

Saturday, April 27, 2013—Grace School of the Bible STS Meeting—Bullinger, Hort, Riplinger, and the Mystery of Romans 16:25-26

## **Introduction**

- E.W. Bullinger is perhaps one of the most influential, misunderstood, and misrepresented individuals in the history of dispensational Bible study. One of the reasons for this is because EWB has not been studied from the perspective of historical theology. In other words, EWB's writings have rarely, if ever, been studied in their chronological order and analyzed accordingly. When one studies EWB through the prism of history a complete understanding of his life and ministry comes into focus. Prior to 1900, EWB was advancing what is presently termed as mid-Dispensationalism. It was not until later in his ministry, toward the end of this life, the EWB changed his mind and began advancing the view that the church the body of Christ began in Acts 28.
- Recently, as part of the *Grace History Project* we taught a series of five lessons titled “Rightly Dividing E.W. Bullinger: The Emergence of Acts 28ism.” In this five part mini-series we tried to demonstrate how and why EWB moved away from his early mid-Acts stance and came to espouse Acts 28ism. Time and space will not permit a detailed discussion of these important events as part of this lesson. Interested parties are encouraged to consider Lessons 76-80 of the *Grace History Project*.
- The bulk of the fifth lesson in this series (Lesson 80) was a discussion of Dr. Bullinger's teaching regarding the doxology of Romans 16:25-27. In order to avoid acknowledging the revelation of the mystery prior to Acts 28, Bullinger argued in his 1912/1913 book *The Foundations of Dispensational Truth* that the verses in question were a postscript that Paul added to the end of Romans after he arrived in Rome in Acts 28.
- Today we want to consider EWB's Postscript Theory from the following angles:
  - What is the Postscript Theory?
  - How does Bullinger seek to justify the theory?
  - What does Hort say about the theory? How does it compare with EWB's early thinking?
  - How should we think about Hort?

## **What is the Postscript Theory?**

- The contents of EWB's last book first appeared in serial form in *Things to Come* late in 1911 under the title of *The Lord Hath Spoken: The Foundations of Dispensational Truth*, and continued for the next two years. This series of articles was not collated and published in a single volume titled, *The Foundations of Dispensational Truth* until sometime later. (Carey, 244) Even a cursory study of *The Foundations of Dispensational Truth* erases any doubt as to whether or not Dr. Bullinger ever fully embraced the Acts 28 position before his death. This work represents a

full scale departure from the doctor's earlier writings. The work fully endorses Acts 28 dispensationalism from start to finish.

- The lengths Dr. Bullinger employs to avoid the mystery having been revealed before Acts 28 are shocking. This is clearly illustrated by his comments on Romans 16:25-26 - EWB suggests to his readers that these verses were a postscript that Paul added to his epistles after he arrived in Rome in Acts 28.
  - “We cannot conclude our remarks on the Epistles to the Romans without attempting to meet the difficulty of ascription or doxology with which it concludes, in ch. 16:25-27. It is obvious that this is not a mere BENEDICTION such as that with which the other epistles conclude; or like that in verses 20 and 24. It is clear that a DOXOLOGOY forms no part of the teaching of the Epistles.

. . . We now propose to show how the inclusion of his doxology forms that starting point, and indeed the text of the Epistle which is immediately to follow; Romans being the seed and Ephesians the fruit; both standing together in the very centre of the chronological order of the Pauline Epistles.

That difficulties about the concluding verses of Romans have been experienced is well known; and this is exemplified in the notes in the margin of the R.V. Much has been said on the subject by such scholars as Dean Alford, Bishops Lightfoot and Gore, as well as by Dr. Hort.” (169)

- On page 170, Bullinger enumerates the nature of the supposed textual difficulties. Please keep in mind that EWB said nothing of these supposed difficulties in his comments on Romans 16 in either *The Mystery: Secret Truth Revealed* (1895) or *The Church Epistles* (1898). It is only after he changed his dispensational views that he refers to the work of Alford, Lightfoot, Gore, and Hort to bolster his new dispensational edifice.
  - “Anyone who goes to the original manuscripts must recognize that he is in the presence of a difficulty; and in facing it, we are not doing so for any special purpose connected with interpretation, but to find a solution that shall do honour to the Word itself. **If, in doing this, other difficulties are solved, and our own interpretation finds support, we cannot be otherwise satisfied.**

There is no question whatever about the genuineness or authenticity of these verses. Let this be clearly understood. The evidence is overwhelming as to that. But the difficulty is there, and has to be accounted for.

The facts are these: 1) The doxology itself is variously placed in the different manuscripts; 2) In over 190 it stands after cp. 16:23; 3) In two or three manuscripts it is omitted altogether; 4) In one there is a space left after verse 24; and in another a space is left after 16:23; 5) In some manuscripts it stands in both places; 6) Even in the

manuscripts where the doxology stands as we have it in the A.V., the benediction in verse 24 is omitted. This variation is exhibited in the R.V.

All of this furnishes overwhelming evidence for the accuracy of the text as preserved in the A.V.; and shows us that all the excitement among the transcribers was caused by the fact that the truth of Mystery had long been lost, and by their having been unaware of the suggestion (which we are not the first to put forth) **as to its being a doxology subsequently added.**”

- It appears that Dr. Bullinger seized upon a textual argument to undergird his new dispensational paradigm.
  - “The proper and invariable ending of the epistles is the benediction (“The grace of our Lord,” etc., more or less full), and *not the doxology*. For even when there is a doxology as well, the benediction always comes after it. In four epistles there is a doxology as well as a benediction, viz., Philippians, I and II Timothy, and Romans. But the benediction in these, except Romans, comes last. See Phil. 4:20; I Tim. 6:15-16; and 2 Tim. 4:18.

If the doxology in the Epistle to the Romans be not the postscript (as we suggest), then it stands out as the only exception to this rule which is observed in every other epistle; for we have: (1) the benediction (16:20); then (2) a second benediction (16:24), with a bona-fide postscript necessary to complete, and completely ending the Epistle. But then follows, after all this, a doxology, reopening the Epistle, introducing entirely fresh matter, and the Epistle is left to end in a manner quite unlike that of every other epistle ever written.

Our suggestion as to its being a later addition *by the same hand which wrote the Epistle*: (1) at once explains all the facts we have stated above; (2) shows the cause as well as the groundlessness of the various attempts to amend the text; (3) completes the exquisite structure of the Epistles as a whole, which we show below; and (4) lets in a flood of light from the teaching which follows from it.” (171-172)

### **How Does Bullinger Seek to Justify the Postscript Theory?**

- On page 169, EWB refers to the textual work of Lightfoot and Hort among others as justification for his postscript theory. The book *Biblical Essays* (originally published in 1893) by J.B. Lightfoot contains a chapter titled “The Structure and Destination of the Epistle to the Romans.” This chapter contains three essays, two by Bishop Lightfoot (1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>) and one by Dr. Hort (2<sup>nd</sup>) that originally appeared in the *Journal of Philosophy* between 1869 and 1871. As the title of the chapter suggests, the essays in question comprise a scholarly dialogue between textual critics about the textual structure and readership of the book of Romans.
- The first essay by Lightfoot consists of thirty-three pages of very technical textual information. The introduction to the third essay (also written by Lightfoot) provides a short summary of the

key textual difficulties covered in the Lightfoot's first essay. The Bishop outlines the key textual discrepancies as follows:

- “One or more ancient writers used a copy of the Epistle containing only the first fourteen chapters, with or without the doxology which in the common text stands at the close of the whole (16:25-27).
  - In the existing copies this doxology appears sometimes at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> chapter, sometimes at the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> chapter, sometimes in both places, while in some few instances it is omitted altogether.
  - At least one text omits “Rome” in 1:7, 15.” (Lightfoot, 352)
- Toward the end of the first essay, Lightfoot makes the following argument about the ending of the book of Romans based upon the textual information cited above.
    - 1) “In order to account for all these data, I suggest the following hypothesis. At some later period in his life, not improbably during one of his sojourns in Rome, it occurred to the Apostles to give to this letter a wider circulation. To this end he made two changes in it; he obliterated all mention of Rome in the opening paragraphs by slight alterations; and he cut off the last two chapter containing personal matters, adding at the same time a doxology (Rom. 16:25-27) as a termination of the whole. By this ready method it was made available for general circulation, and perhaps was circulated to prepare the way for a personal visit in countries into which he had not yet penetrated.” (Lightfoot, 318-320)
  - It is beyond historical doubt that in 1869, Lightfoot argued that the final doxology to the book of Romans (16:25-27) was in fact a postscript added by Paul on “one of his sojourns in Rome.” The addition of the doxology, as well as the removal of any references to the city of Rome (1:7, 15) or personal greetings to the Romans (Chapters. 15 and 16) were made for the purposes of creating a circular letter and thereby expanding the readership of the epistle, according to Lightfoot. Careful readers will note that Lightfoot is not specific as to when he believes Paul made these alterations to the original Epistle. Was it on his first or second sojourn in Rome? Lightfoot is not specific. Moreover, Lightfoot's reasons for advancing the postscript theory are textual not doctrinal. In other words, Lightfoot is attempting to explain the textual differences found in various copies of the book of Romans: he is not trying to explain what Paul knew doctrinally and when he knew it.
  - It is also equally clear that Bullinger utilized Lightfoot's postscript theory to advance his new dispensational paradigm when he wrote *The Foundations of Dispensational Truth* in 1912/1913. First, the essays in question by Lightfoot date from 1869 and 1871—a full twenty five years before Bullinger penned *The Mystery Secret Truth Revealed* in 1894/1895 and almost thirty years before *The Church Epistles* was written in 1898. In both of these early works, while holding what appears to be an Acts 13 dispensational position, Bullinger comments on Romans 16:25-27 (see Appendix A) and says nothing about them being a postscript, nor does he mention any textual difficulties associated with the book of Romans. That a scholar of Bullinger's caliber

knew of Lightfoot's thinking on this matter in the 1890s seems beyond question when one considers the frequency with which Bullinger refers to the work of Lightfoot throughout his writings. It is only after his 1908 conversation with Charles Welch about dividing Paul's epistles into two groups with respect to Acts 28 that Bullinger cites the textual work of Lightfoot in his 1912/1913 book in order to bolster his newly adopted dispensational position.

- While Bullinger references the work of Lightfoot as justification for arguing that Romans 16:25-27 was a postscript, he does not make the exact same argument. First, Lightfoot is unclear as to exactly when Paul made the alterations suggested above. Was it during his first imprisonment in Rome (Acts 28) or his second? Lightfoot is not clear. Meanwhile, Bullinger is adamant that the verses in question were added during Paul's first imprisonment in Rome in Acts 28 because they bring closure to the divine structure of the book of Romans and set the table for the revelation of the mystery found in Ephesians and Colossians. In short, Bullinger's primary reasons for advancing his version of the postscript theory are not textual like Lightfoot's but doctrinal. Consider the following statements from Bullinger:
  - 1) "It affords additional evidence to the fact that Paul was not commissioned to commit the truths of the Mystery to writing until after he was in Rome, and in prison.
  - 2) Does not disturb the fact that the Pentecostal Dispensation, recorded in the Acts, was complete in itself.
  - 3) The interpretation of the Epistle falls into line with the other earlier Epistles (Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians), which do not go beyond the scope of the Acts, viz., that "gifts" and "ordinances" which are mentioned only in these earlier Epistles and in the Acts pertain to that Dispensation, which was the period of childhood, when all was "in part"; and when all that was "in part" was to be done away as soon as that which was perfect was come. That which is perfect came soon after the apostle's arrival in Rome, and is incorporated for us in the later Pauline or Prison Epistles. All that pertains to this perfection of standing which we find in the earlier Epistles (especially Rom. 1-8) not only reminds us, but is the foundation, of "that which is perfect." (Bullinger, 174)
- In other words, the postscript theory fits Bullinger's new paradigm. This allows for the explaining away of the revelation of the mystery prior to Acts 28. It appears that Dr. Bullinger is doing exactly what he said he was not, i.e., finding an explanation that will fit his new system of interpretation. Consider Bullinger's final words on the subject.
  - "It is evident from this, that without this doxology (Rom. 16:25-27), the structure of the Epistle as a whole would be incomplete. **It must either have formed part of the original Epistle, in which case it upsets the whole of its Dispensational teaching; or it must have been added later, on the apostle's arrival to Rome, in order to complete the structure, in which case it upsets nothing.**

From all this it appears that the doxology would have been out of place had it formed part of the original Epistle as sent by the apostle; and finds its true place if added by him while living in Rome among those to whom he had sent it. The Epistle itself was already there before him; and when the time came to put into writing, among the apostle's parchments (2 Tim. 4:13), the revelation of the Mystery, the doxology could be then added as being at once the inspired conclusion of Romans, and the inspired introduction to Ephesians." (Bullinger, 174)

### **What Does Hort Say About the Postscript Theory?**

- Hort's comments on the Doxology (Rom. 16:25-27) are of particular interest to the subject at hand. Written in 1871, the careful reader of Dr. Hort will note the similarities between his explanation of the revelation of the mystery with those presented by Bullinger in *The Mystery Secret Truth Revealed* (1894/1895) and *The Church Epistles* (1898). Hort argues that Paul knew the mystery during his early ministry when he wrote Romans, I Corinthians, and Galatians but could not fully expound it due to the spiritual state of the churches he was addressing. In fact, Hort explicitly states that Paul could not have written Romans 9-11 without having known the mystery.
  - "Then comes the idea in which the Doxology culminates, the counsel of the far-seeing God, the Ruler of ages or periods, by which the mystery kept secret from ancient times is laid open in the Gospel for the knowledge and faith of all nations. This idea no doubt pervades the Epistle to the Ephesians, though with considerable enrichments. But is it foreign to St. Paul's earlier thought? The second chapter of I Corinthians at once shews that it was not and explains why the face is not obvious. St. Paul is dealing there with converts who were in danger from pride of eloquence and wisdom (from 1:5 onward). For fear of this danger, he says (2:1), he himself kept back all excellency of speech or of wisdom when he came among them, and confined himself to the bare preaching of the Cross as alone fitted to their imperfect state. But for all that he desired them to know that he too have in reserve a wisdom which he spoke among the perfect. Its nature he briefly hints in words that closely resemble our Doxology ("We speak a wisdom of God in a mystery, that hidden wisdom which God fore-ordained before the ages unto the glory of us" 2:7), and then hastens to explain that, even after being laid open, it demands a spiritual power to discern. The Churches to which he wrote about this time, at Corinth, in Galatia, at Rome, were not in a state to profit by an extended exposition of a belief which yet was strong in the Apostles own mind, and so traces of it in the early period are few. Later it filled a large space in his thoughts, it acquired new extensions and associations, and he had occasion to write to Churches which by that time were capable of receiving it. But it is not really absent even from the Epistle to the Romans. Kindred thoughts find broken and obscure utterance in 8:18-30. The belief itself is the hidden foundation of the three chapters (9-11) in which God's dealings with Jews and Gentile are expounded, and comes perceptibly to light in their conclusion (11:33-36). Now it is precisely in these chapters, as F.C. Baur saw long ago, that the main drift of the epistles is most distinctly disclosed: all its various antithesis are so many subordinate aspects of the relation to Jew

and Gentile which in this seeming episode is contemplated in its utmost generality as reaching from the one end of history to the other. The whole epistle could hardly have a fitter close than a Doxology embodying the faith from which its central chapters proceed. Here at last that faith might well be articulately expressed, though a wise economy compelled it to be latent as long as the Apostle was simply instructing the Romans. This Doxology is in fact a connection link between the epistle at large and the earlier concentrated doxology of 11:36. In both alike human sin and hindrance are triumphantly put out of sight: but here the eternal operation of Him “from Whom, through Whom, and unto Whom are all things” is translated into the language of history. . . A minute examination of the passages briefly indicated in this table will shew that the dominate thoughts of the Epistle,—the thoughts which inspired its beginning (1:1-17), its primary close (15:6-33), and its three characteristic chapters (9-11) in which the old faith and revelation are invoked on behalf of the new,—are precisely those expressed in the final doxology; and that the separate words and phrases of the Doxology are for the most part what have already occurred in the Epistle, while there are hardly any not to be found in epistles of the same or an earlier period. If this be so, the obvious resemblances to part of the later epistles lose all force as evidence of date. The Doxology and I Cor. 2:6-10, a passage absolutely inseparable from its context, support each other in shewing that St. Paul’s late teaching was his early belief;” (Hort quoted in Lightfoot, 325-326)

- Why Bullinger would refer his readers to the textual work of Hort in *The Foundations of Dispensational Truth* (1912/1913) to buttress his postscript theory is beyond our ability to comprehend! Hort’s explanation quoted above directly contradicts the doctrinal argument Bullinger is advancing with respect to the revelation of the mystery. While Hort does state that the revelation of the mystery pervades the later epistle of Ephesians he is equally clear that it is not foreign from Paul’s early thought. Hort’s exposition connects the doxology of Romans 16:25-27 with similar statements about the mystery in I Corinthians 2:6-10. During the early portion of his ministry, knowledge of the mystery factored strongly into Paul’s thinking; however, according to Hort, Paul was not able to fully expound it in Corinth because of the spiritual immaturity of this audience. Incidentally, this is the exact same argument that Bullinger made in 1894/1895 when he penned *The Mystery: Secret Truth Revealed* and in 1898’s *The Church Epistles*. (see Appendix B) In the end, Hort maintains that the doxology of Romans 16:25-27 and I Corinthians 2:6-10 form an inseparable link proving that Paul’s later teaching (Ephesians and Colossians) was his early belief. In other words, Hort thinks that Paul knew the mystery when he wrote Romans and I Corinthians before he reached Rome in Acts 28.
- Hort’s comments are perhaps the best explanation in print regarding Paul’s knowledge of the mystery and how it affected the content and timing of his early epistles. Paul not only knew the mystery when he wrote Romans, but it would have been impossible for him to have written chapters 9-11, i.e., the dispensational section, without a working knowledge of the mystery, according to Hort. Consequently, Hort asserts that the doxology is the only true and proper ending to the book of Romans because the separate thoughts contained in the doxology were already expressed throughout the epistle. An evaluation of Hort’s essay leads to the following conclusions: 1) Hort does not agree with the textual arguments set forth by Lightfoot in the first

essay, and 2) doctrinally, Hort's comments directly contradict the doctrinal arguments of Bullinger in *The Foundations of Dispensational Truth*.

### How Should We Think About Hort?

- When I was conducting this research I almost did not read Hort's essay. After all, haven't we all been led to believe by leading King James only "scholars" that Hort was a New Age Necromancer more interested in channeling evil spirits and leading the Ghostly Guild than studying the Bible? What could this Satan worshiper possibly know about the revelation of the mystery?
- Virtually everything we "know" about Westcott and Hort we have learned from King James only authors. All of which are Acts 2 Baptist with an axe to grind against mid-Acts Pauline dispensationalism. In their zeal to uphold the superiority of the King James they have resorted to shabby scholarship and Ad hominem attacks. Rather than seeking to disprove the textual theories of W&H these authors have sought to attack the men behind the text and have been decidedly unfair and biased in doing so.
- Heretofore, not having read W&H ourselves (myself included) we have uncritically perpetuated the teaching of these Acts 2 Baptist authors. In doing so we have not done any favors to our position on the Bible. Our position is a minority position to begin with, consequently we should not muddy the waters by resorting to unsound and unsubstantiated personal attacks to bolster our position. My belief in the inerrancy of the KJB (based on definition presented in 2011) is not depended upon Ruckman, Grady, Waite, Fuller or Riplinger but on my belief in the Biblical doctrines of Inspiration, Preservation, and a Scriptural evaluation of the facts.
- In my opinion Gail Riplinger can not to be trusted. Consider the following statements from *New Age Bible Versions*.
  - "The Greek text used to translate the NIV, NASB and others was an edition drastically altered by a Spiritualist (one who seeks contact with the dead through séances), who believed he was in the "new age,"" (Riplinger, 2)
  - "New versions (and the 'new' church they are producing) owe their occult bend to their underlying Greek text, a novelty produced in the 1870's by B.F. Westcott, a London Spiritualist. Secular historians and numerous occult books see him as 'the Father' of the current channeling phenomenon, a major source of the "doctrines of devils" driving the New Age movement." (Riplinger, 25)
  - "In tracing the recent revival of channeling, **scores of history books**, as we shall see, point to one origin: Westcott and Hort. These new version authors did not stop with their 'Hermes' Club, but went on to engage in spiritualism and to organize a society called the Ghostly Guild." (Riplinger, 402)



- **“Toppling over the heap of secular histories** which identify Westcott and Hort among the seeds of the present New Age thicket is *The Founders of Psychical Research*, by Alan Gauld. He lists their ‘Guild’ among the ‘Founders,’” (Riplinger, 407).
- When one examines the documentation provided by Riplinger to substantiate her claims she only refers to three books: *The Occult Underground* by James Webb, *The Founders of Psychical Research* by Alan Gauld, and *The Society for Psychical Research: An Outline of Its History* by W.H. Salter. *The Occult Underground* does not even list Westcott, “the father of the modern channeling movement,” in its index, and his name is nowhere mentioned in the book. *The Founders of Psychical Research* has in its index one reference to Westcott, a reference which has nothing to do with the occult. This reference directs the reader’s attention to page 64 where Gauld contrasts the orthodoxy of the intellectuals present at Cambridge during Westcott’s time there in the 1840’s with the “agnosticism or hesitant Deism” of those who came in the 1870’s. This is not exactly the kind of material that Riplinger wants us to read. Salter’s book tells us that Westcott was a member of the Ghostly Guild, which is not in dispute. Riplinger has not produced any quotation from any of these books indicating that Westcott participated in any séance or any other occult activity, and in fact, the books contain no such information. (May, *Westcott and the Ghosly Guild*)
- Even if we consider the biographies of Westcott and Hort as history books the number of books utilized by Riplinger in making her arguments is only five a far cry from the “scores” and “toppling heap of secular histories” that are supposed to prove that W&H participated in the Occult.
- David Sorenson (taking his cue from Riplinger), author of *Touch Not the Unclean Thing* informs his readers on page 176 that “In 1872, Westcott then organized the Eranus Club which included not only Hort, but also Sidgwick, J.B. Lightfoot (of the English Bible Revision Committee), Arthur Balfour (later prime minister of England), and others. The club met to conduct séances in the homes of its members, including the home of Hort, (Sorenson) Sorenson supports his claims by referring his readers to the biography of Hort written by his son Arthur. (May, *Westcott and the Ghosly Guild*) A review of the pages cited by Sorenson reveals that there is not one word present that has anything to do with spiritualism and the occult. The pages simply tell us that the Eranus Club had *meetings* in the home of Hort, not séances. (Hort, *Life and Letters, Volume 2*, 184-185)
- In the heart of Riplinger’s discussion of the alleged occult involvement of W&H she states the following on page 408: “Their subversive and clandestine approach continued, as seen ten years later when Westcott writes, “. . . strike blindly . . . much evil would result from the public discussion (229).” Westcott’s son alludes to the shroud of mystery surrounding the continuation of the ‘Ghostly Guild’. “[M]y father laboured under the imputation of being ‘unsafe’ (235). . . What happened to this Guild in the end I have not discovered (119).” When we examine the footnotes which Riplinger has attached to this quote (#39 & #40) we discover that Gail has strung together material from three different, and widely separated pages from the first volume of

Westcott's biography. The pages are 229, 235, and 119. The simple fact is that the three passages are discussing three entirely different subjects. (May, *Westcott and the Ghosly Guild*)

- “[To J.F. Wickenden, November 14, 1854]: Have you entered into the Maurice controversy? I only hope it may pass away quietly. At the first onset we always strike blindly; and much evil would result from the public discussion of the moot points just now. It is well, I believe, that they have been named; and it will be well for men to get familiarized with them. Then at length they may debate if they please. This is a strange symptom of belief or disbelief---that Mr. Maurice's views of the Atonement seem to have called forth comparatively little criticism.” (*Life and Letters of B.F. Westcott, Volume I, 229*)
- “The following letter to Mr. Wickenden refers to the index to the *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, prepared by him, and to an adverse criticism of *The Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles*, which had appeared in the *Literary Churchman*. It may be remarked in passing that these Cambridge sermons were somewhat severely handled by too orthodox critics, and did not obtain a wide circulation. It was mainly on their account, I believe, that my father laboured under the imputation of being “unsafe.” (*Life and Letters of B.F. Westcott, Volume I, 235*).
- What happened to this Guild in the end I have not discovered. My father ceased to interest himself in these matters, not altogether, I believe, from want of faith in what, for lack of a better name, one must call Spiritualism, but because he was seriously convinced that such investigations led to no good. (*Life and Letters of B.F. Westcott, Volume I, 119*)
- While the Guild did being in 1851, the alert reader will note that the letter from which Riplinger misquotes the words “strike blindly” and from which she gives a time period of “ten years later” was written in 1854, a period of only three years. Concerning the third portion of Riplinger's manufactured quote Westcott's son is not discussing the continuing of the Guild but its end. Riplinger twists the wording to make it sound as if the Guild continued clandestinely; she wants her reader to believe that W&H continued to participate in the occult for the duration of their lives. In the end she states on page 407 “Westcott's son writes of his father's lifelong “faith in what for lack of a better name, one must call Spiritualism. . . .”” The actual words of Westcott's son when taken in context paint a much different picture:
  - “What happened to this Guild in the end I have not discovered. **My father ceased to interest himself in these matters**, not altogether, I believe, from want of faith in what, for lack of a better name, one must call Spiritualism, **but because he was seriously convinced that such investigations led to no good.**” (*Life and Letters of B.F. Westcott, Volume I, 119*)
- Arthur Westcott says the exact opposite of what Riplinger claims. The biography says nothing about a “lifelong” anything. Riplinger's accusation of a “lifelong faith in spiritualism” is nothing short of nonsense and the exact opposite of Arthur's point.

- In the section of Riplinger’s manufactured quote where she speaks about Westcott being labeled “unsafe,” Arthur Westcott is discussing the publication of two of his father’s books *Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles* and *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* and not the occult. (*Life and Letters of B.F. Westcott, Volume I, 235*) Consider the following quotations from the books in question and judge for yourself whether or not Westcott was a Satan worshiper.
  - “The narratives of the Gospels admit of the most manifold combinations, not because they are constructed artificially, but because **they are true records of the Truth**. Everything tends to show that the intricate relations which exist between them were not the result of any conscious purpose, **but of that Inspiration which led the Evangelists to preserve only such details as have a lasting and representative interest**. This they did from different points of sight; and each special aspect of truth admits of a perfect combination with the others both in its parts and as a whole.” (Westcott, *Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles*, viii-ix)
  - “**My obligations to the leaders of the extreme German schools are very considerable, though I can rarely accept any of their conclusions.**” (Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, viii)
  - “It (the Bible) is authoritative, for it is the voice of God; it is intelligible, for it is in the language of men. The possibility of such a combination seems to follow directly from a consideration of the nature and form of Inspiration; and the same reflections which establish a necessary connection between inspired thoughts and inspired words, point out the natural transition from the notion of an inspired teacher to that of an inspired book, and justify the application of the epithet at once to the impulse and the result, an ambiguity which at first sight creates only confusion and embarrassment,.” (Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, 7)
  - It (Inspiration) presupposes that the same providential Power which gave the message selected the messenger; and implies that the traits of individual character, and the peculiarities of manner and purpose, which are displayed in the composition and language of the sacred writings, are essential to the perfect exhibition of their meaning. It combines harmoniously the two terms in that relation of the finite to the infinite which is involved in the very idea of revelation. It preserves absolute truthfulness with perfect humanity, so that the nature of man is not neutralized, if we may thus speak, by the divine agency, and the truth of God is not impaired, but exactly expressed in one of its several aspects by the individual mind.” (Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, 14-15)
- Westcott states in a letter dated December 4, 1899 that he was not a mystic and that he believed in the incarnation of Christ.

- “I don’t think that I have even used the word “mystics”: it is so hopelessly vague, and it suggests an esoteric teaching which is wholly foreign to the Christian. But from Cambridge days I have read the writings of many who are called mystics with much profit. Everyone who believes that phenomena are “signs” of the spiritual and eternal receives the name, and to believe in the Incarnation involves this belief, does it not? After all, the first chapter of Genesis is the Protevangelium.” (*Life and Letter of B.F. Westcott, Volume 2, 309*)
- Where W&H Satan worshipers? The arguments made by Riplinger and others do not stand up under scrutiny. They have manufactured quotations and documentation attacking W&H personally in an attempt to buttress their position of the Bible. Not only are such attacks easily proven wrong, but they are unproductive in furthering our position on the Bible.
- As misguided as they were regarding the text of the Bible, W&H were not complete apostates. Attacking the textual theories of W&H is quite different from attacking them as people. *The Revision Revised* written by Dean Burgon in 1883 painstakingly debunks the textual work of W&H without resorting to personal vendettas. Burgon’s works along with *The Identify of the New Testament Text* by Wilbur Pickering are scholarly works that refute W&H’s textual theories without utilizing Ad hominem attacks.
- Acts 17:11—as believers that are often unfairly maligned due to our perceived affiliations (Jordanites) we need to be careful not to do the same. We need to be Bereans about everything that we teach.
- We have set our own agenda in every other area of study except this one. When it comes to the King James Bible we have capitulated to the research and theological viewpoints of Acts 2 Baptists who do not agree without about much of anything. We need to do our own research and generate our own resources that are not only in line with our theology but devoid of senseless personal attacks that do not further our position.

### Works Cited

- Bullinger, E.W. *The Mystery: Secret Truth Revealed*. Wilber, PA: Bible Student's Press, 1895.
- Bullinger, E.W. *The Church Epistles*. Decatur, MI: Invictus, 1898.
- Bullinger, E.W. *The Foundations of Dispensational Truth*. Decatur, MI: Invictus, 1913.
- Carey, Juanita S. *E.W. Bullinger: A Biography*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2000.
- Hort, Arthur F. *The Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, Volume II*. Macmillan & Co: London, 1896.  
[http://books.google.com/books?id=oxc3AAAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&hl=en#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?id=oxc3AAAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&hl=en#v=onepage&q&f=false)
- Lightfoot, J.B. *Biblical Essays*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1893.
- May, James. *Westcott and the Ghostly Guild*. <http://www.westcotthort.com/jmay/ghostlieguild.html>.
- Riplinger, Gail. *New Age Bible Versions*. Ararat, VA: A.V. Publications, 1993.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. *An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*. Macmillan & Co. London, 1860.  
[http://books.google.com/books?id=vs4TAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?id=vs4TAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false)
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. *Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles*. Macmillan & Co. London, 1859.  
[http://books.google.com/books?id=vs4TAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?id=vs4TAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false)
- Westcott, Arthur. *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, Volume I*. Macmillan & Co: London, 1903.  
<http://archive.org/details/lifeandlettersb00unkngoog>
- Westcott, Arthur. *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, Volume II*. Macmillan & Co: London, 1903.  
<http://archive.org/details/brookefosswestco02westuoft>

## Appendix A

### Summary of Bullinger's early comments on Romans 16:25-27

- *The Mystery: Secret Truth Revealed* (1895)
  - “It seems impossible for us to fix the date of the revelation of the mystery to Paul, or say in what part of the Acts it should be placed. From II Corinthians 12:1-7 it would appear that “the abundance of the revelations” was given “above fourteen years ago.” This was written about A.D. 60, and fourteen years before would bring it to A.D. 46, which would synchronize with the important dispensational chapter, Acts 13, where we have the solemn epoch-making words pronounced to the Jews, “It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the gentiles.” (50)
  
- *The Church Epistles* (1898)
  - “The important of thus rightly dividing is seen in the final member (16:25-27) of the Epistle, and in every other. Here we have *the Mystery* in contrast to “God’s Gospel” (in 1:1-6). . . . It surely must be clear to the simplest honest mind that “God’s Gospel,” which is expressly stated to have been “promised afore by His prophets in the Holy Scripture,” cannot possibly be the same as “the Mystery which was kept secret since the world began” . . . If they be the same, then language is useless for the purpose of revelation. If this be “doctrine and instruction”—what is the special instruction conveyed by stating that “promised afore” means “kept secret from times eternal” (RV) until now? . . . No: we abide by the teaching here given, that “the Mystery” was a revelation made to Paul (2 Cor. 12:1, 7; Gal. 1:12, etc.), after his Divine calling to be an Apostle. . . What the Mystery (or Secret) is, is not the purpose of the Epistle to the Romans to teach. The subjective, doctrinal foundation for it is laid; and it is merely mentioned at the close in order to complete the beautiful structure of the Epistle, and to prepare the way for it to be taken up in the Ephesians; where it is fully dealt with as the next great lesson to be taught in Romans must first be experimentally received and learned, before we can pass on to the more advanced lessons of Ephesians. Having learned what it is to have died with Christ, and to have been raised with Christ, we are, in Ephesians, further taught what it is to be now already seated in the Heavens in Christ.” (75-77)

## Appendix B

### Summary of Bullinger's early comments on I Corinthians 2

- *The Mystery: Secret Truth Revealed* (1895)
  - “Instead of declaring the Mystery, he (Paul) had to confine himself to the simplest truths of the Gospel. He preached only a crucified Savior. He could not declare all the great truths involved in a risen and glorified Savior. . . (quotes I Cor. 2:4-10) . . . These words have a special reference to the “hidden wisdom,” i.e., the mystery, and what is stated here is that no human being ever dreamed of it. It never entered into the head or heart of mortal man, “but God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit.” Then he goes on to explain what is the essence of a secret, in verses 10-11, and argues that a no one can tell what a man’s secret is, so no one could possibly have known what God’s secret was unless He had been pleased to reveal it. . . (quotes I Cor. 3:1-4) . . . The great central truth of the whole argument is that these Corinthian Christians were taken up with “Bodies” of men, as we now call them, they were therefore totally unfitted to receive the truth of the “one Body” of Christ. While they were putting the members in the place of the Head, they were carnal and not spiritual, and therefore not in a position to have the truth concerning “the mystery” declared to them.. Hence when the apostle went to Corinth he determined not to go beyond the simplest elementary gospel teaching, to feed them with milk, to proclaim a crucified Savior; for they were not in a condition to hear about the glorified Savior. . .” (43-45)
  
- *The Church Epistles* (1898)
  - “We have seen how, in Rom. 16:25-26 “the Mystery” is referred to and stated as a fact. The time was come for it to be made known, that the saints might be established as the Church of God, apart from the earthly hope of Israel as a nation, now, that as a nation Israel was cast-off. The saints were to know a higher and a heavenly calling. But in I Cor. 2 the reasons are given why, when the apostle was at Corinth, he could not preach “the Mystery” to the saints there. . . Instead of recognizing that they were “one body in Christ” and “members one of another” (Rom. 12:5) they were forming separate “Bodies” of their own, and classing themselves under different teachers, and everyone said, “I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas” (I Cor. 1:12). Instead of reckoning themselves as having died with Christ to sin, since he had died for their sins (Cp. 6:4) they were living in sin. . . This is why he could not preach “the Mystery: to them. . . That is to say, owing to there divisions, and their being taken up with their own “Bodies,” they were not in a fit condition, spiritually, to receive the revelation of the Mystery, which is the one body of Christ, of which He is the glorious Head in heaven, and His people the members of on earth.” (81-83)

## Appendix C

General Chronology of the Ministry of E.W. Bullinger

Note: This chronology is not indented to be exhaustive

- 1837—Born
- 1861—Graduates from King’s College
- 1861—Married Emma Dodson
- 1862—Ordained into the Anglican Church
- 1867—Becomes sectary for the Trinitarian Bible Society
- 1877—*A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament*
- 1881—Doctor of Divinity conferred.
- 1892—*The Kingdom and the Church*
- 1893—*The Witness of the Stars*
- 1894—*Number in Scriptures*
- 1894—*Things to Come Journal*
- 1894/95—*The Mystery: Secret Truth Revealed*
- 1898—*The Church Epistles*
- 1907—*How to Enjoy the Bible*
- 1907—Decision to produce the *Companion Bible* (publication dates below)
- 1908—Conversation with Charles Welch
- 1909—*Part I, The Pentateuch*
- 1910—*Part II, Joshua to Job*
- 1911—*Part III, Psalms to Song of Solomon & Great Cloud of Witnesses*
- 1912—*Part IV, Isaiah to Malachi*
- 1911-1913—*Foundations of Dispensational Truth*
- 1913—Death
- 1913—Monument to Tyndale unveiled
- 1914—*Part V The Four Gospels*
- 1921—*Part VI, Acts to Revelation*