

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

By Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.
President of the Dean Burgon Society

At the Dean Burgon Society Meeting
At Robbinsdale, Minnesota, July 19-20, 2006

B.F.T. #3287

[NOTE: All quotations are from two of my books: (1) *Fundamentalist Deception on Bible Preservation* (BFT #3234 @ \$8.00 + \$3.00 S&H) and (2) *Bob Jones University's ERRORS on Bible Preservation* (BFT #3259 for a GIFT of \$8.00 + \$3.00 S&H.)

I. Quotations from Book #1--

Fundamentalist Deception on Bible Preservation--A Critique of God's Word in our Hands--The Bible Preserved for Us.

The first book I will be referring to is *Fundamentalist Deception on Bible Preservation--A Critique of God's Word in our Hands --The Bible Preserved for Us*. In this book the writers talk about "Bible preservation." I am going to talk about Bob Jones University's emphasis because most of the men who were writers in that book were either graduates, on the Boards, or members of the faculty, or friends of Bob Jones University. The second book I will be referring to is *Bob Jones University's ERRORS on Bible Preservation a critique of Bible Preservation and the Providence of God*. This book also talks about Bible preservation. I am going to speak tonight on the subject of "**FUNDAMENTALISTS BATTLE BIBLE PRESERVATION.**"

The first book to be discussed is *God's Word in Our Hands (GWIH)*. If the writers do not define "Word" of God or "Words of God," what do these words mean? They define God's "**Word**" as God's "message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, or revelation," but not His actual Words. A few writers say that God's Words are in all of the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts all over the world. There are over 5,255 manuscripts. If God's "Word" is "in our hands," how can it be both "in our hands" and also all over the world in these 5,255 manuscripts? That is impossible.

Three False Views of Bible Preservation:

1. To some writers in the GWIH book the "Bible" has not been "preserved" as to its Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. They claim that God did not even promise to preserve those Words. There are many verses which tell that God has promised to preserve his Words.

2. To other writers in the GWIH book the "Bible" has been preserved only as to its "Word" (that is, "message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, or revelation"), but not the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek "Words." They redefine the meaning of "Word" and "Words."

3. To still other writers in the GWIH book the "Bible" has been preserved in the "message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, or revelation" of all the various English and other language translations of the Scripture.

Verses that Clearly Teach Verbal Plenary Preservation

The true position on Bible preservation is that God has preserved His Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words, which underlie our King James Bible. We believe in the verbal and plenary inspiration of God's Words. We've heard these verses before, but I'm going to quote them again.

Matthew 24:35, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

Mark 13:31, “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.”

Luke 21:33, “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.”

The Strongest Greek Negative

Notice the Greek of this. The word for “not” in each of these phrases “*shall not pass away*” is **οὐ μή**. That is the strongest negative in the Greek language. It means “NEVER, NEVER, NEVER”. In this book, *Bible Preservation and the Providence of God*, it says that the Bible nowhere promises to preserve its Words. I don’t see how the Lord Jesus Christ could make His promise any stronger.

John 16:12-14, “I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of [EK “from,” as to the source] himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and, shall show it unto you.”

The Source of these “many things” is the Lord Jesus Christ. In these verses, it is clear that the Lord Jesus Christ Himself is the Author of every Word of the New Testament. God the Holy Spirit relayed these Words to the writers who wrote them down.

The Author of the Old Testament

By extension and analogy, the Lord Jesus Christ is also the Author of every Word of the Old Testament. He is the Logos and the Revelator.

The question is: “Where are those Words?” The authors of these two books mentioned above don’t know where those words are. With our partners, Dr. Stuart Custer (then a Professor at Bob Jones University) and I debated this very question in the 1980’s. In those days Dr. Custer said that the Words closest to the originals were found in the Nestle/Aland critical Greek text. My partner and I said that the Words closest to the originals were found in the Textus Receptus underlying our King James Bible.

Only “Message” and “Thoughts”?

Now, however, the Bob Jones University graduates, Board members, Faculty members, and friends say that they do not know where the Words of God are, just God’s “message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, or revelation.”

The Lord Jesus responded to the Devil with these Words:

Matthew 4:4, “But He [the Lord Jesus Christ] answered and said, it is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.”

The Greek verb for “it is written,” is in the perfect tense. It is something that has been written down in the past. The Words are preserved to the present and will be preserved on into the future.

Psalms 12:6-7, “The words of the LORD are pure words, as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.”

The NIV says, “thou shalt keep us.” There is no Hebrew word for “us” in this verse anywhere. This changes

the whole meaning of the verse. The NIV people say this means “*people*” and not the “*Words*” of God. These verse clearly teach that God Himself has promised not only to “*keep*” His Words, but also to “*preserve*” His Words.

Matthew 5:17-18, “*Think not that I am come to destroy the law, of the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.*”

The “*jot*” is the smallest Hebrew letter. It is like our “*comma*.” The “*tittle*,” according to Dr. Thomas Strouse’s research, is the smallest vowel in Hebrew. It is only a dot. The “*jot*” and the “*tittle*” shall not pass away “*till all be fulfilled.*”

The Strongest Greek Negative

Notice once again that the Greek negative used for the word, “*no*” in the phrase, “*in no wise.*” It is **ou mh** which is the strongest negative in the Greek language.

How can these Fundamentalist schools and books argue that there is not a single verse of Scripture that promises God will preserve His **Words**? What’s wrong with these people? Why can’t they see what is so clear in the Scripture? The view concerning Bible preservation that the Lord Jesus Christ is teaching in this verse is that even the smallest letters and vowels of the Bible shall be preserved.

The Denial of the Preservation of Every Word of Scripture

Quotation #74 (p.85) The unnamed, secret Committee wrote: “*Many passages of Scripture are often cited as demanding supernatural preservation of every word of Scripture in a particular extant text, or lineage of texts – even in a particular translation. Careful exegesis of those texts leads to the conclusion that they are often misunderstood and/or misapplied.*”

I don’t see how the Lord Jesus Christ could have said it any clearer in the three Gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke. “*Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.*” Who is doing the misunderstanding?

All the Translations or Texts as the “**Word**” of God

Quotation #136 (p. 166) This quote is from one of the men quoting John R. Rice with approval. Gephart wrote: “*Rice went so far as to say that all the translations together are the ‘**Word** of God’ in them we meet and hear God and are brought into a saving fellowship with Him.*”

Quotation #164 (p. 183) Gephart wrote: “*However, it is also true that the W-H [Westcott & Hort] text, the N-A [Nestle-Aland] text, the UBS [United Bible Societies] text, the H-F [Hodges & Farstad] text and the R-P [Robinson & Pierpont] text are the **Word** of God.*”

What do they mean by the **Word** of God? They certainly don’t mean the **Words** of God.

The “**Truth**” of God Only

Quotation #168 (p. 193) Davey wrote, “*All fundamentalists, then, view Holy Scriptures through the following theological lens: (1) God has indeed spoken **truth** to man . . .*”

They speak about God’s **truth**. I am all for God’s **truth**, but where are the **Words**? It’s a true statement that “*today is Thursday.*” It is also true that “*today is July 20 2006.*” Both of those statements are “**truth.**” But each statement uses different words.

“Truth” Is Not Enough

“Truth” alone is far too vague a term when you are talking about Bible preservation. “Truth preservation” and “Words preservation” are not the same. They are not equal to each other.

The “Thoughts” of God Only

Quotation #183 (p.209) Davey wrote, “When God wanted His Word put in written form, He did so on His own initiative by transferring select eternal **thoughts** through the personalities of holy, human agents . . .”

Quotation #231 (p. 289) Bernard wrote, “*From the beginning of creation it has clearly been God’s intention to perpetuate His **thoughts** through speech and writing.*”

“Thoughts” Are Not “Words”

Here again these men are talking about God’s “thoughts” and not His “Words.” “Thoughts” unless put into “Words” are insufficient for Bible Preservation.

The “Message” of God Only

Quotation #292 (p.377) Quoting Combs with approval, Downey wrote, “*The essential **message** of Scripture has been preserved not only in the Byzantine text-type, but in the Alexandrian text-type as well; the K.J.V. is the Word of God as well as the NASB.”*

God promised to preserve His **Words** not simply His **message**. The NASV and the KJB cannot both be the “*Word of God*” unless you redefine “*Word*” as “*message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, or revelation.*”

Over 4,000 NASV Failures

I have noted in my report, BFT #1494-P (\$15.00 + \$5.00 S&H), there are over 4,000 important differences between the NASV and the KJB. How can they both be the Words of God?

The “Communication” of God Only

Quotation # 263 (p. 339) Harding wrote, “*True the sacred writers were the organs of God for the infallible communication of His mind and will.*”

If we don’t know what the words are that they believe God is “*communicating*”?

The Denial of God’s

Direct Promise of Preservation

Quotation #309 (p.390) Downey wrote, “*Some among us believe the Bible makes **no direct promise of its own preservation**, that it only implies it by inference.*”

Clear Verbal Preservation Promise

The Lord Jesus Christ could not possibly make this promise of verbal plenary preservation any clearer when He said in both Matthew, Mark, and Luke, “*Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not*

pass away.” If that is simply misinterpretation, I do not know what we would be able to underhand.

Changing “Preservation” to “Perpetuity”

Quotation #315 (p. 404) Shaylor wrote, “*The continuation of God’s Word in spite of difficulty of making perfect reproduction is often called ‘preservation.’ The term ‘perpetuity,’ the quality or condition of being perpetual or lasting forever,’ might be more fitting.*”

Dr. Shaylor said that “perpetuity” is a more fitting term. You can perpetuate errors.

“Perpetuity” Is Not “Preservation”

Perpetuity is not preservation, and is an extremely poor substitute for it.

Quotation #317 (p.407) Shaylor wrote, “*He breathed out His words of those languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek). The purpose of **inerrant words** was to guarantee an **inerrant message**. When we have the equivalent words in another language we have God’s **Word**, but we do not have the actual words that He gave. When those translated words accurately convey what was given by biblical languages that express the **Word** of God and the truth given by languages that express the **Word** of God and the **truth** given by inspiration is present, we can properly call a faithful translation the **Word** of God.”*

No, the purpose of **inerrant words** was to guarantee **inerrant WORDS**. That’s it. It’s simple. This is not complicated. God has promised to preserve His **Words**, and He HAS preserved His **Words**.

My Position on Verbal Plenary Preservation of the Bible

Quotation #326 (p.412) Shaylor wrote, “*The most representative of this view is the statement of Waite. “It is my own personal conviction and believe after studying this subject since 1971, that the **WORDS** of the Received Greek and Masoretic Hebrew Text that underlie the **KING JAMES BIBLE** are the very **WORDS** which God has **PRESERVED** down through the centuries, being the exact **WORDS** of the **ORIGINALS** themselves.”*

I am glad he quoted me correctly. I believe this. Though this belief is founded on many facts, I can’t prove it to anybody who does not have access to these same facts. It is my firm conviction. **Quotation #334** (p.422) Shaylor wrote, “*When we use a faithful, conservative translation such as the King James Version, the New King James Version, the New American Standard Version, or another version of demonstrated accuracy we can trust our Bible as the **Word** of God. We can be confident that we have **God’s Word in our hands**.*”

God’s Words Kept Intact in English

The King James Bible is the only example of God’s Words kept intact in English.

The New King James Version has over 2,000 examples of either adding, subtracting, or changing the Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek Words (Cf. **BFT #1442 @ \$10.00 + \$5.00 S&H**). As mentioned before, the New American Standard Version has over 4,000 of such examples (Cf. **BFT #1494-P @ \$15.00 + \$5.00 S&H**).

Quotation #335 (On the back cover) Bob Jones, III then President of Bob Jones University wrote about this GWIH book, “*Like a clean-edged sword, God’s Word in our Hands cuts through the current confused and schismatic clatter on the subject of biblical preservation. These conservatives and God-fearing authors do the church great service by presenting us with soul-thrilling evidence of the **reliability** and durability of the eternal Word.*”

“Reliability” Not Enough

“Reliability” is not enough. We must have the exact Words themselves.

Two Deceptions in God’s Word in Our Hands

Deception on “Word.”

Deception #1--Meaning of “Word”

The first DECEPTION in the book, *God’s Word in Our Hands* (GWIH) deals with their meaning of “Word.”

In the Bible, the “**Word** of God” and the “**Words** of God” mean the same thing (Psalm 119:11, 105). The writers in the GWIH book have altered this identity without telling the readers. They use “**Word**” to mean only the Bible’s “*message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, doctrine, or revelation,*” but not the Bible’s “**Words.**”

Deception on “Preservation.”

Deception #2: “Preservation” Meaning

The second DECEPTION of GWIH book deals with their meaning of “preservation.”

The Managing Editor of the book, suggested “**perpetuation**” for “**preservation.**” That which is “**perpetuated**” is not necessarily “**preserved**” The writers deny that the Bible’s Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek “**Words**” have been “**preserved,**” but only God’s “**Word,**” meaning the Bible’s “*message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, doctrine, or revelation,*” but not “**Words.**”

II. Quotations from Book #2--

Bob Jones University’s ERRORS on Bible Preservation--

*A Critique of Bible Preservation and
the Providence of God*

The next analysis is *Bob Jones University’s ERRORS on Bible Preservation--A Critique of Bible Preservation and the Providence of God.*

The Bob Jones Connection – Two Fundamentalist staff members of Bob Jones University have written a book called, *Bible Preservation and the Providence of God.* Because of the authors’ affiliation with Bob Jones University (BJU), that school must agree enough with the book to have permitted these men to have written it. There is no disclaimer in the book to the effect that, though the writers are connected with BJU, the book sets forth only the opinions of the authors and these views are not necessarily those of the school with which they are affiliated. Because

of the absence of such a disclaimer, I am assuming that these views represent those of BJU as well. My analysis will therefore be called "*Bob Jones University's Errors on Bible Preservation.*"

The Two BJU Writers: The names of the two writers are Samuel Schnaiter and Ron Tagliapietra. When the book was published, both of these men were connected with Bob Jones University (BJU).

Samuel Schnaiter has been at Bob Jones University for many years. He received his Ph.D. from there in 1980. His doctoral dissertation was about New Testament Textual Criticism. I have a copy of this dissertation and have read it thoroughly. I have strong disagreements with it in many areas. Since 1970, he has been on the faculty of Bob Jones University. At the time of writing he was a Professor of New Testament Language and Literature and the Chairman of the University's Ancient Languages Department.

The Writers and Book Source. Ron Tagliapietra has attended the following schools: (1) Central College, (2) University of Oregon (3) Pillsbury Baptist Bible College and (4) Bob Jones University. As of the publication date of this book, he had been writing books for the Bob Jones University Press for twelve years. Both of these men are on the paid staff of Bob Jones University.

I bought this book from Bob Jones University. They sell it in their bookstore. There is no disclaimer of any kind on the book, as there is on some of the other books sold in the school's bookstore that states that the school does not necessarily approve of all that is written in this book. Because there is no such disclaimer, it means to me that Bob Jones University does not disagree with the views expressed in this book. In other words, I take from this that this book has Bob Jones University's blessings and that it is BJU's official position. I don't know how BJU would permit two paid staff members to publish a book that was contrary to their official position--especially when written by their Chairman of the Ancient Languages Department.

Preservation of "Teaching" Only- Not "Words"?

Statement #22 (p.16) "*The teaching of Scripture is inerrant and infallible...*"

Notice they use the word "**teaching.**" This is just one more undefined term wherein they deny the preservation of the **Words** of the originals. It can be placed right along with their other meanings for the "**Word**" of God like "*ideas, thoughts, concepts, message, truth, or teachings,*" but not the original **Words**.

Denial of Preserved Words

They do not believe that God has preserved His Hebrew Aramaic and Greek Words to this day, but only the "ideas, thoughts, concepts, message, truth, or teachings" are "inerrant and infallible." There is a great deal of difference between these two positions.

Statement #59 (p.32) "*In fact, we as authors do not hold the same view on the subject. But we invariably agree on the fundamental teachings of the Word of God.*"

"Teachings" Are Not "Words"

Notice their "agreement" is only on the "teachings" of the "Word" of God, by which they mean only the "ideas, thoughts, concepts, message, truth, or teachings," but not the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Bible.

Of course they are going to agree on the "*teachings*" because they don't have to agree on "*Words.*"

Preservation of "Message" Only-

Not “Words”?

Statement # 51 (p. 30) *“Though it may sound strange, it merely recognizes that a technical difference in sentence structure need not affect this **message**.”*

They do not care about “*difference in sentence structure*” so long as the “**message**” is there. By “**message**” they show clearly that all they believe about “**Bible preservation**” is only the “*ideas, thoughts, concepts, message, truth, or teachings,*” rather than the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek “**Words**” of the Bible. I do not know why they call it “**Bible preservation.**”

The Need to Preserve Original Words

The Old and New Testaments of the Bible were made of original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. Without preserving those original Words there has been no genuine “preservation” of the “Bible.”

It is very easy to understand. If I give you a **message** that a boy brought something to his room, but didn’t tell you what boy or what that something was, then you would not know the exact details because you don’t have the exact **words**. What was that SOMETHING that the boy brought to his room? Was it a ball? Was it a bug? Was the boy dressed in yellow or green? Yes, you got the **message** that a boy brought something to his room, but you do not know precisely what happened or how the boy was dressed if you do not have exact **words**.

Statement #208 (p. 264) [from APPENDIX 1 by Samuel Schnaiter, quoting a letter to Dr. Charles Woodbridge from his article in *Biblical Viewpoint*] *“However, the presence of manuscript variations leads us to analyze more carefully the considerations of preservation into two categories. (1) THE PRESERVATION OF THE AUTHORITATIVE MESSAGE OF GOD, and (2) THE PRESERVATION OF THE PRECISE WORDING OF THAT MESSAGE...However, such PROMISES OF PRESERVATION in view of the wording variations CAN ONLY APPLY TO THE MESSAGE OF GOD’S WORD NOT TO ITS PRECISE WORDING.”*

I differ completely with this quotation from the *Biblical Viewpoint* by Dr. Samuel Schnaiter... where he says, that “PRESERVATION CAN ONLY APPLY TO THE MESSAGE OF GOD’S WORD, NOT TO ITS PRECISE WORDING.” This false position of Schnaiter and Bob Jones University is an extremely erroneous and deceptive teaching in regard to Bible “**preservation.**” In fact, it is no “**preservation**” at all.

Preservation and Alleged “Typos”

Statement #41: (pp. 25-26) *“It is obvious that Jesus did not consider the lack of the autographs an important matter, and he called the extant copies inspired in spite of any ‘typos’ in them.”*

No Old Testament “Typos”

These authors are saying that the Lord Jesus Christ believed apparently, that there were “typos” or typographical errors or mistakes in the Old Testament. This is absolutely false.

The Lord Jesus Christ was the Source of those Hebrew and Aramaic **Words**. He gave **every Word** of the Hebrew/Aramaic Old Testament as well as **every Word** in the New Testament text to God the Holy Spirit. Then the Holy Spirit gave those **Words** to the writers to put down. God had preserved His “**Words**” until the time of the Lord Jesus Christ and there were no “**typos.**”

Our son, D. A. Waite Jr. made definitions for our **Bible For Today’s Defined King James Bible**. It is **BFT #3000** in both large and medium sizes of genuine leather and hardback styles (ranging from \$15 to \$40 + S&H.) In

the first few printings, we had some “**typos**.” We are not perfect, so we had a second edition, third edition, fourth edition, and so on. Over 53,000 have been printed and sold all over the world. We are trying to get most of those “**typos**” out of our Bible. The Lord Jesus Christ did NOT have any “**typos**” because He IS perfect.

Preservation and “Word” Instead of “Words”?

Statement #49: (p.30) *“Warfield also wrote an introduction to Textual Criticism of the New Testament. In his work, he distinguishes purity of doctrinal context (substantial purity), from purity of transmission (textual purity).”*

Schnaiter and Tagliapietra agree with B.B. Warfield, a Westcott and Hort worshiper. I do not agree with any such distinction.

Denial of “Textual Purity”

Just as Warfield before them, these two Bob Jones university staff men do not believe in “textual purity,” but only “substantial purity,” by which they mean that only the “ideas, thoughts, concepts, message, truth, or teachings” of the Bible have been preserved, but not its original “Words.”

This is a heretical and an apostate view and position on **Bible preservation**. These men, and Bob Jones University that pays their salaries, believe there are “**textual**” errors and “**typos**” in the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek “**Words**.”

Statement #52 (p. 30) *“With this in mind, Warfield gauges the “purity” of the text of the New Testament by two measuring rods. First, he compares it to a modern book produced by modern proofreading methods, and with the original available for consultation. Compared to this **the text** of the New Testament is **‘sorely corrupt.’”***

They are quoting this with approval. Do these two Bob Jones university staff members agree with this heretical and apostate position that **the text** of the New Testament is **sorely corrupt**? In the absence of a clear denial of this position it appears that they agree with that false position. If this is the case, shame on these two authors and Bob Jones University that pays their salaries and has them on their staff while holding to this heretical position! This position is that of the apostates in the Roman Catholic Church, the apostates in the liberal modernistic churches, the compromisers in the neo-evangelical churches, and sadly many also who call themselves Fundamentalists.

Statement #54 (p.31) [Warfield’s observations] *“...such has been the Providence of God in preserving for His church in such and every age a **competently exact text** of the Scriptures...its comparatively infrequent **blemishes**...its wonderful approximation to its autographs.”*

In this quotation of Warfield with approval, the authors’ true doubts in inerrant Bible preservation are shown clearly.

BJU Denies Perfect Preservation

The words “competently exact,” “comparatively infrequent blemishes,” and “approximation to its autographs” show plainly that these two Bob Jones University staff members and therefore the University itself, denies perfect preservation of the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of our Bible. This cannot be a true Fundamentalist position.

Warfield was a pupil of Westcott and Hort and through Brokenshire, a pupil of Warfield, has had an influence on many of the teachers at BJU including Schnaiter and his co-author.

Statement #55 (p .31) *“It is simply not true to say that the **truth** of Scripture is imperiled by **textual impurities** of the sort found in the New Testament manuscripts.”*

With the use of the words “**truth**” and “**textual impurities**,” these authors clearly believe we do not have the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek **Words** of the Bible preserved, but only the “*ideas, thoughts, concepts, message, truth, or teachings*” of that Bible.

No “Textual Impurities” in the KJB

This is not “Bible Preservation” which is the title of their book. According to the study by Dr. Jack Moorman (BFT #3084 now in hardback for a GIFT of \$20.00 + \$5.00 S&H), there are over 8,000 “textual impurities” in the Westcott and Hort/Nestle-Aland kind of text; but I am convinced that the original Words underlying our King James Bible do not have “impurities.”

Preservation and the Praise of Westcott & Hort

Statement # 95 (p. 89) “. . . *the insight and judgment that they applied to textual research has ruled the field of textual thinking from their day to the present. . . . Even the most recent editions of the Greek New Testament are substantially based on Westcott and Hort’s Greek text.*”

I agree with this statement, but disagree that their “**insight and judgment**” was worthwhile and correct. It is the wrong emphasis. They had incorrect “**insight and judgment.**”

An Important Admission

I am glad that these writers admit, “all the modern editions of the Greek New Testament are substantially based on Westcott and Hort’s Greek Text.”

Statement #96 (p.89) “. . . *the application of sound critical research principles.*”

There indeed must be proper “**principles**” but Westcott and Hort and improper “**principles.**” Dean Burgon had proper standards to determine the proper text of Scripture. His books are found on the Dean Burgon Society Website (http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/idx_dbpress.htm).

Preservation and Praising Sinai & Vatican Manuscripts

Statement #145 (p.154) *“We have already seen that no manuscript has ever been promoted as perfect (though Sinaiticus and Vaticanus came as close as any.)”*

This is the most ridiculous statement made thus far.

“B” And “Aleph” the Worst of All

Far from the Gnostic “Sinaiticus and Vaticanus” manuscripts being “perfect,” Dean Burgon has denounced them as being the worst manuscripts that ever saw the light of day.

These two false Gnostic Greek manuscripts have over **8,000 differences** with the **Words** underlying in the New Testament of our King James Bible (See **BFT #3084 @ \$20.00 + \$5.00 S&H**). As Herman Hoskier has annotated,

these two manuscripts contradict each other in over 3,000 places in the four Gospels alone. Are they so out of touch with reality that they have never heard of the verbal plenary preservation (VPP) of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek **Words** that underlie the King James Bible. There is a growing group of us who believe this. It is time for the Bob Jones University followers to recognize. It.

Preservation and Diminishing Dean John W. Burgon?

Statement #105 (p.94) *“Although Burgon exercised admirable thoroughness in examining **textual evidence**, his refutation of Hort’s procedures and conclusions **convinced few textual researchers.**”*

Dean Burgon has certainly **“convinced”** me of the defense of the Traditional Greek text. I read of Dean John William Burgon first in Dr. David Otis Fuller’s book, *Which Bible*. It is a condensed version of Burgon’s *Revision Revised*. I read Dean Burgon with great interest and learning, even though he was an Anglican of the Church of England and I am a Baptist. I love his facts, his wording, his documentation, and his spirit.

The Influence of Dean Burgon

Even though they say Dean Burgon **“convinced few textual researchers,”** there has been a society in memory of Dean Burgon. I have been the President of the Dean Burgon Society since its founding in 1978. This is an active Society that meets each year with from thirteen to eighteen speakers speaking on the theme of **“IN DEFENSE OF TRADITIONAL BIBLE TEXTS.”**

Its messages are transmitted all over the world on its Website, www.DeanBurgonSociety.org. There are nineteen members of the DBS Executive Committee and as of this writing nineteen more members of the DBS Advisory Council. These represent Pastors and laymen from the USA and the foreign countries of Canada, the United Kingdom, Mexico, Brazil, Australia and Singapore. Its radio programs are aired in this country and by Short-wave potentially to every nation of the world each week. A number of people are waking up to the truth through its ministry.

DBS’s Hardback Reprints of Dean Burgon’s Books

- (1) *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (BFT #1139 @ \$15 + 5 S&H)
- (2) *The Revision Revised* (BFT #611 @ \$25 + 5 S&H)
- (3) *The Traditional Text* (BFT #1159 @ 15 + 5 S&H)
- (4) *The Causes of Corruption of the Traditional Text* (BFT #1160 @ \$16 + 5 S&H)
- (5) *Inspiration and Interpretation* (BFT #1220 @ \$25 + \$5 S&H).

All of these can be ordered at the DBS Website (www.DeanBurgonSociety.org) and also at the BFT Website (www.BibleForToday.org).

Preservation and Errors on the “Variants”

Statement #117 (p.105) *“Recall that there is only a small proportion of passages where manuscripts*

substantially disagree.”

This is false.

8,000 Is Not A “Small Proportion”

As I have said before, in the New Testament, Dr. Jack Moorman has specified over 8,000 differences between the Greek Text of Nestle/Aland and the Greek Text underlying the King James Bible. It is a result of hundreds of hours of research. It gives the Greek Words from Matthew through Revelation and the English translations. This book of 544 pages is entitled *8,000 Differences between the NIV and Modern Versions and the Words, Underlying the King James Bible*.

It has been reprinted as a joint publication of the **Bible For Today** and the **Dean Burgon Society**. It is available from the **BIBLE FOR TODAY** or the **DEAN BURGON SOCIETY** as #3084 for a gift of \$20.00 + \$5.00 S&H. Though some of these are smaller differences than others, but many are “**substantial**.” Among these 8,000 differences, there are 356 doctrinal passages that are in error.

356 Doctrinal Passages Different

Once again, I invite the reader to get a copy and study Dr. Jack Moorman’s 100-page document on **356 Doctrinal Passages in the NIV and its Underlying Greek Text (BFT # 2956 @ \$10 + \$4 S&H)**.

Statement #184 (p. 250) [This is found in the section “What is Translating”] “*Greek manuscripts are not the main cause of differences among translations, and even language development accounts for only a few dozen differences.*”

This is a blatant lie that different Greek manuscripts account for “**only a few dozen differences.**” In the New Testament, Dr. Jack Moorman has outlined **over 8,000 differences** between the Greek Text of Nestle/Aland and the Greek Text underlying the King James Bible. It is a result of hundreds of hours of research. It gives the Greek Words and the English translations. This newly printed hardback book is a must for those interested in the TRUTH about manuscript differences. (**#3084 for a gift of \$20.00 + \$5.00 S&H**).

Statement #211 (p. 286) “*My point is, therefore that God’s providential care of the New Testament is undisturbed by the manuscript variants.*”

Again this is false. The manuscripts worshiped by these authors and Bob Jones University have been perverted. They have been “**disturbed**” by over **8,000 “manuscript variants.”** They have been theologically “disturbed” in over 356 passages (**BFT # 2956 @ \$10 + \$4 S&H**).

God’s “Providential Care’s” Object

The providence of God was not behind the preservation of Vatican (“B”) and Sinai (“Aleph”). “*God’s providential care*” was indeed “undisturbed” by the preserved original Hebrew and Aramaic, and Greek Words which underlie our King James Bible. I would agree that God’s providence did protect those Words.

Preservation and “Doctrine” Being Affected

Statement #85 (p. 83) “*None of these variants affect meaning much less doctrine.*”

This is absolutely and totally false.

“Meaning” & “Doctrine” Variants

The differences in both “*meaning*” and “*doctrine*” found in the false Westcott and Hort type of text used at Bob Jones University are numerous.

To say there are not “**variants**” in “*meaning*” is obviously false. The “*8,000 Differences*” 544-page book (#3084 for a gift of \$20.00 + \$5.00 S&H) proves clearly that “*meaning*” is “**affected**.” The “*356 Doctrinal Passages*” 100-page book (BFT # 2956 @ \$10 + \$4 S&H) proves clearly that “*doctrine*” is “**affected**.”

Statement #87 (p. 84) *“The most important conclusion is that even those few variants that affect meaning do not affect doctrine.”*

May I repeat myself and say that this is totally false? How could these Bob Jones University paid staff members write such a falsehood? Are these men asleep? Once again I invite the reader to get a copy and study Dr. Jack Moorman’s 100-large-page documentation on *356 Doctrinal Passages in the NIV and its Underlying Greek Text* It is BFT #2956 @ \$10. + \$4 S&H. These passages are found in their favorite Vatican and Sinai Critical Texts used at BJU in the Greek department.

Statement #88 (p. 84) *“It cannot be stressed too heavily that not one textual variant affects even one single teaching of Scripture. Fully 100% of the Greek New Testament is free from variants that alter doctrine.”*

When are they going to stop these untrue statements? Do you see why I attack the teachings and views of these brethren, which are filled with such errors and falsehoods? I again invite the reader to get a copy and study Dr. Jack Moorman’s 100-large-page documentation of *356 Doctrinal Passages in the NIV and its Underlying Greek Text*. It is (BFT # 2956 @ \$10. + \$4. S&H). Mark it well. These writers and Bob Jones University that employs them are in serious error on this false statement. This is a combination of scholarly unpreparedness, deception, dishonesty, and falsehood. These men are uninformed, misinformed, and are misinforming others.

When talking about doctrine, I’ve always used, among many other illustrations, these three:

(1) John 6:47

“*Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.*” (KJB)

“*I tell you the truth, he who believes has everlasting life.*” (NIV)

“*Truly, truly, I say to you, he who believes has eternal life.*” (NASV)

Notice that both the NIV and the NASV (and almost all the modern versions) take out “on me”. They just say “he who believes” has “*everlasting*” or “*eternal*” life. That is a variant which seriously affects doctrine.

(2) 1 Timothy 3:16

“*. . . God was manifest in the flesh, . . .*” (KJB)

“*. . . He appeared in a body, . . .*” (NIV)

“*. . . He who was revealed in the flesh*” (NASV)

Notice that both the NIV and the NASV (and almost all the modern versions) take out “God.” That is another variant which seriously affects doctrine.

(3) Philippians 4:13

“*I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.*” (KJB)

“*I can do everything through him who gives me strength.*” (NIV)

“*I can do all things through Him who strengthens me.*” (NASV)

Notice that both the NIV and the NASV (and almost all the modern versions) take out “Christ” and just say “him”

or "Him." This yet another example where doctrine is affected. The Gnostics changed this verse because they didn't believe that the Lord Jesus was God, but only a man who could not "*strengthen*" anyone.

Statement #108 (p. 96) ". . . *Bengel proved that manuscript variation does not affect doctrine, and his theories earned him the title Father of Textual Criticism.*"

Bengel's position on "**doctrine**" is totally false. These BJU paid staff-writers should not agree with it. When are they going to get truthful and honest about this question of "**doctrine**" and "**manuscript variation**"? Once again I invite the reader to get a copy and study Dr. Jack Moorman's 100-page document on *356 Doctrinal Passages in the NIV and its Underlying Greek Text* (BFT # 2956 @ \$10. + \$4. S&H).

Denials of Key Doctrines

In certain places the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is denied. The doctrine of Christ is also denied. The doctrine of Christ's Deity is denied. The doctrine of miracles is denied. The doctrine that Christ is the Creator of all things is denied.

You should stick to the King James Bible wherein in truth no "**doctrine**" is affected or denied.

Statement #111 (p. 97) ". . . *they disagree on the manner of details. All of them agree that not a single doctrine of Scripture is in question.*"

As I have said before, that is an absolutely false and misleading statement. Once again I invite the reader to get a copy and study Dr. Jack Moorman's 100-page document on *356 Doctrinal Passages in the NIV and its Underlying Greek Text* (BFT # 2956 @ \$10. + \$4. S&H). For them to say that "*not a single doctrine of Scripture is in question*" is grossly untrue and deceptive.

Statement #115 (p.103) "*Third and most important, none of these views necessarily disturbs the orthodoxy of the Christian Church as plainly taught in the Scriptures.*"

The false Westcott and Hort view of the Bible does "**disturb**" and undermine the "**orthodoxy**" of the Christian Church. It undermines it because it takes away the Christian Church's "**Scriptures**."

2,286 Words Missing

Their text drops out a total of 2,286 words as Dr. Jack Moorman has documented in his book, *Missing in Modern Versions* (BFT #1726 @ \$8.00 + \$4.00 S&H).

Once again I invite the reader to get a copy and study Dr. Jack Moorman's 100-large-page documentation on *356 Doctrinal Passages in the NIV and the Underlying Greek Text* (BFT #2956 @ \$10. + \$4. S&H). This is an important subject to study and to answer to the satisfaction of all the members of our churches.

Statement #131 (p. 120) "*The variants have minimal importance to preservation because they are comparatively few, and because no Christian doctrine is affected by them.*"

They are wrong in two areas by this sentence. (1) The "**variants**" are not "**comparatively few**." As I have mentioned before Dr. Jack Moorman's 544-page research has cataloged over 8,000 *Differences between the Critical Texts and the Text underlying our King James Bible* (#3084 for a gift of \$20.00 + \$5.00 S&H). 8,000 differences are not a "**few**" by anyone's mathematics. (2) "**Christian doctrine**" is "**affected**." Once again I invite the reader to get a copy and study Dr. Jack Moorman's 100-page document on *356 Doctrinal Passages in the NIV and the Underlying Greek Text* (BFT # 2956 @ \$10. + \$4 S& H).

356 Doctrinal Passages

There are 356 “doctrinal passages” affected by the false text of “B” and “Aleph” and these new translations.

Statement #159 (p. 160) *“Mauro acknowledges that the sum of all the variant readings taken together does not give ground to the slightest doubt as to any of the fundamental points of faith and doctrine.”*

That is a blatant falsehood. Once again I invite the reader to get a copy and study Dr. Jack Moorman’s 100-page documentation on *356 Doctrinal Passages in the NIV and its Underlying Greek Text (BFT #2956 @ \$10.00 + \$4.00 S&H)*. Many of these 356 passages shed doubt on **“fundamental points of faith and doctrine.”**

Lying About Doctrine

To say falsely that doctrine is not involved, when doctrine is involved does incalculable harm to those who are reading this Bob Jones University book.

This is one solid reason why I am so strongly against this misleading and book filled with falsehoods..

Statement #162 (p. 163) [quoting Philip Mauro with approval] *“In other words the very worst text that could be constructed from the abundant materials available would not disturb any of the great truths of the Christian faith.”*

These writers and Bob Jones University that employ them are quoting Mauro with approval. His statement is a blatant falsehood. These 356 doctrinal passages do indeed bring the **“slightest doubt “** and **“disturb”** some of the **“great truths of the Christian faith.”**

Statement #163 (p. 163) *“If most liberal of the critical eclectic scholars set out to begin an anti-KJV conspiracy group and consistently chose the worst possible readings from his alternatives, no doctrinal changes would result.”*

This is a repetition of a blatant falsehood! I cannot understand how these Bob Jones university staff men can be so ignorant of these 356 doctrinal passages. Or, if they are cognizant of these passages, I am truly amazed that they cannot see these passages do involve **“doctrinal changes.”** Where is their theological fundamentalism if they cannot see that these changes affect sound **doctrine?**

Statement #179 (p.247) *“In spite of all the uproar, our first five chapters stressed that these differences affect very few passages and never affect doctrine.”*

Both of these statements are entirely false. (1) In the first place **“these differences”** in the two Greek texts are sizable in the New Testament. I refer you again to Dr. Jack Moorman’s excellent research: *8,000 Differences between the Critical Texts and the Text underlying our King James Bible (#3084 for a gift of \$20.00 + \$5.00 S&H)* to show the falsity of this statement. (2) In the second place, it is a total lie to say that **“these differences”** can **“never affect doctrine.”** I again refer you to Dr. Moorman’s study entitled: *356 Doctrinal Passages in the NIV and its Underlying Greek Text (BFT #2956 @ \$10.00 + \$4.00 S&H)* to show the falsity of this second statement.

Statement #188 (p. 263) *“We have already shown that no doctrinal variations arise regardless of which manuscripts are used.”*

Again, the writers, and Bob Jones University that employs them, have been guilty of a blatant falsehood. As mentioned repeatedly above, there are 356 passages where **“doctrinal variations arise”** due to the false Critical Text that is used by Bob Jones University and these staff employees who wrote this book.

Statement #188 (p. 263) *“We have already shown that no doctrinal variations arise regardless of*

which manuscripts are used.”

Again, the writers, and Bob Jones University that employs them, repeats their blatant falsehood. As I have mentioned many times in this presentation, there are 356 passages where “**doctrinal variations arise**” due to the false Critical Text that is used.

Two Reasons For Lies

Two conclusions can be drawn from this:

1. **If these teachers don't know the facts of the case, they shouldn't be teaching falsehoods, and definitely should not write books to lead people astray.**
2. **If they do know the truth about the 356 passages of “doctrinal variations,” and lie about it to their readers, they are using the methodology of the devil himself who is the author of lies (John 8:44).**

I'm not calling these fundamental Bible believing Christians Satanic, but I am saying if they know the facts and then lie about them, they are using Satan's methods. Christians should not use Satan's methods.

I invite the reader to get my own book, *Defending the King James Bible* (BFT #1594 @ \$12. + \$5. S&H). It is now in its tenth printing and is a 3rd Revised Edition. Look at Chapter Five where I have listed and illustrated about 158 of these 356 passages. When the Critical Greek text is used, most definitely, “*doctrinal variations arise.*”

To say that “**doctrine**” is not affected in the Critical Greek text is simply not true. People might tell these falsehoods in order to put you at ease when you use a modern version.

Be On Guard With Modern Versions

When you use a modern version you should not be at ease. You should be on guard. You should wonder when the new version you might be using is going to make an error, add a word, here, subtract a word, eliminate a doctrine, or change doctrine.

Statement #209 (p. 286) [quoting Richard Bentley] “*The real text of sacred writers is competently exact . . . nor is one article of faith or moral precept either perverted, or lost... Choose as awkwardly as you will, choose the worst by design, out of the whole lump of readings.*”

Bentley and these BJU paid staff members are dead wrong. This flies in the face of the truth. Once more I invite the reader to get a copy and study Dr. Jack Moorman's 100-large-page documentation on *356 Doctrinal Passages in the NIV and its Underlying Greek Text* (BFT # 2956 @ \$10. + \$4. S&H). This careful research proves Bentley's statement to be ridiculous and erroneous.

Preservation and A False View of Inspiration

Statement #28 (p. 19) “*In 2 Timothy 3:16, we are told of the origin of the graphs. It is the product of the divine breath of God as evidenced by the word THEOPNEUSTOS which translates ‘given by inspiration.’*”

Removing GOD From Inspiration

The word, THEOPNEUSTOS is not translated “given by inspiration” in 2 Timothy 3:16, it is to be

translated “given by inspiration of God.” The word is made up of THEOS, which is God, and PNEUSTOS, which is an adjectival part of PNEO which means “*to breathe*.” You cannot, as these BJU paid staff-writers, leave out God in the breathing out of His Words.

Statement # 43 (p.26) “. . . In a manner similar to a supervision of the *inspired writers themselves* . . .”

This is a popular error and is a theological heresy. I would think such an error to be beneath such BJU paid staff members and scholars such as the writers of this book. I do not know what theology book these men were taught with to have committed such gross theological error.

The Writers Were Not “Inspired”

There are no such things as “inspired writers.” “Inspired of God” means “God-breathed.” God did not “breathe out” writers. The writers were “*moved, led, or carried along by the Holy Spirit*” but not “inspired” “inspired of God,” or “God-breathed.”

“*For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*” (2 Peter 1:21). The word for “**moved**” (PHEROMENOI) is not THEOPNEUSTOS or “God-breathed.” These two words are totally different.

The “Words” Were God-Breathed

The writers were not “inspired.” They were “moved.” The things that were “given by inspiration of God” were the original Words of the Old and New Testaments (2 Timothy 3:16). “All Scripture” (PASA GRAPHE) refers to “*all which was originally written down*.” GRAPHE comes from GRAPHO which is “to write.” It includes all the Words and the letters that are “God-breathed” (THEOPNEUSTOS). God breathed out the letters and Words of the Bible, not the “writers.”

Statement #76 (P. 67) “*Yet versions that honestly attempted to translate (rather than tamper) were accepted as the inspired Word of God.*”

It is assumed that these BJU paid staff members agree with the statement that “*versions*” of this kind are “*accepted*” by them as “*the inspired Word of God*.” They have no disclaimer to this position. They did not correct it as a misconception.

“Versions” Are Not “Inspired”

Therefore, I conclude that the paid BJU staff members are saying wrongfully that “versions” (that is translations) are “the inspired Word of God.”

Nothing could be further from the truth. If this be the case, it is the position of Dr. Peter Ruckman who wrongfully teaches that the King James Bible is “*inspired of God,*” or “*God-breathed,*” or “*given by inspiration of God.*”

“Versions” Are Not “God-Breathed”

No “Version” in any language of the world (including the English King James Bible) is, was, or ever will be “breathed-out by God,” hence they can never properly and Scripturally be referred to as “inspired.”

Every translation in whatever language, based on whatever Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek foundation, and however accurate they are, are still the work of men, not the work of God Himself.

Statement # 77 (p. 67) “*With these facts in mind, we need never to be ashamed to hold up an English Bible and declare ‘This is the inspired Word of God.’*”

Once again, these paid BJU staff members are using the heretical language of Dr. Peter Ruckman. He would at least wrongfully limit the “**inspired Word of God designation**” to the King James Bible. These authors go even beyond Ruckmanism in extending this erroneous designation to “*an English Bible*” that they do not limit in any way. Do they include the New International Version, the New American Standard Version, the English Standard Version, the Revised Standard Version, the New Revised Standard Version, the Contemporary English Version, or other “**English Bibles**” in their heretical designation? You must remember that by “**Word of God**” they mean only the “*ideas, thoughts, concepts, message, truth, or teachings,*” but not the “**Words**” of God.

Need For “Inspiration” Accuracy

Though many teachers, Pastors, and lay people are confused about this subject, I cannot stress enough the fact that, the God of the Bible “breathed-out” or “inspired” Words in only three original languages:

1. Hebrew,
2. A little Aramaic, and
3. Greek.

Translations of these “breathed-out, inspired” Words cannot themselves be termed “breathed-out” by God or “inspired by God” or “inspired.” They are man’s translations of God’s “breathed-out” Words.

We must be very careful and accurate in this Bible-battle to use proper Biblical terms lest we become Ruckmanites, or Semi-Ruckmanites by our non-precise choice of vocabulary words in dealing with this important Biblical doctrii