is only in this way that we can do our duty to God and to our country. It is only in this way that we can demonstrate our loyalty to Jesus Christ, the **KINGS OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS** (Rev. 19:16)." -BBS, pp. 227,228.

We pray this brief review of the position of the late Dr. Edward F. Hills defending the old KJV will encourage your heart, strengthen your faith, and motivate you to a stronger defense of your English Bible authority.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hills, Edward F.

The King James Version Defended. Des Moines: The Christian Research Press. 1956, 1973.

Believing Bible Study. Des Moines: The Christian Research Press. 1967, 1977

Letis, Theodore P.

Edward Freer Hills' Contribution To The Ecclesiastical Text . Vallecito: Journal Of Christian Reconstruction, Volume twelve, Number two, 1989, pages 21-172.

(Above material first copied for this paper from "Edward Freer Hills's Contribution to the Revival of the Ecclesiastical Text." Unpublished thesis of Theodore P. Letis in partial fulfillment of the degree of Master of Theological Studies. 1977)

The Majority Text: Essays and Reviews in the Continuing Debate. Grand Rapids: Institute For Biblical Textual Studies. 1977

[[HomePage](#)] [[Up](#)] [[How We Got Our Bible](#)] [[Which Bible Will You Trust?](#)]
[[King James Bible Authority](#)] [[Dr. Edward Freer Hill on the KJB](#)]
[[The KJB, Mission Boards & the DBS](#)] [[The Attack on the Canon of Scripture](#)]
[[Deification of our KJ Bible](#)] [[The Plain Sense Of Scripture](#)] [[Defending The KJB](#)]
[[A Reply to Dr Daniel Wallace](#)] [[Perfect Bible Not Perfect Version](#)] [[Truth Or Lies](#)]
[[Answers To Anti-KJV Questions](#)] [[Bible Inspiration and the KJB](#)] [[King James Only?](#)]
[[Multiversions Onlyism](#)] [[Video Bible Sermons of Wayside BC](#)]
[[Video Bible Sermons of Straightway BC](#)]



the
**Dean
Burgon
Society
Inc.**

Box 354 - Collingswood, New Jersey 08108, U.S.A.
Phone: (856) 854-4452
Fax: (856) 854-2464
E-mail: DBS@DeanBurgonSociety.org

WebSite PageViews:

256724

By Logos Ministries - An anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast - hope in Christ Jesus (Heb. 6:19)