

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

FUNDAMENTALIST

DECEPTION

on

Bible Preservation

A Critique of

***“God’s Word in our Hands--
The Bible Preserved For Us”***

Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Bob Jones University's

ERRORS on

Bible Preservation

A Critique of

“Bible Preservation

and the Providence of God ”

Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

“God’s Word” Re-Defined

In the title, *God’s Word in Our Hands*, if they do not define “Word” as “Words,” how do they define it? They define God’s “Word” merely as “message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, or revelation,” but NOT as “Words.” A few of the writers say that God’s Word (the Hebrew and Greek Words) are in all the manuscripts all over the world, that is, in the more than 5,255 and more manuscripts. Why is their title so ambiguous then? If it is “*God’s Word in our Hands*” how can it be both in our hands and in yet in the thousands and thousands of libraries and books and places all over the world? That is both an inconsistent as well as an impossible position.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Their “Bible Preservation” View

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.

2. To other writers in this *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.

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.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Preservation of WORDS Needed

Matthew 24:35

³⁵ Heaven and earth shall pass away, but **my words shall not pass away.** (KJV)

Mark 13:31

³¹ Heaven and earth shall pass away: but **my words shall not pass away.** (KJV)

Luke 21:33

³³ Heaven and earth shall pass away: but **my words shall not pass away.** (KJV)

Matthew 24:35

³⁵ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται, οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσι.

John 16:12-14

¹² **I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.**

¹³ **Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.**

¹⁴ **He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and₅ shall shew it unto you.** (KJV)

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Preservation of WORDS Needed

Matthew 4:4

4 But he 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. (KJV)

Psalm 12:6-7

6 The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.

7 Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever. (KJV)

Matthew 5:17-18

17 Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.

18 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. (KJV)

Matthew 5:18

18 ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἕως ἂν πάντα γέγνηται. (SCR)

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Original WORDS Preservation??

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 these texts leads to the conclusion that they are often misunderstood and/or misapplied.”*

Quotation #136. (p. 166) Quoting Rice with approval again, Gephart wrote: *“Rice went so far as to say that ‘all the translations together are the Word of God’ and that the same is true of all the manuscript copies.”*

Quotation #164. (p. 183) Gephart wrote: *“The TR and the KJV are the Word of God: in them we meet and hear God and are brought into a saving fellowship with Him. However, it is also true that the W-H text, the N-A text, the UBS text, the H-F text, and the R-P text are the Word of God.”*

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Original WORDS Preservation??

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 through the medium of human language (Heb. 1:1-2); (2) What truth God wanted written down (inscripturated) He did so through human authors. . . . (3) God’s truth is understandable by man and is written down for future generations to follow. . . . (4) This written truth from God is sufficient to prepare and equip each believer for every necessary good work (5) The truth of God in written form is complete, . . . and is the sole rule (authority) for the believer’s faith and daily life.”**

Quotation #193. (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.”**

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Original WORDS Preservation??

Quotation #260. (p. 335) Harding wrote: ***“Biblical Christianity consists of both belief and behavior. God preserves His Word in order that His people might glorify Him in their doctrine and practice. Serious departures from the preserved message of Scripture are incurring in some evangelical and fundamental circles today including churches which espouse a King James Only position.”***

Quotation #262. (p. 336) Harding wrote: ***“The believer’s certainty regarding the truthfulness and authority of the Bible can only come by the appealing to the self-authentication nature of Scripture in conjunction with the internal witness of the Spirit. The Scriptures are self-authenticating.”***

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

Quotation #290. (p. 376) Downey wrote: ***“The written, inspired, infallible autograph was physically destroyed but the Word of God endured. Heaven did not protect the scroll, but God’s Word was settled in Heaven. God’s Word transcends written documents even the physical universe. “***

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Original WORDS Preservation??

Quotation #291. (p. 377) Downey wrote: “**Just so, while the textual blemishes are evident, none of them materially affects the obvious truth that the text we have is the Word of God that is ‘able to make thee wise unto salvation (2 Timothy 3:15).’**”

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 KJV is the Word of God as well as the NASB.**”

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.**”

Quotation #311. (p. 391) Speaking of “**many English translations,**” Downey wrote: “**While they are all God’s Word insofar as they are accurate renderings from the original languages, some are more accurate than others.**”

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Original WORDS Preservation??

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

Quotation #317. (p. 407) Shaylor wrote: **“He breathed out His words in 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 inspiration is present, we can properly call a faithful translation the Word of God.”**

Quotation #326. (p. 412) Shaylor wrote: **“The most representative of this view is the statement of Waite: ‘It is my own personal conviction and belief 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.’”**

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Original WORDS Preservation??

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.*”

Quotation #335. (On the back cover) Bob Jones III, then President of Bob Jones University wrote: “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 conservative 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.”

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Summary of the Book

Deception on “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.”

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Summary of the Book

Deception on “Preservation.” The second **DECEPTION** in the **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.**”

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Bob Jones University's

ERRORS on

Bible Preservation

A Critique of

“Bible Preservation

and the Providence of God ”

Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

The Bob Jones Connection

Two 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.”***

Fundamentalists Battle 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 both a Professor of New Testament Language and Literature and the Chairman of the University's Ancient Languages Department.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation Writers and Book Source

Ron Tagliapietra has gone to 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 staff of Bob Jones University.

I got this book from Bob Jones University. They sell it in their bookstore. There is no disclaimer on the book, as on 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. Many books sold in the school's bookstore have a disclaimer on them. They say that Bob Jones University does not necessarily agree with everything within the particular book. Because there is no such disclaimer, it means that Bob Jones University does not disagree with the views expressed in this book. In other words, this book has Bob Jones University's blessings.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation “Teaching” Only--Not “Words”?

STATEMENT #22: (p. 16) *“The **teaching** of Scripture is inerrant and infallible, . . .”*

COMMENT #22: 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. **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”** ¹⁹ are inerrant and infallible.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation “Teaching” Only--Not “Words”?

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, . . .”*

COMMENT #59: 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.**

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

“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 the **message.**”*

COMMENT #51: They do not care about “difference in sentence structure” so long as the **“message”** is there. By **“message”** they show clearly that all they have in **their view of “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 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.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

“Message” Only--Not “Words”?

STATEMENT #208: (p. 284) [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.”

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

“Message” Only--Not “Words”?

COMMENT #208: 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.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

There Were No “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.”*

COMMENT #41: 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 was the One Who gave those Words for the writers. He was the Logos or the Revelator and, as such, He gave every Word of the Hebrew 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.”**

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

“Word” But Not “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 content (**substantial purity**), from purity of transmission (**textual purity**).”*

COMMENT #49: Schnaiter and Tagliapietra agree with B. B. Warfield, a Westcott and Hort worshiper. I do not agree with any such distinction. 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. **These men, and Bob Jones University that pays their salaries, believe there are “textual” errors and “typos” in the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek “Words.”**

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

“Word” But Not “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.’**”*

COMMENT #52: 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 for having them on their staff and holding to this 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.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

“Word” But Not “Words”?

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

COMMENT #54: In this quotation of Warfield with approval, the authors’ true doubts in inerrant Bible preservation are shown clearly. 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. It cannot be a true Fundamentalist position. Warfield was a pupil of Westcott and Hort and has had an influence on Schnaiter and his co-author.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

“Word” But Not “Words”?

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.”***

COMMENT #55: 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. This is not “**Bible Preservation**” which is the title of their book. According to the study by Dr. Jack Moorman (BFT #3084), there are over 8,000 “**textual impurities**” in the Westcott and Hort/Nestle-Aland kind of text; but the original Words underlying our King James Bible do not have “**impurities.**”

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Why Praise 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.*”

COMMENT #95: I agree with this statement, but disagree that their “*insight and judgment*” was worthwhile and correct. It is the wrong emphasis. *It is the wrong basis.* It is the wrong thinking. I am glad that these writers admit that “*all the modern editions of the Greek New Testament are substantially based on Westcott and Hort’s Greek Text.*”

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Why Praise Westcott & Hort?

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

COMMENT #96: There indeed must be proper “*principles,*” but **Westcott and Hort had 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_dbspres.htm).**

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Why Praise Sinai & Vatican?

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.**)”*

COMMENT #145: This is the most ridiculous statement made thus far. Far from **“Sinaiticus and Vaticanus”** being **“perfect,”** they are out of line in over 8,000 places with the Words underlying our King James Bible. . . . 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 crowd to recognize it.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Why Diminish Dean 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.*”**

COMMENT #105: **Dean Burgon has certainly “convinced” me of the defense of the Traditional Greek text.** I read of Dean Burgon first in Dr. David Otis Fuller’s book *Which Bible*. It was a condensed version of Burgon’s *Revision Revised*. I read Dean Burgon even though he was an Anglican of the Church of England and I am a Baptist. I read him and I loved his facts, his wording, his documentation, and his spirit.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Why Diminish 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 more than seventeen speakers **“IN DEFENSE OF TRADITIONAL BIBLE TEXTS.”**

Its messages are transmitted all over the world on its Website, [DeanBurgon Society.org](http://DeanBurgonSociety.org). There are nineteen members of the DBS Executive Committee and as of this writing, fifteen more members of the DBS Advisory Council. These represent Pastors and laymen from the USA and the foreign countries of Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, and Singapore. Its radio programs are aired in this country and by Shortwave around the world each week. A number of people are waking up to the truth through its ministry.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Why Diminish Dean Burgon?

The DBS has reprinted five of Dean Burgon's books in hardback editions:

- (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), and**
- (5) *Inspiration and Interpretation* (BFT #1220 @ \$25 + \$5 S&H).**

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

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Errors On the “Variants”

STATEMENT #117: (p. 105) “Recall that there is *only a small proportion of passages where manuscripts substantially disagree.*”

COMMENT #117: This is false. As I have said before, 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 book of over 500-large-pages on **“8,000 Differences between the NIV and Modern Versions and the Words Underlying the King James Bible”** is available from the BIBLE FOR TODAY for a gift of \$65.00 + \$7.50 S&H. It is BFT #3084. Though obviously some of these are small differences, but many are “*substantial.*” 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).**

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Errors On the “Variants”

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.”**

COMMENT #184: (p. 250) **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 book of over 500-large-pages on **“8,000 Differences between the NIV and Modern Versions and the Words Underlying the King James Bible”** is available from the **BIBLE FOR TODAY.**

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Errors On the “Variants”

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

COMMENT #211: **Again this is false.** The manuscripts worshiped by these authors and Bob Jones University have been perverted. **They have been theologically “*disturbed*” and have over 8,000 “*manuscript variants.*”**

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

I would agree that God’s providence did protect those Words.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Doctrine Is Affected

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

COMMENT #85: This is absolutely and totally false. 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 no ***“variants”*** in ***“meaning”*** is obviously false. This book of over 500-large-pages on ***“8,000 Differences between the NIV and Modern Versions and the Words Underlying the King James Bible”*** is available from the **BIBLE FOR TODAY** for a gift of \$65.00 + \$7.50 S&H. It is **BFT #3084**. It is true that many of these differences do not affect meaning, but there are many that do affect it.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Doctrine Is Affected

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

COMMENT #87: May I repeat myself and say that **this is totally false?** How could these men 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*** (BFT #2956 @ \$10 + \$4 S&H). These passages are found in their favorite Vatican and Sinai Critical Text to see how large a lie they have just written.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation Doctrine Is Affected

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.”***

COMMENT #88: When are they going to stop these lies and falsehoods? 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 on 356 Doctrinal Passages in the NIV and Its Underlying Greek Text (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 deception, dishonesty, and falsehood. These men are uninformed, misinformed, and are misinforming others.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Doctrine Is Affected

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

COMMENT #108: Bengel’s position on “*doctrine*” and these BJU 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). 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.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Doctrine Is Affected

STATEMENT #111: (p. 97) *“... they disagree on the manner and details. All of them agree that not a single doctrine of Scripture is in question.”*

COMMENT #111: 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.**

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation Doctrine Is Affected

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.”

COMMENT #115: 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.” 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 (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.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Doctrine Is Affected

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.”***

COMMENT #131: 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 500-large-page research has catalogued **over 8,000 differences** between the Critical Text and the Text underlying our King James Bible (Cf. BFT #3084 @ \$65.00 + \$7.50 S&H). 8,000 “variants” are not a “few.” **(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 Its Underlying Greek Text** (BFT #2956 @ \$10 + \$4 S&H). There are 356 “doctrinal passages” affected by the false text of “B” and “Aleph” and these new translations.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Doctrine Is Affected

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.’”***

COMMENT #159: **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 + \$4 S&H).** Many of these 356 passages shed doubt on ***“fundamental points of faith and 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 lying book.**

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Doctrine Is Affected

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.”***

COMMENT #162: These writers and Bob Jones University that employs them are quoting Mauro with approval. His statement 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 + \$4 S&H).** These 356 doctrinal passages do indeed bring the **“slightest doubt”** and **“disturb”** some of the **“fundamental points of faith and doctrine”** and some of the **“great truths of the Christian faith.”**

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation Doctrine Is Affected

STATEMENT #163: (p. 163) *“If the 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.**”*

COMMENT #163: **This is a repetition of a blatant falsehood!** Let me say once more, as I have done in just the preceding STATEMENT #162 and in the earlier pages of this book, 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 + \$5 S&H). 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?

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Doctrine Is Affected

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.**”***

COMMENT #179: Both of these statements are entirely false.

(1) In the first place, ***“these differences”*** in the two **Greek texts are sizeable.** 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.

(2) In the second place, it is a total lie to say that ***“these differences”*** can ***“never affect doctrine.”*** **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 + \$4 S&H).**

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Doctrine Is Affected

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

COMMENT #188: Again the writers, and Bob Jones University that employs, them have been guilty of 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 + \$4 S&H). There are 356 passages where ***“doctrinal variations arise”*** due to the false Critical Text that is used.⁴⁹

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Doctrine Is Affected

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

COMMENT #188: Again the writers, and Bob Jones University that employs, them have been guilty of 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 + \$4 S&H). There are 356 passages where ***“doctrinal variations arise”*** due to the false Critical Text that is used.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Doctrine Is Affected

Or I invite the reader to get my own book *Defending the King James Bible* (BFT #1594 @ \$12.00+\$5.00 S&H) and look at Chapter Five where I have listed and illustrated about 158 of these 356 passages showing that the Westcott and Hort type of Greek text does “*affect doctrine*” adversely.

To say that “*none of these passages affect doctrine*” is a bitter falsehood. They tell these falsehoods in order to put you at ease when you use a modern version. 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 a doctrine. You should not be at ease if you are reading from a modern Bible version. You should be on guard.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Doctrine Is Affected

Or I invite the reader to get my own book *Defending the King James Bible* (BFT #1594 @ \$12.00+\$5.00 S&H) and look at Chapter Five where I have listed and illustrated about 158 of these 356 passages showing that the Westcott and Hort type of Greek text does “*affect doctrine*” adversely.

To say that “*none of these passages affect doctrine*” is a bitter falsehood. They tell these falsehoods in order to put you at ease when you use a modern version. 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 a doctrine. You should not be at ease if you are reading from a modern Bible version. You should be on guard.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

Doctrine Is Affected

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.”***

COMMENT #209: **He is 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.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

A False View Of Inspiration

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

COMMENT #28: 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 the participle of PNEO which means to breathe. You cannot leave out God in the breathing-out of His Words.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

A False View Of Inspiration

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

COMMENT #43: **That is a gigantic error.** I do not know what theology book these men were reading to have committed such gross theological error. **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 according to 2 Peter 1:21: “. . . *Holy men of God spake as they were **MOVED** by the Holy Ghost.*” They 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] is given by inspiration of God.**” The words, PASA GRAPHE, refer to all which has been written down. It includes the Words and the letters that are “**God-breathed**” [THEOPNEUSTOS]. God breathed out the letters and Words, not the “writers.”

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

A False View Of Inspiration

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

COMMENT #76: They are saying wrongfully that “versions” (that is, translations) are “*the inspired Word of God.*” Nothing could be further from the truth.

“Versions” are not “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, they are still the work of men, not the work of God Himself.

Fundamentalists Battle Bible Preservation

A False View Of Inspiration

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.’”***

COMMENT #77: The authors do not even specify which English Bible they are speaking of. They would include the NIV, a NASV, the English Standard Version, the Revised Standard Version, the New Revised Standard Version, the Contemporary English Version, or any other so-called ***“English Bible.”*** I cannot hold up any of those versions and say they are the ***“inspired Word of God.”*** ***“Inspired”*** is a word that must have God as the subject of it. **God *“inspired”* or breathed out only the Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. He did not breathe out translations. Again, their position is a false Ruckmanite position in this area of *“inspired”* translations.**