



the Dean Burgon News

IN DEFENSE OF TRADITIONAL BIBLE TEXTS

\$.30 a Copy • \$2.50 a Year

VOL. I, NO. 11

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE DEAN BURGON SOCIETY

NOV. - DEC., 1979

New Executive Committee For D.B.S.

The Dean Burgon Society's finally approved and cleared Executive Committee which was voted on at the Annual Meeting of Oct. 2-4, 1979, in accordance with all the provisions of our Articles of Faith, Operation, and Organization, were as follows, elected for the coming year, 1979-1980: (1) Rev. D. A. Waite, Director of The Bible For Today, from Collingswood, New Jersey (DBS President for another term); (2) Rev. D. O. Fuller, President of Which Bible? Society from Grand Rapids, Michigan (DBS Vice-President for another term); (3) Rev. M. J. Hollowood, Professor at Maranatha Baptist Bible College & Seminary from Watertown, Wisconsin (DBS Vice-President for another term); (4) Rev. E. A. Griffith, Pastor, Bible Baptist Church from West Chester, Pennsylvania (DBS Secretary for another term); (5) Rev. H. L. Morgan, Pastor, Grace Bible Church from Elmer, New Jersey (DBS Treasurer for the first term); (6) Rev. E. L. Bynum, Pastor, Tabernacle Baptist Church from Lubbock, Texas (DBS Editor, Publisher, and Executive Committee Member for another term); (7) Rev. B. D. Cummons, Pastor, Massillon Baptist Temple (DBS Executive Committee Member for his first term); (8) Rev. P. C. Fedena, Pastor of Faith Baptist Church, from Fairless Hills, Pennsylvania (DBS Executive Committee Member for another term); (9) Mr. E. W. Fowler, layman and Adult Bible Teacher at First Baptist Church from New York City, New York (DBS Executive Committee Member for another term); (10) Rev. F. A. McQuade, Pastor, Fellowship Baptist Church from Glen Mills, Pennsylvania (DBS Executive Committee Member for another term); (11) Rev. G. D. Mellish, Canadian Secretary of the Trinitarian Bible Society from Weston, Ontario, Canada (DBS Canadian Representative and Executive Committee Member for another term); (12) Rev. L. R. Oats, Graduate Student and Professor at Maranatha Baptist Bible College

An Answer To "Textus Receptus: Is It Fundamental To Our Faith?"

By Rev. D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.
President, The Dean Burgon Society

[Installment #1]

[Written by Dr. Thurman Wisdom, Dean of the School of Religion at Bob Jones University, as printed in Faith For The Family, October, 1979, pp. 3-4]

We plan, in the next several months of our Dean Burgon to make a reply to the article entitled "Textus Receptus: Is It Fundamental To Our Faith?" by Dr. Thurman Wisdom,

and Seminary from Watertown, Wisconsin (DBS Executive Committee Member for his first term); (13) Mr. R. O. Sanborn, layman active in tract and literature distribution and member of Sunlit Shores Baptist Church from St. Petersburg, Florida (DBS Executive Committee Member for his first term); (14) Rev. T. M. Strouse, Professor at Maranatha Baptist Bible College and Seminary from Watertown, Wisconsin (DBS Executive Committee Member for his first term).

All 14 of these brethren filled out a two-page "Screening Questionnaire" and passed other qualifications set down as standards for their office before being accepted as having been duly elected to their office, and these 30 pages giving their answers and background is available to anyone sending a GIFT to DBS of \$1.00 to cover the costs of postage and handling.

Each of these fine, fundamentalist brethren who are dedicated to the cause of The Dean Burgon Society and its high purposes need your prayers during this coming year for wisdom and leadership by the Lord Jesus Christ Himself as they guide this ONE-YEAR-OLD infant organization which God has raised up in these trying times! □

Dean of the School of Religion at Bob Jones University, which appeared in Faith For The Family, October, 1979, pp. 3-4.

We have received some inquiries concerning this article from our friends of the Dean Burgon Society who have been puzzled by this article and are looking forward to reading our reply to it. There certainly is another side of this question, and we intend to devote some time and space to giving that "other side."

I. PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

A. Our Purpose. By answering this article which appeared in the Bob Jones University magazine, Faith For The Family, and written by one of its professors, we do not mean to demean or to put down Bob Jones University for all of its fine and great stands for the fundamentalist and separatist causes through the years, for we are very much in favor of the major part of their programs and have been for many years now. We stand together on the fundamentals of the Christian Faith, and we also stand together on the great cause of Biblical separation and in opposition to the compromises of Neo-Evangelicalism and similar dangers facing our church world today. Having said this, however, we feel that there are some issues (not personalities) raised in this article which demand our answer and reply.

B. Our Attitude. Our attitude, therefore, as we approach this answer to Dr. Wisdom's article, will be to deal—not with personalities, but—with principles as they are to be discovered within the article itself. We write in the spirit of love and understanding, wishing only to shed some light on the subject at hand, without, if possible, generating an excessive amount of heat, though it is often impossible to avoid a little heat while attempting to shed some light. We feel very definitely that it is well within the province of

THE DEAN BURGON SOCIETY, INC. proudly takes its name in honor of Rev. John William Burgon (1813-1888), the Dean of Chichester in England, whose tireless and accurate scholarship and contribution in the area of New Testament Textual Criticism; whose defense of the Traditional Greek New Testament Text against its many enemies; and whose firm belief in the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible, we believe, have all been unsurpassed either before or since his time!

"KING JAMES FANS" (?)

By E. L. Bynum

Copyright © 1979 by E. L. Bynum

[Installment #2]

Dr. Rice's False Statements

He wrote, "I have a tract before me by Brother E. L. Bynum of Lubbock which claims to be 'a resume of Dr. Otis Fuller's book, *Which Bible?*' I have that book also before me. The tract says, 'We as evangelicals

believe the Bible to be the verbally inspired Word of God, inerrant—namely without error. THEN—we ask, is there one version extant among the multiplicity of versions which is without error today? If there is not, then we worship a God who is either careless or impotent to keep His Word pure thru the ages.'" Dr. Rice was sadly mistaken when he wrote the above words. I did not write the tract that he is quoting from, and he can never produce such a tract at all. The tract that he is quoting from is entitled, "*Is The King James Version Nearest To The Original Auto-graphs?*" Nowhere on the tract does it say or even hint that it was written by E. L. Bynum. It was written by Dr. David Otis Fuller. Less than two inches above the quote that Dr. Rice printed, in the same column and on the same page, it is clearly printed and set out by itself, "By David Otis Fuller." How could he miss that?

He says that I have misquoted Fuller, but I did not. These are Fuller's own words. He did not finish Fuller's questions in the paragraph, which stated, "HOW can we say we believe in the inerrancy of the Word of God and yet say there are errors in every translation?" It appears that Brother Rice wanted to cast Fuller's statement in the very worst light possible, for the very next paragraph of the tract says, "We do not say that the KJV does not permit changes. There are a number that could be and should be made BUT there is a vast difference between a change and an error." Of course he couldn't print that, because that would have made the tract not seem to be so radical after all!

He Does Not Answer Fuller's Tract

Although he had the tract right in front of him, he doesn't answer "Is The King James Version Nearest To The Original Auto-graphs?" He doesn't answer the title, nor does he attempt to answer the material printed in the tract. We suggest that he can't and that is one reason he has to take off on a tangent and print a tirade against those who defend the KJV against the rash of revisers and critics. He also says, "Dr. Fuller over-

The Supernatural Approach To Textual Criticism

(Installment Number 2)

By Thomas M. Strouse, Ph.D.
Maranatha Graduate School Of Theology
Watertown, Wisconsin

[Continued from last month]

Thus in Textual Criticism, the texts arrived at are either close to the original or they are not. And the text that does not represent the original cannot be the Word of God. So Textual Criticism has produced two basic texts, and they are dissimilar at many key theological junctions. Thus, one text must be the true text and one must be a perversion of the true text.⁴

How is it that we then have two basic texts? the Majority Text and the Minority Text, the Byzantine Text and Eclectic Text, the TR and Aleph and B? Is it not because of the basic conflict between two supernatural beings, God and Satan? Surely many textual critics display the epitome of naivety when they follow the lead of Hort who asserted that all the "scribes were angels." The truth of the matter is that there has been diabolical design to undermine, pervert, and confuse the true text of the Holy Scriptures. Even Origen was disturbed by heretics who altered and manipulated the text for their doctrinal interests.⁵ Thus, in recognizing the supernatural import and spiritual ramifications of Textual Criticism, one must proceed to the approach to Textual Criticism.

The Approach To Textual Criticism

The approaches to Textual Criticism can be summarized under two heads—natural and supernatural. Although the materials are the same for each approach, it is the textual critic's theological bias concerning the transmission of the text that determines his approach. For instance, Hort was biased against the TR long before he ever examined the materials.⁶ Is it no wonder that Hort's work is diametrically opposed to the TR? In effect then, advocates of both approaches use the a priori methodology. Natural textual critics say "let us find the non-Majority Text that has been preserved;" whereas, the

states the case in his book, *Which Bible?* and is somewhat accountable for all the radicals who rush into controversy on this subject." This is a harsh statement to make against a man who pastored a great Church for about 40 years, and who has given his life to the preaching and teaching of the pure Word of God. Dr. Fuller cannot be responsible for what every defender of the KJV says, anymore than Dr. Rice can be responsible for what every critic of the KJV says. If Dr. Fuller has overstated the case, why doesn't Dr. Rice prove him to be wrong. Dr. Rice does not answer *Which Bible?* and we predict he won't.

[TO BE CONTINUED]

Can You Send A Christmas Gift To D.B.S.

We have combined our November and December issues of our *Dean Burgon News* in order to permit our staff workers to spend the extra several weeks during the Christmas season with their wives and families and to take a much-needed vacation from their faithful and helpful service to our cause.

As we look forward to Christmas—1979, the Dean Burgon Society has much for which to thank our God! But we do have a great need for gifts from you, our readers, and from our various members scattered across the world. We would pray that through these Christmas Gifts (which are Tax Exempt under current I.R.S. regulations) we might close our year in the black. To do this, we especially need to cancel our small indebtedness of about \$1,500.00 yet left on our Miller's reprint book on the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament and some smaller bills. Can you send us a one-time GIFT of \$1,000? or \$500? or \$250? or \$100? or \$50? or \$25? or \$15? or \$10? or \$5? If the Lord so directs you, we'd be grateful and the Lord would be pleased as well. Make all checks payable to: **The Dean Burgon Society**, Box 359, Collingswood, New Jersey 08108. You will receive a tax deductible numbered receipt by return mail for any GIFT you might send along. Thank you!

our purposes as a Dean Burgon Society to give explanations, and defense when it comes to the principles of our Society which are under attack, not only among the Neo-Evangelical circles, but also among our sister-fundamentalist organizations, groups, churches, schools, and pastors. We realize that it might be expecting too much to see men "back down" from their positions after having espoused them in writing for the entire Christian world to behold, however, we would hope that in the future, such brethren might be somewhat more charitable at least to a position which they do not presently hold but which many of the rest of us equally sincere Bible-believing fundamentalist and separatist brethren continue to hold to and even to a greater degree the more we continue to read and study on these issues which face us.

C. The Importance of These Issues.
[To be continued]

Circulate These Books

A Guide To The TEXTUAL CRITICISM Of The New Testament, by Edward Miller, for a gift of.....	\$7.00
THE REVISION REVISIED, by Dean John William Burgon, for a gift of.....	\$12.00
HERESIES OF WESTCOTT & HORT, by Dr. D. A. Waite, for a gift of.....	\$2.50
GREEK NEW TESTAMENT—RECEIVED TEXT, for a gift of.....	\$6.00
WHICH BIBLE?, edited by Dr. David Otis Fuller, for a gift of.....	\$5.00
TRUE OR FALSE?, edited by Dr. David Otis Fuller, for a gift of.....	\$5.00
COUNTERFEIT OR GENUINE?, edited by Dr. David Otis Fuller, for a gift of.....	\$5.00

textual critics of the supernatural text say "let us find the text that God promised to preserve."⁷

Therefore, it is necessary to summarize the two approaches and their corresponding sub-points to analyze the overall picture and ascertain the Biblical approach to the Textual Criticism of the Supernatural Text.

The Naturalistic Approach To The Transmission Of The Text

This position assumes the transmission of the NT text is on the level of normalcy equivalent to any ancient text. Thus, its transmission is natural, similar to the natural transmission of ancient texts for which there was no divine preservation promised nor needed. For instance, Karl Lachmann, a forerunner to Westcott and Hort, was a classicist on Lucretius and others, who attempted to reconstruct the fourth century text (thus *simia Bentleii*), completely abandoning the TR. His approach was completely as a classicist and a philologist disregarding the theological and supernatural. Hort, who built much on the work of Lachmann, took the same approach. As far as he was concerned, the approach to the Textual Criticism of the NT is the same as any other ancient book.⁸ And of course this assumes there was no need for divine preservation because there was no diabolical tampering of the text. However, this has already been pointed out not to have been the case.

Then, by implication, the natural critics assert that the "best text" has been brought to the fore by a group of rationalistic textual critics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. And so the true text of the originals has been lost to the first fifteen centuries of Christianity, restored by textual critics who had a low view of the inspiration of the NT text, but surprisingly, as it is alleged, had a "high view" of the preservation of the text. Why is it that this text was not restored earlier by true Christians? In fact Van Bruggen states astutely, "if Hort's arguments are proven right, then it is strange that they were not advanced earlier. If they are wrong, the question becomes urgent why they were still generally accepted in the last century."⁹

The outcome of this approach is a non-definitive text. Eclecticism becomes the answer for the text, thus being very subjective. The text that 20th century naturalistic critics furnish for Christianity is based on the majority vote of Aland, Metzger, Black, Wikgren, and Elliott of the UBS Greek Text. And with the many questionable readings in their text indicated by their own textual apparatus, they obviously do not have a definitive text, and therefore do not have the Word of God. Long ago, another naturalistic textual critic expressed this outcome most accurately as he attempted to repudiate Burgon's position on the Traditional Text. F. C. Conybeare stated:

He was, in fact, upholding a paradox; he would not—perhaps could not, so dense was the veil of prejudice with which the old theory of inspiration covered his eyes—see that prior to the collection of the Gospels in a canon, about the year 180, and while they

were still circulating singly in isolated churches, their text was less fixed and more liable to changes, doctrinal and transcriptional, than they ever were afterwards; and that the ultimate text, if there ever was one that deserves to be so called, is forever irrecoverable.¹⁰

[To Be Continued]

⁴Greenlee fails to see this as he credulously states "the TR is not a 'Bad' or misleading text, either theologically or practically. Technically, however, it is far from the original text," p. 72.

⁵J. W. Burgon, *The Last 12 Verses of the Gospel According to St. Mark* (Grand Rapids: Associated Publishers and Authors, Inc., n.d.), p. 176.

⁶A. F. Hort, *Life and Letters of Penton John Anthony Hort* (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1896), p. 211. Cf. also E. C. Colwell, "Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program," *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the NT* (London: E. J. Brill, 1969), p. 158.

⁷Burgon and Miller have been "accused" of this. P. M. Barnard states, "But though the writings of Burgon and Miller force one to the conclusion that for them personally their theory rested on a priori grounds, yet they have with great labor, assiduity, and learning collected a vast amount of evidence in support of the 'Traditional.'" "Text of the Gospels," *A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, ed. James Hastings (EDINBURG: T and T Clark, 1913), II 718.

⁸The principles of criticism explained in the foregoing section hold good for all ancient texts preserved in a plurality of documents. In dealing with the NT no new principle whatever is needed or legitimate." Westcott and Hort, II, 73. Contemporary textual critics also demonstrate their naturalistic approach. Greenlee avers that the Byzantine text became the accepted printed text, "its precise printed form the result of chance." pp. 72, 74. Again, B. M. Metzger does not mention Divine Preservation as he discusses the transmission of the text. *The Text of the NT* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 186-208. So also G. D. Fee, while attempting to refute D. O. Fuller's position on the providential care of God concerning the NT text, states "although in a purely theological argument, one may be reticent to accede to what a theologian says God must do," "Modern Textual Criticism and the Revival of the TR," *JETS*, March, 1978, p. 22. Obviously, these critics, representative of the whole field of naturalistic critics, demonstrate their naturalistic mentality by ignoring God's promises of preservation which He must fulfill, e.g. John 14:26; 16:12,13; cf. also Mt. 24:35; Mk. 13:31; Lk. 21:33.

⁹p. 15. Perhaps true Christians in centuries past failed to advance Hortian textual criticism principles because they did not receive advanced degrees in textual criticism from Tubigen!

¹⁰*History of NT Criticism* (London: Watts and Co., 1910), p. 129. Another naturalistic scholar, Jack Finigan states the same unbelieving pessimism: "Presumably if we could ever recover the original manuscript of a NT book it would be very close to what its author intended. Even here, however, the text might not be completely correct. If the author wrote it himself, he could have made mistakes; if he dictated it to a scribe, the latter would have made mistakes." *Encountering NT Manuscripts* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co. 1974), p. 54. Again, G. D. Fee's naturalistic approach is reflected in his support of the supposition that mere copies mean more errors, for he states that the earliest copies were not made "by trained scribes in scriptoria," p. 26. However, God's work is not carried on by the "professional," whether scribe, clergyman, or textual critic; it is carried on by the priesthood of believers!

Dean Burgon Said It—"ILLUSTRATING HOW THE FIVE OLD UNCIALS CONTRADICT EACH OTHER"

"Imagine it gravely proposed, ... to re-adjust the text... or to re-edit 'HAMLET.' ... Why, some of the poet's most familiar lines would cease to be recognizable: [Using, now, the 5 old uncials, A, B, Aleph, C, and D] e.g. A,—'Toby or not Toby; that is the question:' B,—'Tob or not, is the question:' Aleph,—'To be a tub, or not to be a tub; the question is that:' C,—'The question is, to beat, or not to beat Toby?': D (the 'singular codex'), —'The only question is this: to beat that Toby, or to be a tub?' " [Revision Revised, p. 15]

An Answer To "What Is The 'Inspired' Word Of God?"

By Rev. D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.
President, The Dean Burgon Society

(Installment Number 8)

14. ITEM #14.

A. FAITH FOR THE FAMILY'S Statement. "It was these [the Byzantine text] that were used by the Roman Catholic scholar Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam in the 16th century to publish THE FIRST PRINTED EDITION OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT." [From Feb., 1979, FAITH FOR THE FAMILY, Bob Jones University, lines ##93-98 of the magazine.]

B. The Issue. What did Erasmus have to do with the "GREEK NEW TESTAMENT"? Was he "FIRST" in every sense, or only in the sense that his edition was the "FIRST PRINTED EDITION OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT"? Was Erasmus' Greek New Testament somehow inferior, because of a use of so-called "BYZANTINE" texts?

C. My Comment. The way this sentence is written could very well be confusing to those who are not familiar with the textual history of the Greek New Testament. Erasmus did not "MAKE UP" a "GREEK NEW TESTAMENT" in the sense of originating the documents. He merely selected documents of the Greek New Testament which he thought were the best representatives of all the manuscripts available at that time. Though Erasmus is credited with having produced the "FIRST PRINTED edition of the Greek New Testament," he was NOT the one who COMPLETED the FIRST edition of the Greek New Testament. Edward Miller's book, A GUIDE TO THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT [which the DEAN BURGON SOCIETY is presently re-printing, and which will be available shortly for a GIFT of \$7.00, with pre-publication availability for a GIFT to DBS of \$5.00], that:

1. Cardinal Ximenes, founder of the University of Alcalá, and an eminent patron of literature, WAS FIRST IN THE FIELD. . . . Having collected together as many Manuscripts as he could, he set Lopez de Stunica and other learned editors to the work in 1502, . . . But many years elapsed ere the completion of the New Testament in Greek and Latin on Jan. 10, 1514; and the book was NOT PUBLISHED TILL 1520, after Ximenes' death, and did not get into general circulation till two years after. The COMPLUTENSIAN POLYGLOTT—for which was the title, . . . [Edward Miller, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-8].

Erasmus' edition was begun on April 17, 1515 [Cf. Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 8], and the New Testament was printed before the end of February, 1516 by Froben, the printer of Basle, having heard of the operations in Spain and the edition directed by Cardinal Ximenes, and wanting to forestall them. [Cf. Miller, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9]. So, while it is technically

accurate, as Dr. Panosian stated, to say Erasmus was "FIRST" as a "PRINTED EDITION," in point of fact, the COMPLUTENSIAN POLYCLOTT of Cardinal Ximenes, was "FIRST" in point of completion, as of January 10, 1514 (though not PRINTED until 1520), whereas that of Erasmus was printed in 1516, which was two years AFTER the completion of that of Ximenes, but four years BEFORE Ximenes was published.

[To Be Continued]

THE DEAN BURGON NEWS

Box 359
Collingswood, NJ 08108

(Address Correction Requested)

OUR READERS RESPOND

MISSOURI: I am a life member of The Dean Burgon Society. I wish you to start mailing my subscription of The Dean Burgon News to my new address. . . . Thank you so much for all your time and trouble. God bless your work for the Lord!!

OHIO: Please reserve a copy of "Textual Criticism" by Edward Miller. Will also be interested in obtaining reprints of Dean Burgon's books.

COLORADO: I have been reading the Dean Burgon News for the last two months. I was so pleased to see a stand for the King James Version. Could you please tell me what it is to be a member of the Society? Thank you for your time and help.

NEVADA: Please send me a subscription for one year, for The Dean Burgon News. Thanks for informing me. I am thankful for your society and work. You have my prayers.

COLORADO: Enclosed please find my subscription to The Dean Burgon News. I appreciate your stand.

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 822
Camden, N.J.

WHY NOT SUBSCRIBE TODAY?



SEND GIFT SUBSCRIPTIONS! All gifts to Dean Burgon Society are tax deductible!

THE DEAN BURGON SOCIETY

Box 359, Collingswood, New Jersey 08108, U.S.A.
Phone: 609-854-4452

MEMBERSHIP FORM

I have a copy of the "Articles of Faith, Operation, and Organization" of The Dean Burgon Society, Incorporated. After reading these "Articles," I wish to state, by my signature below, that I believe in and accept such "Articles." I understand that my "Membership" is for one year and that I must renew my "Membership" at that time in order to remain a "Member" in good standing of the Society.

() I wish to become a member of The Dean Burgon Society for the first time.

() I wish to renew my membership subscription

which has expired as of:.....

SIGNED:

DATE:

I enclose: (Attention: The Dean Burgon Society
Box 359, Collingswood, NJ 08108

*Membership Donation (\$5.00/year) \$.....

*Life Membership Donation (\$50.00) \$.....

*Additional Donation To The Society \$.....

TOTAL: \$.....

Please PRINT in CAPITAL LETTERS your name and address below:

NAME:

ADDRESS:.....

CITY:.....

STATE:..... ZIP:.....

Although I am not a member of The Dean Burgon Society, I do wish to subscribe to the Newsletter, by making a gift of \$2.50 to the Society.

NAME:

ADDRESS:.....

CITY:.....

STATE:..... ZIP:.....

*I understand that, included in my first \$2.50 gift accompanying any donation or order—regardless of the amount of the order or donation—is my year's subscription to The Dean Burgon Society NEWSLETTER.

Canada & All Foreign
Subscriptions \$5.00 Yearly

THE DEAN BURGON SOCIETY

Executive Committee

- PRESIDENT Rev. B. D. Cummons Massillon, OH
- Rev. D. A. Waite Collingswood, NJ
- VICE PRESIDENT Rev. P. C. Fedena Fairless Hills, PA
- Rev. D. O. Fuller Grand Rapids, MI
- Mr. E. W. Fowler Scarsdale, NY
- VICE PRESIDENT Rev. F. A. McQuade Glen Mills, PA
- Rev. M. J. Hollowood Watertown, WI
- Rev. G. D. Mellish Weston, Ont., CAN.
- SECRETARY Rev. E. A. Griffith West Chester, PA
- Rev. L. R. Oats Watertown, WI
- TREASURER Rev. H. L. Morgan Elmer, NJ
- Mr. R. O. Sanborn St. Petersburg, FL
- Rev. E. L. Bynum Lubbock, TX
- Rev. T. M. Strouse Watertown, WI

MICHIGAN: Please send me your organizations articles of belief. I think that God is leading me to stand beside you on this matter.

CALIFORNIA: I am enjoying very much your DB News, and I do appreciate your stand currently on the "Chicago Statement" and on the Faith for the Family article on "Inspired Word of God." I felt sure as I read the article in "Faith for the Family" that it wasn't correct.

TEXAS: I receive The Dean Burgon News and appreciate it greatly. Where can I secure a copy of REVISION REVISED by Dean Burgon in readable type? (Answer: From The Dean Burgon Society).

THE DEAN BURGON NEWS

Published Monthly by
The Dean Burgon Society
D. A. Waite, President
Box 359
Collingswood, NJ 08108

Editorial Committee:

- E. L. Bynum, Editor
- M. J. Hollowood, Member
- D. A. Waite, Member