

# **The Real History of the One Bible**

by Kent Brandenburg

No matter what the issue or the doctrine is, you have at least some problem if you cannot establish historic precedent for it. Part of the tactic or strategy for enabling or allowing a new position that has not been taken or believed is to create some type of history of it. For instance, advocates of same sex marriage want people to see it in the fourteenth amendment. After reading that into a mid-nineteenth century law, they proceed to attack their opponents as hateful bigots who don't care about a constitutionally protected right. So step two of inventing a new history is to attack the old or original or real history, to make it look like it was never the history at all. If you can get as many spokesmen as possible repeating the new history, people will just believe it. And then they'll think that the old history is the one that was invented. Especially if it is convenient for people to take the new position.

A lot of people can be wrong. A few people can be right. Jesus reveals that point in Matthew 7:13-14. But when it comes to doctrine, not everybody is going to be wrong. Why? Some will depart from the faith, but not everyone (1 Tim 4:1). The gates of Hell will not prevail against the pillar and ground of the truth (Mt 16:18, 1 Tim 3:15). So if a several or multiple Bible belief were in fact authoritative and true, we would see at least some Christians believing it in history. But, alas, we do not. All we read before the 19th century is one Bible. We don't find a multiple Bible doctrine in history. We have it today, but it started somewhere after the church started and the Bible was complete. In other words, men came up with that belief. It isn't original. It's a man-made doctrine. I would be happy to report otherwise if it were true. But I can't, because it isn't.

The larger point is that the Bible itself teaches one Bible. That's how all those Christians came to their position. They just believed God. Just like there was no theistic evolution position until the 19th century. Christians just believed the biblical account in Genesis. You don't find the multiple Bible position in history before the 19th century because the Bible didn't teach it, so Christians didn't believe it.

So nobody believes in multiple Bibles then, right? Well, no.

Sure, but it is only unbelievers or liberals who take the multiple Bible position, correct? Wrong again. Now you're also a conservative if you believe that. You are still fundamentalist if you believe that.

And if you believe in one Bible? Sorry, but you are a silly, almost brainless, schismatic, thoughtless dufus. You've got to be. That's the way this whole thing will work with no history. People who take the original position can't be taken seriously for the new position to work. I mean, you can't say that you believe in the Genesis account of creation, can you? It's the same kind of thing here. Exactly.

To top all of this off, a whole new history of one Bible has been created out of whole cloth. The standard fake history, akin to same sex marriage being in the 14th amendment, is that the one Bible doctrine came from Benjamin Wilkerson, a Seventh-day Adventist, in a book he wrote in 1930. That's very important. Wilkerson was in a cult (of course). So the nuts who believe this, as you would expect, started with a cult. And then a Baptist pastor did a little less than plagiarize Wilkerson. That was David Otis Fuller, and he spread this new teaching all over. So there we go. Not true. But part of the overall necessity of eliminating the real history of the original doctrine to make room for the new. I recently read this related comment:

And fundamentalists like to make any traditional view sanctified with the full authority of Scripture behind it. At least that's the tendency of some. So the [one Bible] position found how to connect itself to Bible preservation in a way to make the view doctrinally based.

This comment wasn't even questioned. It is now blindly assumed by many. The idea here is that a preferred position was invented in 1930, one convenient to certain Christians, one Bible, and then these went to the Bible to commandeer verses for the cause. That is a lie. In this case, it is definitely a purposeful lie, propaganda-like.

When I've had discussions with those considered to be the greatest experts for multiple Bibles, they agree that the historic doctrine is one Bible. They know that's what Christians believed. When you read the bibliology of Christians, those justified by faith, and creeds and confessions from the same, no one believed in multiple Bibles. All of them believed one Bible. They came to that belief from Scripture itself. Their conviction for one Bible originated from the promises of God's Word.

All the history I read for multiple Bibles goes back to Benjamin Warfield at Princeton in the late 19th century. That's where the teaching of multiple Bibles began. So you've had one line of doctrine about one Bible, and then diverting from that stream of orthodoxy, forming a new path, is Warfield. Others followed. And since then they have invented a fake history and attacked and degraded the true.

John Adams, in 1770 in his defense of the British soldiers who participated in the Boston Massacre, said:

Facts are stubborn things; and whatever may be our wishes, our inclinations, or the dictates of our passion, they cannot alter the state of facts and evidence.

The fact is that Christians have always believed in one Bible. Whatever may be the wish or inclination of the multiple Bible people, they cannot alter that fact.