

Dr. MacRae Interviewed by James Neher

8-28-79

I appreciate your showing me this though I wonder why you waste time on it. On bothering to get things of this type. This man from what I've heard used to be connected with Bob Jones University. I'm not sure that's right. I have that impression. Then he's turned against them. I notice he speaks -- criticizes them very strongly here. Because they don't just use the KJV. Really sad such blatant unfounded statements and misrepresentations that people would give money enough to make it worthwhile to publish a thing like this. Really sad.

I got a letter last year from one of my graduates of 30 yrs. ago who was running a Christian school in Iowa. He said, What are we going to do about the "Alexandrian Cult?" That was Ruckman's term-- the Alexandrian cult for those who don't believe the KJV is inspired. From the tone of this fellow's letter-- he had written to Ruckman, or Ruckman had written to him. I got the impression from his letter that he was swayed by it. I wrote him back at some length, and he wrote back a friendly letter thanking me for it.

Then saying this man Hill who wrote THE THE KING JAMES VERSION DEFENDED was a member of his church. He sent me a little book on true Bible study by him. He took a very fine attitude in his later letter. But in his first letter he talked about the Alexandrian cult-- sounding as if he'd been influenced by that sort of thing. Of course there is no such thing as an Alexandrian cult. There may be a KJV cult. May be a Textus Receptus cult. But is no scholar I know of today who feels the Alexandrian scholars were inspired, or anything like that.

I did feel in seminary that the NT men when I was a student gave too much standing to just 2 MSS. They followed W&H closely-- Dr. Machen and the others did. They never used the word Alexandrian text but their attitude was that the "neutral text" was the best text. Aleph and B have a text and agree, that's the original text. But if they disagree, and the one that disagrees agrees with other early MSS that are called the Western Text, then the one that stands alone is the correct text.

I thought that was a crazy extreme view. W&H had some good points. Even top scholars like those we had there were carried away to an extreme on it, but I doubt if there has been any scholar in the last 30 yrs. that I've ever heard of who has followed W&H. They recognize certain excellences in some work W&H did. But they do not take the attitude of giving as much attention to these 2 MSS as they did.

To say 100 MSS copied in 1400 A.D. are more important than 2 MSS from 400 A.D. is of course ridiculous. Even the attitude of taking the majority of all the MSS we have is at least not so senseless as the attitude that whatever MS the KJV used are necessarily the right ones. It is really absurd.