



# The Dean Burgon Society News

In Defense Of Traditional Bible Texts

\$2.00 a Copy---\$10.00/year (Canada \$15/year)--856-854-4452;

Website: [www.DeanBurgonSociety.org](http://www.DeanBurgonSociety.org)

**No. 77 OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE DEAN BURGON SOCIETY July 1--September 30, 2006**

*"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." (Psalm 12:6-7)*

## The Dean Burgon Society's 28<sup>th</sup> Conference

### July 19-20 in MN

The 28<sup>th</sup> conference of the Dean Burgon Society (DBS) will be held at Calvary Baptist Church in Robbinsdale, Minnesota on July 19-20, 2006. Our host is Dr. Michael Monte. Special arrangements have been made at the AmericInn of Brooklyn Center, 2050 Freeway Blvd, MN, 55430.. Phone number: 1-763-566-7500. Web address with a map. [http://www.americinn.com/display\\_property.aspx?id=29](http://www.americinn.com/display_property.aspx?id=29) Please mention the DBS for special pricing. Rooms are \$89/night plus tax with a continental breakfast. All meals will be at the church. The distance from the church to the hotel is approximately 3 miles. The nearest airport is Minneapolis/St. Paul International, about 25 miles from the motel.

### Shuttle Available

A shuttle will be available between the motel and the church; and if needed, between the airport and motel by the church. Please make your reservations as soon as possible because a convention will be in town at the same time as the annual meeting and rooms are limited. The block of rooms reserved for the DBS will be held until June 27<sup>th</sup>. Cancellations, 24 hours before reservations. A map to the church may be found at the DBS Website: [www.deanburgonsociety.org](http://www.deanburgonsociety.org). Please make your arrangements soon!

### Meeting Tapes

In case you could not be at the annual conference, you can order audio tapes (9 audio cassettes @ \$35 + \$5 S&H) or video tapes (3 videos or DVD's, 6 hours each, @ \$35 + \$5.00 S&H). These DVD's or VHS's take you right there in the meeting where you see

and hear the speakers and the audience response as well. Get a copy for a friend as well. Urge them to keep up with the issues "In Defense of Traditional Bible Texts."

### DBS Women Meet

While the DBS Executive Committee meets Wednesday, July 19th from 9 a.m. to 12 noon, the DBS Women will meet that day from 10 a.m. to 12 noon. Susan Monte will welcome them. Lita Ramnarine, Patty Canter, and Stacy Brown will give their testimonies. Yvonne Waite will inform them on some Gnostic beliefs in modern Bible Versions.

### Speakers' Schedule

#### Wednesday, July 19, 2006

- 2:00-2:45 p.m. Dr. Bob Barnett (MI)  
*"God's Words & God's Person"*
- 2:50-3:35 p.m. Pastor Denis Gibson (CAN)  
*"Our Lord's Pre-Existence"*
- 3:40-4:25 p.m. Pastor Paul Reno (MD)  
*"I-Don't-Know' Scholarship"*
- 4:30-5:15 p.m. OPEN  
[Drs. Branine or Doom or Testimonies]
- 5:15-6:45 p.m. SUPPER at the church  
7:00-7:05 p.m. SINGING
- 7:10-7:55 p.m. Dr. David Brown (WI)  
*"The TR In Early English Versions"*
- 8:00-8:10 p.m. Singing & Offering
- 8:15-9:00 p.m. Dr. Kirk DiVietro (MA)  
*"We Must Battle for the Gospel"*

#### Thursday, July 20, 2006

- 9:00-9:45 a.m. Dr. H. D. Williams (GA)  
*"The Everlasting Sign"*
- 9:50-10:35 a.m. Dan Waite (NJ)

*"DBS--28-Years of Consistency"*

10:40-11:25 a.m. Pstr. Dave Hollowood (IL)  
*"God's Dictionary"*

11:30-11:55 a.m. OPEN

[Drs. Branine or Doom or Testimonies]

11:55-12:55 p.m. LUNCH at the church

1:00-1:45 p.m. Dr. David Sorenson (MN)

*"Inspiration/Preservation/Abomination"*

1:50-2:35 p.m. Pastor Ralph Brown (WI)

*"The Faith Once Delivered"*

2:40-3:25 p.m. Dr. Humberto Gomez (MX)

*"The Outreach of the TR Spanish Bible"*

3:30-4:15 p.m. Pastor Eric Maynard (IL)

*"Why We Must Continue to Use the KJB"*

4:20-5:05 p.m. Dr. Michael Monte (MN)

*"KJB--A Defense Against False Science"*

5:10-6:45 p.m. SUPPER at the church

7:00-7:05 p.m. SINGING

7:10-7:55 p.m. Dr. Thomas M. Strouse (CT)

*"The 'One Title' of Luke 16:17"*

8:00-8:10 p.m. SINGING AND OFFERING

8:15--9:00 p.m. Dr. D. A. Waite (NJ)

*"BJU's Errors on Bible Preservation"*

### Editor's Corner

by Dr. D. A. Waite

*President of the Dean Burgon Society*

Recently, the Dean Burgon Society was notified about a posting on an Internet Website, [baptistboard.com](http://baptistboard.com), which made some serious accusations. The charges made by the participants against the DBS, Dr. Waite, and Singaporean defenders of verbal plenary inspiration (VPI) and verbal plenary preservation (VPP) were answered by Dr. D. A. Waite, President of the DBS. Dr. Waite's answers to the accusations are printed in this issue to refute the accusations, to set the

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

record straight, and to promote the truth about topics addressed in the web-posting. The customary abbreviations for words on Website postings were left as originally found in the posting.

## Reply About DBS

By **D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.**  
President of the Dean Burgon Society  
April 18, 2006

The posting on the Website was Sunday, April 9, 2006 between "ASKJO" and Dr. Thomas Cassidy.

**ASKJO WROTE:** "Are you not satisfied with the Dean Burgon Society where you are a member of?"

**DR. WAITE'S COMMENT:** Our DBS records indicate that the last date listing Dr. Thomas Cassidy as a "member" of the Dean Burgon Society Executive Committee was June of 2002. He does not appear on that DBS Committee in the July, 2003 list. He was no longer a member because he failed to complete and return the annual DBS Questionnaire sent to all DBS leaders.

**DR. CASSIDY WROTE:** "I am never satisfied by lies or by liars. If you can prove your assertions against Westcott and Hort by giving me the title of the writing, and page number, do so. If not, then you should be honest and retract your false accusations. When a member of the DBS lies it is just as unconscionable as when anybody else lies."

**DR. WAITE'S COMMENT:** There is a false implication that "members of the DBS" lie and are "liars." This is completely false. Our leaders and speakers back up their statements with factual documentation at all times. This is indeed a libelous charge against good and godly brethren.

**ASKJO WROTE:** "was ur position against lying in DBS concerning its lying abt WH? this seems to be the case of Waite's disciples in Singapore, who still routinely enjoy burning their effigies." "do u think those who continue to slander WH here without evidence shd be named n exposed? haven't they been warned over n again? it appears it's gone beyond "mindless" accusation; there's something deliberate going on here. n we know who's the father of lies."

**DR. WAITE'S COMMENT:** There is no "lying" on the part of DBS and its speakers about WH (Westcott and Hort). They were not either Fundamentalists or even Conservatives in their theology. For documented proof of this the reader is

referred to my two books: (1) *The Theological Heresies of Westcott and Hort* (BFT #595), and (2) *Bishop Westcott's Clever Denial of the Bodily Resurrection of Christ* (BFT #1131). Further documentation in their own words of their theological heresies is found in their own letters, collected by their sons, under the titles of (1) *The Life and Letters of Bishop B. F. Westcott* (BFT #1866, 928 pp.) and (2) *The Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort* (BFT #1867, 997 pp.). These documents have been available for many years from the Bible For Today, 900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, New Jersey 08108 USA on the web at [www.BibleForToday.com](http://www.BibleForToday.com).

**DR. CASSIDY WROTE:** "I was at the meeting of the Executive Committee when Dr. S. H. Tow (Tow Siang Hwa) was considered for membership. I was against Dr. Tow's being a member for many reasons, not the least of which is the polity of the denomination he superintends in the far east plus the radical and divisive nature of his bibliology."

**DR. WAITE'S COMMENT:** I just played the tape recording of the DBS Executive Committee meeting held July 10, 1996, where Dr. S. H. Tow gave his bold and Biblical statement of his stand against apostasy, neoevangelicalism, charismaticism, the new versions, BJU's position, etc., and in favor of the King James Bible and those who stand for it. His 10 to 20 minute question and answer session before the Committee was well received by the men who were in attendance. Not one negative thing was stated against having him a part of the DBS Advisory Council. If Dr. Cassidy was against his admission to the DBS Advisory Council, he never voiced it at that meeting or to me privately at any time. I explained to the men that the DBS was not a group of a specific denomination (though most of the men are Baptists). I formed it that way 27 years ago so that men who stood for the DBS principles could be welcomed to join in with us IN DEFENSE OF TRADITIONAL BIBLE TEXTS, beginning with the King James Bible. Dr. S. H. Tow is an enthusiastic supporter of that Bible. Dr. Tow's "bibliology" is neither "radical" nor "divisive" in nature. His "polity" can be his own just like Dr. Cassidy's can be his own. The DBS has nothing whatever to say concerning church polity.

**DR. CASSIDY WROTE:** "(The DBS was chartered to "Defend the Traditional Texts" but was rapidly evolving into a radical KJVO group.) He was admitted anyway, and

others such as Timothy Tow, Jeffrey Khoo and Quek Suan Yew soon followed, all of which take a very radical view of bible preservation and translation that is not only antibiblical, but which also contradicts the history and doctrinal position of DBS."

**DR. WAITE'S COMMENT:** The DBS still "defends the traditional texts." It is not "evolving into a radical KJVO group." It strongly founds the KJB on the verbal, plenary preserved, inerrant, infallible Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek that underlie the King James Bible. That view does not "contradict the history and doctrinal position of DBS." Dr. Timothy Tow and Dr. Quek Suan Yew so far as I know are not DBS members, and certainly did not "follow" Dr. S. H. Tow in being DBS Advisory Council Members. Dr. Jeffrey Khoo took the place of Dr. S. H. Tow as a DBS Advisory Council Member. Dr. Tow was last listed on the DBS Advisory Council roster in July, 2003. The roster of August, 2004 to date has the name of Dr. Jeffrey Khoo who took Dr. S. H. Tow's (his uncle's) place.

**DR. CASSIDY WROTE:** "That was what began my distancing myself from the DBS, but it was the dishonesty of D. A. Waite himself that ultimately led me to refuse to sign a statement that was dictatorially forced on the Executive Committee by Waite in contradiction to the vote of the Executive Committee the previous year."

**DR. WAITE'S COMMENT:** If indeed the selection of Dr. S. H. Tow to the DBS Executive Committee in 1996 "began his distancing himself from the DBS," why was he content for six more years to be on the DBS Executive Committee rosters of 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002? Who is being "dishonest" here? He never said one word of discontent to me throughout those six years, nor did he ever speak to me against Dr. S. H. Tow's being elected to be on the DBS Advisory Council. If he had been against Dr. Tow's nomination, it would not have made any difference because Dr. Tow was voted on to the DBS Advisory Council by unanimous vote. Dr. Cassidy did not vote against him, and even if he had, he would have been hopelessly outvoted by the other brethren who hold Dr. Tow in high esteem as a Chinese Christian leader from Singapore and who said many "amens" as he presented his doctrinal and practical position on Bible doctrine and practice. So far as my alleged "dishonesty" and my allegedly "dictatorially forcing on the Executive Committee" a "statement" which

was "in contradiction to the vote of the Executive Committee the previous year," let me say the following. This is verbatim from the DBS 2002 Executive Committee Agenda, p. 5, point #11 (quoting from the Minutes of July 18, 2001 from 9 a.m. till 2 noon):

'A major discussion ensued over the use of the word "inspiration" in conjunction with a translation of the Bible. Various points of view were expressed. In conclusion of the matter a paper ballot vote was taken on two definitive questions. a. "Do you believe any translation is 'given by inspiration of God'?" 18 voted No; 0 voted Yes; 0 Abstained. (100% voting No). b. "Do you think that it is technically proper to refer to any translations as being 'inspired of God.?" 14 voted No; 3 voted Yes; 1 Abstained. (82% voting No). All I did for the next year's meeting (2002) was to put in the Annual DBS Questionnaire for the leaders, (referring to their messages on the DBS platform), the following words: "I will not refer to the King James Bible (or any other translation) as being 'given by inspiration of God' (God-breathed) 2 Timothy 3:16)" I did this because we had 100% accord on that wording.

Dr. Cassidy and two other men argued strongly for saying that the King James Bible was "inspired." I told the men that so far as I was concerned, the terms "given by inspiration of God" and "inspired" meant the same thing. However, at the next year's meeting after this voting in July, 2001, which would have been in 2002, one of our DBS Executive Committee men repeatedly referred to the KJB as being "inspired." Dr. Thomas Strouse said he thought we had settled this matter the year before (2001). He asked me to speak to this speaker which I did. He had signed the Questionnaire so I asked him why he said this in his speech about the King James Bible and why had written a booklet saying the same things and placed the booklet on our DBS book tables. He said he did not believe the KJB was "given by inspiration of God" but that it was "inspired." So for the next meeting in July of 2003, I took the stand with the 14 to 3 men (82% present and voting in 2001) and tightened up this loophole, so that no speaker would ever have any question about what was meant.

I phrased the Annual DBS Questionnaire as follows: "If I speak at DBS meetings, I will not refer to the King James Bible (or any other translation) as being "inspired," "given by inspiration of God" or "God breathed" (2 Timothy 3:16)." This

action was not "dictatorially forced" upon the leaders, but it was, on the contrary, a vote of over 82% of the 17 leaders present and voting by written ballot on this question. Dr. Cassidy was one of the three who voted "yes" on question "b." He also argued with me on the DBS platform trying to convince the audience that the King James Bible was "inspired." This is all recorded on audio and video tape. I told the audience that the DBS doctrinal statement denies this and puts "inspiration" solely at the level of God's Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words.

**DR. CASSIDY WROTE:** "Yes, I do believe such blatant falsehood should be exposed. There is no excuse for such falsehood coming from supposedly regenerate men."

**DR. WAITE'S COMMENT:** There was no "blatant falsehood" and had there been, I would have been the first one to have exposed it.

**DR. CASSIDY WROTE:** "Just an aside regarding what is going on with Tow, Khoo, et al. They have now come to the point where they seem to have adopted the "bad seed" theory of regeneration. Quek Suan Yew has stated that he prays for the salvation of the souls of those who do not use the KJV, implying they are not saved. My son-in-law, and his family, use the CUV. To say that prayer is needed for their salvation because they use the CUV is an attack on the very regenerating power of the Lord Jesus Christ, implying that He is unable to redeem those using the CUV (or by implication other versions except the KJV)." "That heresy much be exposed and eradicated from the Body of Christ. It is a cancer that will destroy the very Gospel itself if left unchecked."

**DR. WAITE'S COMMENT:** Though it sounds suspiciously false, and I know very well that the Chinese CUV is based upon the false Greek critical text of Westcott and Hort and others, I will leave to the Drs. S. H. Tow, Timothy Tow, Jeffrey Khoo, and Quek Suan Yew to answer for themselves on this point since I have no direct knowledge about it.

**ASKJO WROTE:** "amen n amen!! i have personal interest in the Tow Khoo Quek triumvirate that's wrecked the Bible Presbyterian movement in Singapore, n i'm grateful for the stand u've taken. nor am i alone, as i know people in the BP movement directly affected by the cancer n resulting schism."

**DR. WAITE'S COMMENT:** Though I have only limited knowledge of the Bible Presbyterian situation in Singa-

pore, I am certain that any such "schism" that might be there is a result of these brethren seeking to establish Biblical truth in the face of unbiblical falsehood. I am sure they did their best to excise the so-called "cancer" unbiblical falsehood. If there was any "wrecking" that was done, it was done by those who refused to take a Biblical approach to the question of verbal plenary preservation of God's Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. Drs. Tow, Khoo, and Quek are sound on these principles.

**ASKJO WROTE:** "btw, if u're comfortable with it, wld u let us know what form of dishonesty was involved concerning Waite himself that made u separate fr DBS, whether it concerned the handling of MSS evidence or WH or readability tests or some such? having read portions of his Defined KJB n 4 Fold Superiority, it's hard to pinpoint where the dishonesty lies ... it's all over!"

**DR WAITE'S COMMENT:** There was no "dishonesty involved" in either Dr. Cassidy's need to "separate from DBS," or in "handling of MSS evidence," or about "WH" (Westcott and Hort), or about "readability tests." "Dishonesty" and "lies" are not "all over" my book, DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE. It is filled with truth as I understand it. As for Dr. Cassidy's "separation from DBS, I was one of the 82% (14 to 3) of the DBS leaders who communicated to all DBS speakers, and to him individually, that he would not be able to say on our DBS platform that the King James Bible (or any other translation) was either "inspired," "given by inspiration of God," or "God breathed." He was not able to agree with this DBS doctrinal position and so he refused to submit his Annual DBS Questionnaire and thus forfeited his right to be on the DBS Executive Committee any longer.

**ASKJO WROTE:** "good for ur son-in-law to stand w the CUV. it's one of the good translations available, even if it's not Tronly (n it's certainly not KJB-based!). in order to retain their Chinese speaking supporters, the Singaporean disciples of Waite avoid pointing out the differences n offer a special dispensation to the CUV until such a time a 4 Fold Superior Chinese Bible can be created based on the TR n Bomberg, ha! their principles can be pretty dynamic in certain situations, it appears! [Laugh]"

**DR. WAITE'S COMMENT:** I disagree that there are "Singaporean disciples of Waite." They are Christian brethren who have exercised their minds,

hearts, and souls to dig into the Words of God to come out with the same or similar truth and I have found in my own search since 1970. They are "Singaporean disciples" of the Lord Jesus Christ, and I praise God for them! I pray diligently that their tribe might increase and that their Far Eastern Bible College and Seminary might send forth hundreds of like-minded students to all the countries of the world (including the United States of America) to proclaim these truths and to disclaim all opposing errors.

**DR. CASSIDY WROTE:** "The issue that finally broke this camel's back was over the use of the word "inspired" regarding bible translations. At the Executive Committee meeting Waite tried to push through a resolution that no DBS member could use the word "inspired" to refer to any bible translation. The year before I had presented a paper that dealt with the doctrine of derivative inspiration. I believe translations are inspired in the derivative sense. That is, the history of the translation is inspired history, the promises are inspired promises, and the prophecy is inspired prophecy. In the plenary sense a bible translation can be said to be inspired, but not in the verbal sense. That has been the orthodox position for several centuries, possibly for a couple of millennia."

**DR. WAITE'S COMMENT:** As clearly stated above on pages 2 and 3, I did not seek to "push through a resolution that no DBS member could use the word 'inspired' to refer to any bible translation." On the contrary, I asked the 18 DBS leaders present to respond by secret ballot on two separate questions regarding the doctrine of Bible inspiration. Of the 17 men present and voting on the question of "inspiration" of Bible translations, the results were overwhelmingly. By a vote of 14 to 3 (82%) the men were solidly in favor of my own views and that of the Dean Burgon Society's Articles of Faith ([http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/DBS\\_Society/statement.htm](http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/DBS_Society/statement.htm)).

**DR. CASSIDY WROTE:** "However Waite declared, by fiat, that no DBS member could use the word "inspired" to refer to his English bible. I disagreed, and stood up and said so. I often hold my bible up and declare it to be the inspired word of God. Everybody knows, when I say that, I am not referring to the words of the KJV English, but that the bible, by derivation, is authentic and reliable and the word of God even if it is given by way of translation. I explained that there is a big difference between the term "inspired" and the

much more precise (and biblical) term "given by inspiration." I would never say my English bible was "given by inspiration." We discussed (argued) about it for about an hour and when it became obvious that he would not prevail, we voted that we would not use the term "given by inspiration" when speaking or writing on behalf of the DBS, but could use the term "inspired" in the derivative sense. That passed and I thought the controversy was settled."

**DR. WAITE'S COMMENT:** I did not "declare by fiat, that no DBS member could use the word 'inspired' to refer to his English bible." This was decided by a ballot vote, not by "fiat." The Executive Committee did not vote that DBS speakers or writers "could use the term 'inspired' in the derivative sense." No such resolution was made nor is it on the tape recording nor is it in the minutes of the meeting. The only thing that was in the minutes (pp. 2-3 above) and that was recorded, was the opinions of the 18 DBS leaders assembled in July, 2001 at Ramsey, Minnesota. The DBS leaders never agreed to "derivative inspiration" but included their opposition to that false doctrine within the use of the word "inspiration" regarding Bible translations. All three of those who believe in the "inspiration" of the King James Bible and/or other translations are no longer members of the DBS. They have all refused to sign the Annual DBS Questionnaire.

**DR. CASSIDY WROTE:** "Much to my surprise the next year when I got the paper to sign agreeing to the doctrinal statement of the DBS it said that I agreed not to use either term when referring to the English bible, and did not limit that restriction to speaking or writing for the Society but was all inclusive suggesting to me that I was being told what I could and could not say from my own pulpit. It was, in my opinion, dishonest and not what we had agreed to in the Executive Committee meeting. I refused to sign it and by so doing gave up my seat on the Executive Committee."

**DR. WAITE'S COMMENT:** This is totally, clearly, and completely false and misleading. The DBS Questionnaire (which Dr. Jeffrey Khoo and all our DBS leaders have in their possession and can verify the truthfulness of what follows) is very clear. It has been used ever since this matter was settled in 2001 and 2002 by our DBS men. It does NOT tell him or any DBS Pastor "what he could and could not say from his own pulpit." Who is being "dishonest" here? Here is the exact verbatim transcript of question #2 of our current DBS "Questionnaire for Prospective DBS Execu-

tive Committee and/or DBS Advisory Council" members: 2. [ ] I AGREE, [ ] I DO NOT AGREE. I have no problem following unequivocally our DBS documents' official position on referring to the King James Bible. If I become, either a DBS Executive member or Advisory Council member, and if I speak at DBS meetings, I will be careful to limit my references to the King James Bible in line with our DBS documents such as: (1) a "true, faithful, and accurate translation" of which we can say "This is the Word of God" [ARTICLES, p. 3]; or (2) "The Authorized Version has been, and continues to be, the God honored, most [or "only"] accurate, and best translation from the proper original language texts of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, and authoritative Word of God for the English-speaking nations" [BIBLE PRESERVATION, p. 7 "K"] Since our DBS documents do NOT state or teach that the King James Bible (or any other translation) was "God breathed," "given by inspiration of God," or "inspired," (2 Timothy 3:16), if I speak at DBS meetings, I will not refer to the King James Bible (or any other translation) as being "God breathed," "given by inspiration of God," or "inspired," (2 Timothy 3:16). As for the doctrine of Biblical Inspiration as taught in our DBS Articles of Faith, I prepared all of our DBS leaders in minute detail on this subject. I quoted extensively to each of them our DBS position on Biblical Inspiration in two separate letters: 1. A 17-page letter dated January 5, 2001 with 586 numbered lines for easy reference to any line needed to be referenced. Copies are available upon request if self-addressed and stamped envelopes are provided. 2. A 6 page letter dated February 1, 2001 outlining once again the importance for the Dean Burgon Society to take a proper position on the doctrine of Bible inspiration. Copies are available upon request if self-addressed and stamped envelopes are provided. This was not something that took Dr. Cassidy by surprise, but it was something that had been gone over thoroughly well before the July, 2001 meeting and the ballot vote on the two questions mentioned on pages 2-3 above. I trust that this has clarified many things contained in the document concerning Dr. Thomas Cassidy and related matters. For further clarification, you can reach me at 856-854-4747 by phone; 856-854-2464 by FAX; [BFT@BibleForToday.org](mailto:BFT@BibleForToday.org) by E-mail, or at Bible For Today, 900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, New Jersey

08108 USA, by letter. Sincerely yours for God's Words, DAW/w Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D. President, Dean Burgon Society

## Fundamentalist Deception on Bible Preservation

An Analysis of the BJU-Sponsored Book, *God's Word in Our hands--The Bible Preserved For Us* [GWIH] by D. A. Waite, Ph.D., Th. D. DBS President

The following are some "quotations" and "comments" that are taken from my book, FUNDAMENTALIST DECEPTION ON BIBLE PRESERVATION. This is a 168-page perfect-bound book and can be ordered as BFT #3234 for a GIFT of \$8.00 + \$4.00 S&H. There are a total of 335 quotations from this GWIH book that I have answered in 335 comments. Here are just a few of them for your to read. I hope you will order the book and see for yourself the many misleading statements that should be answered.

**Quotation #28.** (p. xxi) Randolph Shaylor wrote: "We believe that the Bible teaches that God has providentially preserved His written word. This preservation exists in the totality of the ancient manuscripts of that revelation. We are therefore certain that we possess the very word of God."

**Comment #28.** Randolph Shaylor, from Riverdale, GA, was the managing editor of this GWIH book. He is a graduate of Bob Jones University and one of the seven members of the Text and Translation Committee.

Notice that he believes God has preserved only "His written Word." He does not state he believes in God's preservation of "His written Words." By "Word" he means only the "message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, or revelation," but not the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. Therein lies the deception that is repeated over and over in this GWIH book. Most born-again Christians would believe that God's "Word" and God's "Words" are identical. They are identical in the Bible, but not with these deceptive Fundamentalists as they use it in this GWIH book.

If indeed God's "Word" (that is, "message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, or revelation") is "preserved" "in the totality of the ancient language manuscripts," how can it be God's Word "in our hands"?

**Quotation #60.** (p. 28) Hutcheson referred with approval to R. A. Torrey and A. T. Roberston when he wrote: "Both of these giants of the faith were committed to the preserved Word of God in the eclectic Greek Text and in multiple conservative translations."

**Comment #60.** Both these "giants" and Hutcheson are in error. The "eclectic Greek Text" of Westcott and Hort, Nestle-Aland, or United Bible Societies differ from the true Words underlying our King James Bible in over 8,000 places and have 356 doctrinal passages which are in error. What sort of "preservation" is that?

**Quotation #61.** (p. 28) Hutcheson wrote: "However, God's people including the great number with limited educational backgrounds--must be free with a clear conscience and the rich heritage of historic Christian doctrine--to use any conservative English Bible in the pew and in the pulpit in order to hear the Holy Spirit communicate His Truth to them in words of understandable, everyday English."

**Comment #61.** Get a Defined King James Bible if you want to have the Words of God translated into understandable English. We should not want to "communicate His truth" (that is, His "message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, doctrine, or revelation"), but we should want to "communicate" God's Words from Hebrew and Aramaic to English and from Greek to English as our King James Bible has done. There is no "rich heritage of historic Christian doctrine" in these multiple so-called conservative-English translations that are in the pew and in the pulpit. That "heritage" is found exclusively in our King James Bible.

**Quotation #67.** (p. 39) Conley wrote: "Some portray the current translation controversy as a battle between those who believe God has preserved His Word and those who don't, but that is not where the disagreement is."

**Comment #67.** J. Drew Conley is from Greenville, SC. He is a graduate of Bob Jones University and is one of the seven men on the Text and Translation Committee.

This certainly is where the "battle" is. The GWIH book argues that God has "preserved only His Word" (meaning only the "message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, doctrine, or revelation") but not His Words. This is gross deception because most people who are not in on the deception, believe that "Word" and "Words" are the same thing, when they are not. I and others believe God

has preserved His Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words which underlie our King James Bible, and not only his "message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, doctrine, or revelation." There is world of difference between these two ideas.

**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."

**Comment #74.** I and my friends are not "misapplying" these Scripture verses. These unnamed men have "misunderstood and/or misapplied" the verses as I will show.

**Quotation #78.** (p. 87) The unnamed, secret Committee wrote: "Verse 6 [in Psalm 12] is a clear statement of David's confidence in the truthfulness, purity, and trustworthiness of God's Words."

**Comment #78.** This verse goes far beyond mere "confidence in the truthfulness, purity, and trustworthiness of God's Words." It is rather the promise of perfect verbal plenary preservation of every one of those Old Testament Words, and by extension of this principle, this extends to every one of the New Testament Words.

**Quotation #97.** (p. 103) Concerning "jots and tittles," the unnamed, secret Committee wrote: "The Lord's referring to these minutia of the written law has been regarded generally by conservatives as the most explicit possible confirmation that He viewed the Old Testament to be verbally inspired and therefore inerrant."

**Comment #97.** The Lord Jesus Christ's clear teaching in Matthew 5:18-19 not only defends the verbal plenary preservation of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Bible, but also the verbal plenary preservation of those Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. The Lord Jesus Christ said in Matthew 5:18: "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot and or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." The smallest letter in Hebrew is the YOD. It is like our comma. The smallest vowel in Hebrew is a DOT. That is what a TITTLE is. This clearly teaches that not even the smallest letter or the tiniest DOTS under the letters will perish until all things are fulfilled. This is a primary reference to verbal plenary preservation of the Old Testament Hebrew and Aramaic Words, but by principle can also

include the New Testament Greek Words:

**Quotation #106.** (p. 110) The unnamed, secret Committee wrote: "As we have shown, the Bible's statements and commands will often require its availability. In much the way a radio broadcast addresses the audience with the assumption that they are listening, the Bible addresses the reader with the assumption that he actually has God's Word before him. However, we have also shown that the key passages cited by those who insist that the Bible demands its perfect preservation in a single manuscript and translation simply do not support the claims of this position."

**Comment #106.** I have never said the Words must be in a "single manuscript" or in a "translation." But perfect preservation is promised in this passage. The Committee has not "shown" the things they said they have shown. With obfuscation and deception, they have explained away the clear teaching of this passage that God has promised verbal plenary preservation of His Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Bible. They have taken these precious verses and they wrongly say they do not mean what they clearly teach. These men are wrong in their perverted and twisted exegesis in order to deny the promise of the verbal plenary preservation of God's Words. Shame on them!

**Quotation #124.** (p. 152) Quoting me, Mincy wrote: "Waite says that God has preserved His Words 'in the TR which underlies the KJV.' He does not specify which TR. He leaves his readers with the false impression that there is but one fixed TR which underlies the KJV."

**Comment #124.** This is deceptively false. I specify exactly the Words to which I refer. They are the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that underlie the King James Bible. How more specific can I get? With very few exceptions this is the Greek Text edited by Dr. Frederick Scrivener (BFT #471 and BFT #1670). This can be purchased at our Bible For Today ministry or on line at [BibleForToday.org](http://BibleForToday.org).

**Quotation #127.** (p. 154) Quoting me again, Mincy wrote: "D. A. Waite, for example writes, 'It is a gross misinformation to say that the Textus Receptus began with an edition of Erasmus. Waite does not agree with Edward F. Hills. . . Again Waite writes 'The Textus Receptus is a Greek Text of the New Testament that has been handed down from generation to generation. It had its origination in the Apostolic era, when the New Testament was written. Erasmus merely put these Traditional Text manuscripts into

print A.D. 1516.'" [Fundamentalist Misinformation on Bible Versions, Collingswood, NJ, Bible For Today Press, Page 68 and 42.]

**Comment #127.** Since Mincy quoted me accurately, I would have to agree with him here. The source of these quotes, *Fundamentalist Mis-Information on Bible Versions* (BFT #2974), is my answer to the earlier Bob Jones University backed book, *From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man*, also edited by the late James B. Williams.

**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."

**Comment #164.** Again Gephart deceptively uses "Word" which means only the "message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, doctrine, or revelation" but not the Words of the Bible. This is one of most ridiculous statements made by Gephart in his entire article. He is equating totally different and distinct entities, tying them all together into one big equality of "Word." Yet, he cannot see the illogic of such a contradictory affirmation. This is a deceptive, confusing, and flagrant error.

**Quotation #165.** (p. 183) Gephart wrote: "We can be thankful that through the centuries the Lord has equipped men with knowledge and textual skill and that He has blessed us with the fruit of their labors. How foolish to criticize and debunk the praiseworthy efforts of these remarkable servants who have exerted such labors over the text of our Scripture."

**Comment #165.** Many of these that he is talking about, especially Westcott and Hort, were apostate heretics bound for Hell. Why should we not be against them? Why should we be "thankful" for apostates and unbelievers who have shortened our Textus Receptus by 2,886 Greek words? Why should we be "thankful" for these apostates who have introduced to the Greek Text over 356 doctrinal errors. Why should we be "thankful" for these apostates who have changed our Textus Receptus that underlies our King James Bible in over 8,000 specific places? I am not "thankful" for that at all. With Jeremiah of old, "I am full of the fury of the Lord" (Jeremiah 6:11) over such mis-handling of God's Words!

**Quotation #221.** (p. 271) "This of course, would not be the case if within the small amount of significant textual variation

there was significance doctrinal differences. If one of these texts or translations, for instance, denied the deity of Christ, added works to faith for justification, denied the existence of Hell, called in question the resurrection, counseled unbelief, or promoted evil, then yes, we are looking at different Bibles. But not a single variant in any way alters what Christians believe and practice. Every variant could be included in our Bibles or every one could be omitted and it would not affect our faith or practice in the slightest way."

**Comment #221.** This is one of the most despicably deceptive and false statements Minnick has made in his entire long chapter. False doctrines that "alter what Christians believe and practice" are to be found in Dr. Moorman's *356 Doctrinal Errors in the NIV and Other Modern Versions* (BFT #2956). Minnick should be ashamed of himself for deceiving his reading public in this manner. It is inexcusable! Just for one example, when the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ is questioned (as it is in the critical text and in the NIV, NASV, ESV, RSV, NRSV, and many other translations) at I Timothy 3:16, how can Minnock deny it?

**Quotation #248.** (p. 312) Bernard wrote: "In 1964, Albert Eugene Nida published *Towards the Science of Translating*, considered a classic and still a useful reference work. He presented the case for the theory of translation known first as dynamic equivalence later as functional equivalence. . . . As such dynamic equivalence was basically good. All the basic principals of dynamic equivalence are proper linguistic grammatical principals. They can be adequately applied to translation."

**Comment #248.** Bernard is putting his stamp of approval on the apostate Eugene Nida and upon the horrific use of "dynamic equivalence" as a proper means of translation. In reality it does three things, all of which are sin in the eyes of God. (1) It adds to God's Words whenever it wants. That's sin. (2) It subtracts from God's Words any time it wishes. That is sin. (3) It changes God's Words in some other way. That is also sin.

**Quotation #261.** (p. 335) Harding wrote: "A number of those believe that if a pastor or church uses a conservative English translation other than the KJV, they have departed from the faith and are headed toward ecclesiastical, theological, or personal compromise."

**Comment #261.** That might very well be the case, but again, Harding levels a charge, but gives no examples of "a number of

those” or any of those who make such statements. This sounds like a wild charge without substantiation of any kind. I believe every Pastor and every Fundamental church should use the King James Bible, but if they do not, though I differ strongly with this, I do not make such wild predictions.

**Quotation #285.** (pp. 373 and 393) In footnote #12, Downey wrote: “Donald Waite equates the King James Bible and the Textus Receptus when he speaks of ‘Bible-believing Christians—those who hold to the King James Bible and the Textus Receptus.’”

**Comment #285.** “Equate” means “to make equal or equivalent.” It is a lie for Downey to say that I “equate the King James Bible and the Textus Receptus.” How could Downey get this from the quotation above? I hold to both of these, but do not “equate” them. This is deceptive falsehood.

**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. . . .”

**Comment #290.** That is deceptive heresy to say that God has not protected His “scroll” meaning His Words written on the “scroll,” and that only His “Word,” meaning the “message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, doctrine, or revelation” have survived. I believe this is rank heresy to say that God has not protected and preserved His Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. How can Downey say “God’s Word transcends written documents”? Unless he means only the “message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, doctrine, or revelation” but not the Words. God’s Words are found in “written documents.” They do not “transcend” them!

**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.”

**Comment #292.** Here once again is reference only to the “message” but not the very Words of God that have been “preserved.” It is only the “over-all picture” of “thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, doctrine, or revelation” that could possibly make the critical text and the TR and the KJB and the NASV all “the Word of God.” How deceptively tragic are these word games played by the GWIH writers.

**Quotation #310.** (p. 391) Downey

wrote: “We all ought to be about the business of proclaiming the truth of God’s Word rather than dividing over differences of opinion about the text of God’s Word.”

**Comment #310.** We must continue to debate what the Words of God are so we can “Preach the Words” (2 Timothy 4:2) correctly. He again uses “Word” meaning only the “message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, doctrine, or revelation” but not the Words.

**Quotation #318.** (p. 407) Shaylor wrote: “The New Testament word theopneustos in 2 Timothy 3:16 is God’s explanation of how He gave His written Word. It is literally God-breathed. God breathed out His Word in His words insuring inerrant recording of His revelation.”

**Comment #318.** That is a false, defective, and deceptive definition of what God breathed out. God did breathe out His “Words” and not simply in His Word. By this term he means only the “message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, doctrine, or revelation” but not the Words of the Bible.

**Quotation #321.** (p. 408) Shaylor wrote: “Traditionally the English translation of the Bible first published in 1611 is called the Authorized Version or the King James Version. Because of confusion about the term some have begun to call it the King James Bible and have begun to call other translations that they reject versions.”

**Comment #321.** That is exactly what I call it, the King James Bible. It is the only Bible in the English language currently because it is the only Bible that has the proper Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underneath it, has superior translators, has superior translation technique, and has superior and sound theology. Others are inferior in all four of these ways and are to be called “versions.”

**Quotation #324.** (p. 410) Shaylor wrote: “Another extreme view is that the New Age Movement has corrupted the English translations since the KJV (AV). . . . Some insist that the KJV must be translated into other languages so that all peoples can have the ‘words of God.’”

**Comment #324.** There have been many “corrupted” English translations since the KJV. The Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that underlie the King James Bible should be translated into all the languages of the world. They may use the King James as the basis, but they should compare it with the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that underlie it. That is what Dr. Jung has done in the Korean language.

**Quotation #331.** (pp. 413-414)

Shaylor wrote: “The other view that describes a much smaller number of MSS has been variously called the Alexandrian Text type, the minority text type, the Critical Text (CT) or the Eclectic Text. The belief that the date of the production of these MSS is nearer that of the autographs than those of the Byzantine type promotes confidence that these are more accurate representations of the autographs. . . . The statement that God’s Word has been preserved by the totality of manuscripts includes those of both the Majority Text family and the Minority Text family. In reality there is a greater degree of similarity than difference.”

**Comment #331.** This Alexandrian Text is “much smaller” in number. It has only Vatican and Sinai and about forty-three other MSS or less than 1% of the evidence. He completely disregards the fact that Gnostic heretics’ knives operated on those early texts of the Vatican and Sinai MSS to alter them in many places to make them defective in doctrine and in other ways. to change them. To say that between the TR and the CT there is a “greater degree of similarity than difference” is total falsehood and deception. They differ in over 8,000 words (cf. BFT #3084) and in over 356 doctrinal places (cf. BFT #2956).

**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.”

**Comment #334.** That is how he closes this book. When he speaks of “God’s Word” he means only the “message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, doctrine, or revelation” of God, but not God’s very Words. In our King James Bible we have God’s Words kept intact in English because of its accurate translation into English of the verbal plenary preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that underlie it.

**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.”

**Comment #335.** Notice, Jones does

not say "eternal Words" or talk about the "biblical preservation" of God's Words but deceptively refers only to the "eternal Word" by which he means only the "message, thoughts, ideas, concepts, truth, doctrine, or revelation" rather than the preservation of God's Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words.

**2. A Guide to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.** This book is by Rev. Edward Miller who was a close friend and fellow worker with Dean John W. Burgon. In this volume, Miller condenses and sums up Dean Burgon's methodology for textual criticism. In it he refutes the false system used

of \$16.00 + \$5.00 S&H. Hardback book over 300 pages

**6. The Cause of Corruption Of The Traditional Text,** by Dean John William Burgon Dean Burgon, gives detailed illustrations of five accidental causes and ten intentional causes of the corruption of the

## The Book You Can Trust--The King James Bible!

The Dean Burgon Society News

(#77)

July 1--September 30, 2006

Box 354  
Collingswood, NJ 08108  
Address Service Requested  
[www.DeanBurgonSociety.org](http://www.DeanBurgonSociety.org)

856-854-4452  
Dr. D. A. Waite, Editor  
Dr. H. D. Williams, Associate Editor  
Published As The Lord Provides

Non-Profit Org.  
U.S. Postage PAID  
Permit #822  
Bellmawr, NJ

COLLINGSWOOD NJ VOL 06-2012

### DO NOT GIVE UP THE WORDS THAT ENDURE FOREVER!

The following books are available from the DBS. Books may be ordered with credit card by phone at 856-854-4452 or from the DBS Website: [www.deanburgonsociety.org](http://www.deanburgonsociety.org). At the Home Page click on DBS Press, then click on "Click here to order DBS Publications button."

**1. Inspiration and Interpretation** by Dean John Burgon. There is an excellent summary of this book by Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph. D. at [www.deanburgonsociety.org/dbs2925d.htm](http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/dbs2925d.htm). This is a "must have" book for anyone interested in the preservation of the Scriptures. Dr. Burgon remarks on "Essays and Reviews" concerning inspiration and interpretation of Scripture. The book includes sermons on "The Study Of The Bible Recommended; And A Method Of Studying It Described", "Natural Science and Theological Science", "Inspiration of Scripture.--Gospel Difficulties.--The Word Of God Infallible.--Other Sciences Subordinate To Theological Science," "The Plenary Inspiration of Every Part of the Bible, Vindicated and Explained.--Nature Of Inspiration.--The Text Of Scripture," and much more. Order DBS #1220 now for a gift of \$25 + \$5.00 shipping and handling. Hardback book, over 300 pages.

by Bishop Westcott and Professor Hort. This DBS #743 is for a gift of \$11.00 + \$5.00 Shipping and handling. It is a hardback book of 168 pages.

**3. The Last Twelve Verses of Mark** by Dean John William Burgon. Dean Burgon vindicates and establishes Mark 16:9-20 as genuine. In his day the only manuscripts (with few exceptions) that omitted these verses were the false Vatican & Sinai manuscripts. Order DBS #1139 for a gift of \$15.00 + \$5.00 S&H. Hardback book Over 300 pages.

**4. Revision Revised** by Dean John William Burgon. In this volume, Burgon does the following four things: (1) He attacks the false Greek text of Westcott and Hort; (2) He demolishes the theory behind that text; (3) He refutes the English Revised Version of 1881 and (4) He defends the King James Bible! Order DBS #611 for a gift of \$25.00 + \$5.00 S&H, Hardback book over 500 pages

**5. Traditional Text Of The Holy Gospels** by Dean John William Burgon. A careful survey of the historical supremacy of the New Testament Greek Text that has been preserved from the first century until the present. Dean Burgon shows the superiority of this text and the inferiority of *B* and *Aleph* and others. Order DBS #1159 for a gift

original traditional text. The book is replete with condemnation of the *B & Aleph*, Vatican & Sinai manuscripts, and the Westcott and Hort and other critical Greek New Testament Texts. Order DBS #1160 for a gift of \$15.00 + \$5.00 S&H. Hardback book almost 300 pages.

**7. Forever Settled** by Jack Moorman. This is a survey of the documents and history of the Bible, illustrated with pictures of various Hebrew and Greek texts. An excellent textbook for those interested in the background of the current textual battle. Order DBS #1428 for a gift of \$20.00 + \$5.00 S&H. Hardback book over 300 pages.

**8. Ten Reasons Why the D.B.S. Deserves Its Name** by Dr. D. A. Waite, President of the Dean Burgon Society. The booklet is paperback, perfect bound. It uses the letters of DEAN BURGON and explains how both Dean Burgon and the DBS were and are Defending, Educational, Adamant, Neglected, Believing, Undaunted, Relevant, Growing, Obedient, and Needed. Order DBS #1847 for a gift of \$5.00 + \$2.00 S&H.

**"... the TRUTH shall make you FREE" (John 8:32b)**