



# The Dean Burgon Society News

In Defense Of Traditional Bible Texts

\$2.00 a Copy—\$5.00/year (Canada \$10/year)—856-854-4452;

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

**No. 70 OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE DEAN BURGON SOCIETY March-July, 2004**

*"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)*

**HERITAGE BAPTIST UNIVERSITY, GREENWOOD, IN for DBS—July 14-15, 2004**

## The Dean Burgon Society's 26th Anniversary

### Where and When

Heritage Baptist University and its President, Rev. Russell Denis, Jr., is hosting our Dean Burgon Society's 26<sup>th</sup> anniversary meeting on Wednesday and Thursday, July 14-15, 2004, in Greenwood, Indiana.

### Information

For a men's dorm room at the University, call 317-882-2345. For a room at Lees Inn call 317-865-0100. A map to HBU is at [www.hbuonline.edu/map1.htm](http://www.hbuonline.edu/map1.htm). For DBS beliefs, books, articles, and information, see [www.DeanBurgonSociety.org](http://www.DeanBurgonSociety.org).

### Calling All Women

We would like to invite the DBS Women and all ladies at the University and surrounding churches to attend the DBS Women's meeting on July 14, 2004, from 10 to 12 noon. Mrs. Branine, representing the school, will introduce the speakers: Mrs. Williams (*God's Word, a Symphony of Praise*), Mrs. Reno (*The KJB Essay Youth Contest*), and Mrs. Waite (*Review of God's Secretaries--the Making of the KJB*).

### Speakers & Titles

Here is a schedule of our speakers and their titles as of press time:

#### Wednesday, July 14, 2004

**8-8:45 a.m.** Breakfast at your Motel

**9-12 a.m.** DBS EXEC. COMMITTEE

**9-9:45 a.m.** Ladies Coffee in Cafeteria

**10-12 a.m.** DBS WOMEN'S MEETING

**12-1:45 p.m.** LUNCH at the college

**1:30-2:10 p.m.** Dr. Bob Barnett (MI)

*"God's Nectar Preserved"*

**2:15-2:40 p.m.** Pastor Doug Sherrill (GA)

*"Job's Plea for Preservation"*

**2:45-3:25 p.m.** Dr. Clinton Branine (IN)

*"The Traditional Text's Early Date"*

**3:30-3:55 p.m.** Roy Magnuson (SC)

*"Verbicide--The War Against God's Words"*

**4:00-4:40 p.m.** Dr. David Brown (WI)

*"Rome's Evil Root & Fruit"*

**4:45-5:10 p.m.** Dr. Edward DeWitt (IL)

*"The Passion of the Christ"*

**5:15-5:30 p.m.** Dr. DiVietro & Iraq (MA)

**5:30-6:55 p.m.** DINNER at the college

**7-7:10 p.m.** "Singing and Offering"

**7:15-7:40 p.m.** Rev. Bill Hendricks (IL)

*"The Word of God Made Void"*

**7:45-8:10 p.m.** Daniel Waite (NJ)

*"DBS 2003 In Review"*

**8:15-8:55 p.m.** Dr. H. D. Williams (GA)

*"The Attack on the Canon of Scripture"*

#### Thursday, July 15, 2004

**9-9:40 a.m.** Pastor Dave Hollowood (IL)

*"The Seed Is the Word"*

**9:45-10:10 a.m.** Peter Lopez (IN)

*"The Bible Issue: Subtlety or Simplicity"*

**10:15-10:55 a.m.** Dr. Gary LaMore (CAN)

*"John MacArthur's Blind-Eye & Deaf Ear"*

**11:00-11:25 p.m.** Col. Pedro Almeida (MD)

*"Portuguese Bible Issues"*

**11:30-12:45 p.m.** LUNCH at the college

**1:00-1:40 p.m.** Pastor Paul Reno (MD)

*"Preexistent Truth Preserved"*

**1:45-2:10 p.m.** Dr. Aaron Strouse (CT)

*"Emmanuel Baptist Seminary Report"*

**2:15-3:55 p.m.** Dr. David Sorensen (MN)

*"The Text Issue & Biblical Separation"*

**4:00-4:25 p.m.** Pastor Michael Monte (MN)

*"Rise & Results of the Alexandrian Text"*

**4:30-5:10 p.m.** Dr. Bob Doom (NC)

*"Correct Text & Translation Battle"*

**5:15-5:30 p.m.** "Testimonies or Q&A"

**5:30-6:55 p.m.** DINNER at the college

**7-7:10 p.m.** "Singing and Offering"

**7:15-7:40 p.m.** Mark Reno (MD)

*"Motives for Diluting the Scriptures"*

**7:45-8:10 p.m.** Pastor Marc Monte (IN)

*"Fundamentalist Bible Betrayal"*

**8:15-8:55 p.m.** Dr. D. A. Waite (NJ)

*"Fundamentalist Deception on Preservation"*

### Meeting Tapes

In case you can not be at the meetings, you can order audio tapes (9 audio cassettes @ \$25 + \$4 S&H) or video tapes (2 videos or DVD's, 6 hours each, @ \$25 + \$5.00 S&H).

### Editor's Corner

**By Dr. D. A. Waite**

*President, Dean Burgon Society*

**Getting Things Ready.** This is the last tiny section to be written. I am getting ready to take the *DBS News* to the printer soon. When it's printed, our son, Daniel, who is on the DBS Advisory Council, will put address labels on each copy, take the mail to the main post office, and have it sent to you.

**An Excellent Issue.** As I read and edited (as needed) each of the articles contained in this issue, I was very grateful to the Lord Jesus Christ for such needed facts and truths which are made available by these writers. Our Assistant Editor, Dr. H. D.

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

Williams, has done, as before, an excellent job in securing these informative articles.

**Help Support this Effort.** Please help us with the **\$800 needed** to recover the cost of printing and mailing this excellent defense of the Words of God! Pray with us that the Lord will supply through **YOU and others.**

## Pastor's Corner

Erasmus of Rotterdam  
[1466-1536]

### A Good Son of the Roman Catholic Church?

By Dr. Gary E. LaMore

The following is taken from chapter 1 of William Packard's *Evangelism in America from Tents to TV*. The chapter is entitled "Martin Luther And The Protestant Reformation."

Packard says, "*Humanist thinkers were also beginning to advance their intellectual arguments and satire against the Church, and these written attacks were more disquieting than any sermons which might be preached against the Church's immorality. Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466-1536) had travelled to England in 1499 to meet with Thomas More, and Erasmus had ample opportunity to observe the corruption and cynicism of the Roman Church. In 1509 Erasmus published his *Ecomium Moriae, or The Praise of Folly*, which stirred theologians to an uproar with its biting satire on the absurdities of Church teaching, its ridicule of the Pope and celibacy and other sacred tenets of Catholicism. Erasmus reserved his chief scorn for his fellow clergy:*

"...whose brains are the rottenest, intellects the dullest, doctrines the thorniest, manners the brutalest, life the foulest, speech the spitefullest, hearts the blackest, that ever I encountered in the world." [p.25]

Mr. Packard is the great-grandson of Evangelist Dwight L. Moody. Based on his own personal statements in his book, one may conclude that he is neither an Evangelical nor a Fundamentalist. Thus he has no theological axe to grind. He is just making a statement based on the research he has done. Why cannot so-called Fundamentalists see the same things concerning Erasmus that Mr. Packard has seen? Why must they declare that Erasmus was a good son of the Roman Catholic Church when the facts of history prove otherwise? Have they not read? Do they not know?

Surely these so-called Fundamentalists must know that Erasmus wrote *The Praise of Folly* (1509) while indisposed with lumbago at the home of his friend [Sir] Thomas More [1478-1535], in England. He wrote it in seven days. If not the most important of his works, it is the one through which he achieved international renown. It went through forty editions during his lifetime. [Hans] Holbein [the Younger] (c1497-1543) illustrated it with pen-and-ink sketches. It is the most popular of all Renaissance classics. Speaking in the name of Folly, Erasmus criticizes the institutions, customs, men and beliefs of his time. The objects of his satire include marriage, self-love, war, *the corruption of the Church*, national pride, the competition for material goods, the wordiness of the lawyers, the speculations of the scientists, the logic-chopping and hairsplitting of the theologians, *the ignorance and diversity of the religious orders*, the pride of kings and the servility of courtiers, *the neglect of spiritual duties and responsibilities to their flocks of bishops, cardinals and popes*. All are held up to *ridicule*; the true duties and interests of all are shown. Erasmus professed a simple humanistic form of Christianity, and though *he was severely critical of the Church*, he refused to leave it and join the Protestants though he died among them.

Surely if Mr. Packard can see and understand what Erasmus saw and understood, why cannot so-called Fundamental believers do the same? Perhaps they need to read *The Praise of Folly* themselves. The author of this brief presentation has, and he agrees with the observations and conclusions of Erasmus. Since *The Praise of Folly* is a classic piece of Renaissance literature, the pseudo-Fundamentalist scholars would have to really understand the Renaissance and the classical models that the Renaissance authors used.

Yes, true Fundamentalists have their Erasmus and pseudo-Fundamentalists have their Westcott and Hort. And what were Westcott and Hort? *Apostates*. If the so-called Fundamentalists think that Westcott and Hort were not apostates, all they need to do is read Dr. D. A. Waite's book on the *Theological Heresies of Westcott and Hort*. True fundamentalists are still waiting for their pseudo-fundamentalist friends to write a refutation of Dr. Waite's book. How easy it is for pseudo-fundamentalists to exalt *folly* over fact. Their pride of intellect will not allow them to come to the truth. It would take true

humility for them to admit they were wrong. Also they would have to admit to their students that they were wrong and that they had lied to them because of their failure to really study the issues involved in the so-called King James controversy. Truly Erasmus was writing about them in *The Praise of Folly*.

## Apologetic Section

### The Mechanisms For The Preservation Of The Words Of God

By H. D. Williams, M.D.

Associate Editor, DBS News

The *mechanisms* for the preservation of the Words of God are recorded for us in many passages of Scripture. Many people are surprised by this insight. The mechanisms include *literal* as well as *providential* means.

The first step of preservation was to "write" His Words *in a book*. [Ex. 17:4, 34:27; Num. 5:23; Deut. 31:24; Jos. 23:6; Isa. 8:1, 30:8; Jer. 30:2; Rev. 1:19] It is very interesting that "written in the (or this) book" occurs 93 times.

Second, His Words are written in *many books*. [Acts 1:20, 7:42, 13:33, 15:15, 24:13; Mat. 5:17, 23:35]

Third, *all* His Words were commanded to be written. [Ex. 24:3, 4; Deut. 9:10, 27:3; Jer. 30:2, 4]

Fourth, *copies of all* His Words were to be made. [Deut. 10:2,4; 17:8, 27:3; Jos. 8:32; Jer. 25:13, 36:2, 28, 32, 51:60; Psa. 40:7, 102:12, 18]

Fifth, the Words were *to be read*. [Ex. 24:7; Deut. 17:19; Jos. 8:34; 2 Kings 23:2, 2; Chron. 34:30; Jer. 36:6, 10] The Hebrew word, *Kara*, used in all these passages also means to proclaim, publish, and preach the Words.

Sixth, all generations have been commanded *to keep* (guard, protect, preserve, observe) the Words. [Ex. 15:26, 20:5-6; Lev. 18:4-5; Deut. 29:9; 1 Kings 2:3; 2 Kings. 17:13; 2 Chron. 34:31; Neh 1:9; Eccl. 12:13; Ezek. 11:20; Dan. 9:4; Jn. 14:15, 23]

Seven, all generations have been commanded to keep the Words *on their hearts*. [Deut. 6:6-9; Prov. 3:3; Psa. 40:8, 119:11; Jer. 31:33; Mat. 28:19-20; Jn. 14: 15, 21] This also means to understand them well enough to teach them, particularly to children.

Eight, individuals should recognize that God's Words are *specific* as to the mech-

anisms already presented, and those to follow. This specificity should be recognized just like Biblical facts are recognized and appreciated. [Ezek. 13:9, 24:2, 43:11; Dan. 5:24, 25; Dan. 9:13; Hos. 8:12; Mic. 2:5; Mat. 21:13; John 12:6]

Nine, the phrase "*it is written*" occurs 93 times in the Bible, and invariably it means the Words were written in the past and are still present now and in the future. [Dr. D. A. Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, pp. 9-11; and Kent Brandenburg, Editor, *Thou shalt Keep Them*, David Sutton, p. 75-81]

Ten, *God guaranteed* the preservation of the covenant, *His Words*. [Ex. 24:7; Deut. 7:9, 33:9; 1 Chron. 16:15; Psa. 12:6-7, 89:34, 105:8; Mat 4:4, 5:17-18, 24:35; 1 Pet. 1:23-25]

Eleven, *The Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit* were the means for man to *receive* the Words, which were recorded. [Jn. 3: 31-33, 5:34, 7:38-39, 12:47-48, 14:17, 16:13-14, 17:8, 20:22; 2 Tim. 3:15-17]

Twelve, "God gave *responsibility* of preservation of the Old Testament to Israel." [*Thou Shalt Keep Them*, p. 104] [Gen. 17:9-10; Ex. 20:6; Deut. 6:6-9; Isa. 26:2; Acts 7:38; Rom. 3:1-2, 9:3-5]

Thirteen, the Old Testament saints were to keep the Words *in the tabernacle or temple*, their place of worship. [Deut. 31:26, 34:30; 2 Kings 23:2]

Fourteen, in the New Testament times, the members of *the churches* were to go, to keep (observe, protect, guard, and preserve), to teach, to receive, and to recognize His Words. [Mat. 28:19-20; Jn. 10:27, 17:8, 14:21, 15:20; 1 Cor. 7:19; Gal. 2:5; 2 Tim. 2:24-26; Tit. 3:10; 1 Jn 3:22-24; Rev. 1:3, 14:12, 12:17; 22:7, 9, 18, 19].

Fifteen, our local *church* is to be "the pillar and ground of the truth." [1 Tim. 3:15]

Sixteen, *believers* in the churches are to be the *stewards* of God's Words. [1 Tim. 1:11, 18-20, 4:6-16; 1 Cor. 4:1-2; Eph. 3:9] [Many of the preceding concepts were obtained from *Thou shalt Keep Them*.]

The New Testament era has an even better way for preservation of God's Words than the Old Testament times. Dr. Jack Moorman sums up the present era's preservation of the Scripture by saying, "*Just as the divine glories of the New Testament are brighter far than the glories of the Old Testament, so the manner in which God has preserved the New Testament Text is far more wonderful than the manner in which He preserved the Old Testament text. God*

*preserved the Old Testament text by means of something physical and external, namely, the Aaronic priesthood. God has preserved the New Testament text by means of something inward and spiritual, namely, the universal priesthood of believers.*" [Dr. Jack Moorman, *Forever Settled*, [DBS #1428] 1999, p. 62]

Yes, the churches, which are filled with Bible believing saints are responsible for "keeping" the Words of God; and they have done it. There has been a record of independent churches who were filled with the priesthood of believers throughout the centuries. There are many authors who would dispute this fact, and they would argue that individuals within the churches wrote fraudulent books to counter other ideologies seeking dominance. [Bart Ehrman, *Lost Christianities*, p. 203-227]. The truth about these authors, however, is that they use speculation, theory, and circumstantial evidence. The truth is that a born-again believer sealed with the Holy Spirit could not knowingly change even one jot or tittle of Scripture.

There has been a continuous presence of independent Bible believing churches that have preserved the text. Much evidence of the existence of these churches has been provided in books such as Alexis Muston's, *The Israel of the Alps, A History of the Waldenses* published in 1875. Muston writes, "*In the first centuries of the Christian era, each church founded by the disciples of Christ had a unity and an independence of its own. They were united by the same faith, but that faith was not imposed by authority upon any one.*" [p. 4] He proceeds to discuss briefly the concept of the formation of the state-church under Constantine, but acknowledges the persistence of independent churches. He even states that Ambrose (339-397 A.D.) "*did not acknowledge any authority on earth superior to that of the Bible.*" [p. 5] In the 6<sup>th</sup> century, Muston relates the story of nine pastors who "*separated themselves from the Roman Church, or rather they solemnly renewed the protestation of their independence of it.*" [p. 7] He quoted a 7<sup>th</sup> century a pastor in Milan: "*To combat the opinion that the pope is head of the church, he directs attention to the fact that the Councils of Nice, Constantinople, Chalcedon, and many others, had been convoked by the emperors, and not by the pope.*" [p. 8] Muston relates "*the resistance [to the papal see] also becoming more vigorous in the following centuries, and we can follow its traces quite on to the 12<sup>th</sup>*

*century, when the existence of the Vaudois [Waldensians] is no longer doubted by anybody.*" [p.8] He reports that "*the Kingdom of Lombardy itself was solicitous for the preservation of this independence.*" He says, "*thus the doctrines which characterized the primitive [apostolic] church and which still characterized the Vaudois Church at the present day [the 1870's], have never remained without a witness in the countries inhabited by the Vaudois; and if men had been silent, the Bible would have spoken.*" [p.9] The Bible has spoken and the evidence for the preservation of God's Words is overwhelming. God's precious Words have been preserved in the New Testament era by the mechanisms announced in Scripture, and independent churches still honor, revere, protect, guard, and defend the very Words of the Living God. The Dean Burgon Society was formed to assist the churches to defend, guard, protect, and keep the Words of the Living God.

During the early centuries, corruptions arose, but independent churches still continued to flourish. G. H. Orchard says, "*During the rise and growth of these corruptions, the churches for three centuries remained as originally formed, independent of each other, and were united by no tie but that of charity.*" [G. H. Orchard, *A Concise History of the Baptists*, Chapter 1, Section III.4] "*During the first three centuries, Christian congregations, all over the East, subsisted in separate independent bodies, unsupported by government, and consequently without any secular power over one another.*" [Orchard, Chapter 1, Section III.7]

By the fourth century, groups of independent churches formed to resist the corruption of centralized power, wrong discipline, wrong doctrine, and the wrong philosophical influences of neo-Platonists in Alexandria, Egypt, that led men like Pantaneus, Ammonius Saccas, and Origen, to reject the Scriptures as written. The Alexandrian center of apostasy is very likely the source of the modernist textual critics' favorite manuscripts, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. The independent groups that were formed to resist these encroachments on apostolic doctrine were maligned by Rome and derogatorily called "*Puritans.*"

G. H. Orchard says, "*One Novatus, of Carthage, coming to Rome, united himself with Novatian, and their combined efforts were attended with remarkable success. It is evident that many persons were previously in*

such a situation as to embrace the earliest opportunity of uniting with churches whose communion was scriptural. Novatian became the first pastor in the new interest, and is accused of the crime of giving birth to an innumerable multitude of congregations of Puritans in every part of the Roman empire; and yet ...these churches flourished until the fifth century. . . . The churches thus formed upon a plan of strict communion and rigid discipline, obtained the reproach of Puritans; they were the oldest body of Christian churches, of which we have any account, and a succession of them, we shall prove, has continued to the present day. Novatian's example had a powerful influence, and Puritan churches rose in different parts, in quick succession. So early as 254, these Dissenters [from Rome] are complained of, as having infected France with their doctrines, [Mezeray's Hist., p. 4. Miln. Ch. Hist., c. 3, c. 13] which will aid us in the Albigensian churches, where the same severity of discipline is traced, [Allix's Pied, c. 17, 156] and reprobated." [Orchard, Chapter 2, Section 1] [All emphases are mine.]

The influence of these independent churches would be felt through the dark ages and into the Reformation. It is a well known fact that the men of the Reformation were influenced by members of the Waldensian churches. It was the independent Waldensian churches which supplied the manuscripts that Erasmus et al. used to print the first Traditional or Received Text. The evidence of preservation provided by translations into other languages, lectionaries, the writings of church fathers, and manuscripts is enormous. The independent, believer churches have preserved, guarded, and protected the Words of God as commanded. Will we continue? Are we still able to defend the Truth AGAINST ALL THREATS, and as my Pastor says, against the GOLIATHS?

## Professors' Corner

### The Date Problem and the Text

By: Clinton L. Branine

Professor, Heritage Baptist University

The New Version advocates attempt to use the date of Traditional Text manuscripts as a convincing reason to support their position.

Notice the statement by Stewart Custer, *The Truth About the King James Version*

Controversy: "The Alexandrian text is older and better attested than the others." He goes on to say, "The Byzantine text is later than the others and is a derived text." (p. 9) He continues, "Thus the earliest evidence for the Byzantine text is the middle of the fourth century two centuries later than the Alexandrian text." (p. 9)

D. A. Carson agrees with Custer. "They [scholars] argued that the Byzantine textual tradition [which includes the TR] did not originate before the mid-fourth century, and that it was the result of a conflation of earlier texts." (*The King James Version Debate*, p.40)

Stewart Custer follows the reasoning of Westcott and Hort. Most New Version advocates go back to Westcott and Hort for a late date for the Traditional Text. Is this reasoning supported by fact? No!

Dr. Harry A. Sturz, *The Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Textual Criticism*, gives the following information: "These 150 readings (Byzantine) are early. They go back to the second century, for they are supported by papyri which range from the third to the second century in date." (p. 62) "...it is startling from the standpoint of the WH theory to find that the so-called 'Byzantine' readings not only existed early but were present in Egypt before the end of the second century." (Sturz, p. 62)

Sturz continues, "WH, therefore, were mistaken in regard to their insistence that all the pre-Syrian evidence for readings was to be found in the Alexandrian, Neutral, and Western texts, i.e., that these three text-types and their chief witnesses reserved the complete second-century picture of the textual tradition on which the Syrian editor(s) built." (pp. 62-63)

John Burgon surveyed the early church fathers as to the text they used. He says:

1. The original predominance of the Traditional text is shown in the list given of the earliest Fathers. Their record proves that in their writings, and so in the church generally, corruption had made itself felt in the earliest times, but that the pure waters generally prevailed.
2. The Tradition is also carried on through the majority of the Fathers who succeeded them. There is no break or interval: the witness is continuous. Again, not the slightest confirmation is given

to Dr. Hort's notion that a revision or recension was definitely accomplished at Antioch in the middle of the fourth century." (*The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, vol 1, p. 121)

Burgon says, "For the 76 Church Fathers examined, [Fathers that died before A.D. 400] there were 2,630 references to the Traditional Text and only 1,753 to the Neologian [Westcott-Hort type of] text. The Traditional Text was definitely in existence well before 400 A.D. In other words, not only is the Traditional Text present in these church fathers' time, who lived and died prior to 400 A.D., the Traditional Text predominated over the Neologian [W-H] 3 to 2."

Edward Miller (Dean Burgon's editor) wrote, "As far as the Fathers who died before 400 A.D. are concerned, the question may now be put and answered. Do they witness to the Traditional Text as existing from the first, or do they not? The results of the evidence, both as regards the quantity and the quality of the testimony, enable us to reply, not only that the Traditional Text was in existence, but that it was predominant, during the period under review." (David Otis Fuller, *Which Bible*, p. 116)

Westcott and Hort with their followers "...argued that the Byzantine textual tradition (which includes the TR) did not originate before the mid-fourth century, and that it was the result of a conflation of earlier texts. This text was taken to Constantinople, where it became popular spreading throughout the Byzantine Empire." (D. A. Carson, *The King James Version Debate*, pp. 40-41)

"Westcott and Hort theorized that such a prevailing text type could only be accounted for on the basis of its having been ecclesiastically sanctioned, without a single shred of historical evidence for this supposed empire-wide church council, these men simply picked out a place, Antioch; a time, A.D. 250-350; a coordinator, Lucian; impressive sounding, technical designation, *The Lucian Recension*." (William Grady, *Final Authority*, p. 32 [DBS #2374])

A number of papyri (p) that date about 200 A.D., which is 150 years before Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, agree with Traditional Text readings. Most scholars deny this but note the evidence for the Traditional Text. After a thorough study of p 46, Gunther Zuntz states: "A number of Byzantine readings, most of them genuine, which previously were discarded as 'late,' are

anticipated by p 46." (*The Text of the Epistles*, p. 55) E. C. Colwell agreed with Zuntz, (*What is the Best New Testament*, p. 70). These men agreed that most of the readings of p 46 were from the second century.

Floyd Jones gives the following: "Hills declared that the Chester Beatty readings vindicate 'distinctive Syrian readings' twenty-six times in the gospels, eight times in the Book of Acts, and thirty-one times in Paul's Epistles. Hills goes on to state that Papyrus Bodmer II (Papyri 66) confirms 13% of the so-called 'late' Syrian readings (18 out of 138). To properly appreciate this one must consider the fact that only about thirty percent of the New Testament has any papyri support, and much of that thirty percent has only one papyrus. Thus this is seen as a major confirmation to the antiquity of the text of the Traditional Text in direct contradiction to the theory previously outlined in which the Syrian readings were said by Westcott and Hort to be fourth and fifth century. May we not reasonably project the subsequent discoveries of papyri will give similar support to readings now only extant in Byzantine text?" (*Which Version is the Bible?* p. 79)

Westcott and Hort rewrote the history of the text with their Lucian recension. Liberals today reject for the most part the validity of the Westcott-Hort Lucian theory. However, this is not the case with conservative text scholars. See *The Bible Version Debate* published by Central Baptist Seminary, Minneapolis, MN. This school also produced the *One Bible Only?*

Stewart Custer and the Bob Jones scholars also continue with the Westcott-Hort view.

The Dallas Seminary Scholars and most of the Fundamental Seminaries agree with Westcott and Hort. This is indeed odd when liberal scholars agree there is no history to back the Westcott-Hort view.

The facts evidence an early existence of the Traditional Text. We believe the Traditional Text is a preservation of the original text.

## Critique of Bible Preservation and the Providence of God

By Dr. Thomas M. Strouse

Dean, Emmanuel Baptist Theological Seminary, Newington, CT

### INTRODUCTION

David Beale, in observing the inherent

weakness of soft conservatives' capitulation to Neo-Liberalism in their churches in the 1930's, states, "*The tolerant conservatives were quite willing to accept peaceful coexistence, though most did not realize that it would mean gradual extinction for them.*" (*In Pursuit of Purity* [Greenville, SC: Unusual Publication, 1986], p. 245). Peaceful coexistence with those who deny the Biblical doctrine of verbal plenary preservation of the Words of God is certainly not what the Apostle Paul had in mind when he warned Timothy, stating,

"If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome Words, even the Words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: **from such withdraw thyself**" [all bold the reviewer's] (I Tim. 6:3-5)

Exemplary of the capitulation to theological error is the recent book entitled *Bible Preservation and the Providence of God* (Philadelphia: Xlibris Corp., 2002, 349 pp.) by Bob Jones University professor Sam Schnaiter and Bob Jones University writer Ron Tagliapietra. These authors, holding to different textual views, give an informative and perhaps helpful survey of seven textual theories, including representative proponents and translations, in the field of the transmission of the Bible text. However, this volume is both revealing and alarming as it purports to discuss Bible preservation and the transmission of the text. It is revealing in that it demonstrates the apparent need that Bob Jones University has to give the final warning ("*Christians espousing the KJV-Only view should protect themselves against the charge of heresy by not majoring on minor issues,*" p. 165) and the last word ("*Is there not a place for charity amongst Christians...We submit this book with the hope that God will be glorified for inspiration, preservation, and providence, and that God's people will focus on obeying His Word instead of arguing over trivia,*" pp. 280-281) on the subject of Bible texts and translations.

It also reveals the desire for BJU to target fundamental churches that use the KJB and reassure them concerning the supposed orthodoxy of their faculty in Bibliology. This book alarms by exposing several weaknesses

of the Bible faculty of BJU and other Bible schools of their textual ilk.

First, the readers of the book should be alarmed because it manifests the deficiency of the Critical Text advocates to exegete Scripture for their Bibliological arguments.

Second, it reveals the obdurate attitude of the Critical Text devotees toward the TR/KJV proponents who do exegete Scripture for their position (i. e., E. Hills, D. Waite, and D. Cloud).

Third, it emphasizes the limits of human scholarship in restoring the Words of God since only three (conservative eclecticism, majority text, independent text) of the seven textual theories (the remaining four are radical eclecticism, critical eclecticism, *textus receptus*, and King James Version Only) may be "offered to the readers for mature consideration" (p. 182).

Fourth, it suggests that the allies of the position of the book are moving further into the Neo-Orthodox practice of "term changing" while pleading for charity (p. 120).

Fifth, the authors attribute to the Lord Jesus Christ a cavalier attitude toward the Biblical doctrine of inerrancy by alleging that "he [sic] called the extant copies *inspired* in spite of any 'typos' in them" (p. 26)

These men have the audacity to declare that the Lord Jesus Christ taught the doctrine of "*inspired typos*" (= inspired errors)!? The omniscient Lord Jesus, Who is the Truth (Jn. 14:6), never questioned the pure Words of the truth of the preserved OT (Prov. 30:5-6; Ps. 19:9), referred to the OT as truth (Mk 12:14; Lk. 4:25; Jn. 17:17), and bore witness to the truth (Jn. 16:7; 18:37). To suggest that the Lord's view on the inerrancy of the OT was an "errant inerrancy" position of inspired and preserved errors ("*typos*") is not only an example of blatant Neo-Orthodoxy but of horrific blasphemy

## WEAKNESSES

### Neo-Orthodox Tendencies

Persistent and pernicious errors, which must be repudiated with Scripture, permeate this volume. Beginning with the most serious error facing fundamentalism, this reviewer focuses on the fact that Schnaiter deliberately rejects the Biblical identification of the "Word" of God with the "Words" of God and espouses that God's Word refers to the "Message" of God's Word and not to the precise wording (p. 284). This book by professed Fundamentalists is an example of the escalating tendency toward the Neo-

Orthodox practice to re-define what is the "Word" of God. In contrast, the Lord Jesus Christ identified the "Words" of the Father with the Word of God (Jn. 17:8, 17) and promised the preservation of His Words (= Word). Again He said, "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not *my* Words (*remata*), hath one that judgeth him: the word (*logos*) that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day (Jn. 12:48). The Just God of the Bible will judge all mankind with the canonical Words, not merely the message, He has preserved for every generation since their inscripturation. Again, Luke identified the Words of God with the Word of God in Peter's preached sermon, which was eventually inscriptured (Act. 10:44; 1 Pet. 1:23-25).

Another example of this re-defining of terms (Neo-Orthodoxy) manifests in the statement "every Christian is a textual critic" (p. 29). This nonsensical statement is not only Biblically wrong (where were the textual critics in the Ephesian church who were to preserve the Book of Revelation for the six other churches [Rev. 2-3, 22]?) but historically insensitive. The Biblical criticism movement of the 17<sup>th</sup> century spawned the critical discipline designated "textual criticism" with its various canons or axioms. No Christian walks into a Christian bookstore and says "i am going to apply Axiom #1 'the oldest is best' and Axiom #2 'the hardest is preferred' to my selection of a translation."

### Imprecise Definitions

In Schnaiter's brief and rather elementary discussion of the process and product of inspiration, he seems to indicate that the originals were inspired (pp. 15-20). Indeed, *theopneustos* ("is given by inspiration of God") is a very technical word and can only refer to the *autographa*. However, Schnaiter says in conclusion "we need never be ashamed to hold up an English Bible and declare 'this is the inspired Word of God'" (p. 67). This loose usage of "inspired" is Ruckmanism *redivivus*, and if Schnaiter's statement is true, then there is no need for *Bible Preservation and the Providence of God*.

With regard to the doctrine of preservation, Schnaiter gives another Biblically imprecise definition, stating, "These passages [Ps. 119:89-90, 160; Isa. 40:8; Mt. 4:4; 5:18; 24:35] give us every right to believe that those who want God's Word are not now, nor ever will be, *substantially* without the Word

of God" (pp. 23-24). The promises of Scripture are far more precise: "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" (Ps. 12:6-7). The Lord has promised the preservation of every jot and tittle, not merely a substantial amount of His Words (Mt. 5:18).

### Bible De-Emphasis

One would think a book with "Bible preservation" in the title would deal with what the Bible says about preservation. However, Schnaiter and Tagliapietra devote two paragraphs, maybe four, to any explication, and sophomoric at that, of verses dealing with preservation (pp. 21, 23-24), in a 349 page book. The book really gives what man says about preservation and what theories man attempts to use to determine the exact Biblical wording (pp. 25-183). Although the authors may be credited with bringing together seven "theories" for evaluation, ultimately they cannot state which "theory" is correct, nor do they demonstrate the Biblical foundation of the five theories which require Textual Criticism (the *Textus Receptus* and KJV Only "theories" excluded).

### Unproved Assumptions

Part and parcel of the Critical Text position is the unproved assumption that Christ and the Apostles quoted or cited the Greek OT (cf. pp. 26; 120; 181; *et al.*). The Bible teaches neither the example nor the necessity of Christ and the Apostles using the LXX. In fact, the Bible argues against this false assumption. The Lord taught that the Scripture He used was the preserved Hebrew OT ("it is written" *gegraptai*) which had jots and tittles and the three-fold Tenak division (*Torah, Nabiim, Kethubim*) starting with Genesis and ending with II Chronicles (Mt. 4:4; 5:18; Lk. 24:44; Jn. 11:50-51, respectively). When He and the Apostles dealt with Jews and Gentiles, they used the appropriate Hebrew OT Scriptures or their Greek NT Words. In fact, the example the authors put forward to prove that Christ "quoted" the LXX was His citation of Ps. 8:2 in Mt. 21:16. But their own words disprove their assumption since Schnaiter and Tagliapietra state that the Lord quoted the Hebrew when speaking to "Hebrew speaking Jews," who were His audience in this case (v. 15) as "chief priests and scribes" (p. 65). The historical evidence for the pre-Christian LXX is suspect and unconvincing, and cannot pre-

empt this Biblical teaching, the KJV translators notwithstanding (p. 205).

Although the texts and translations differ in words, Schnaiter assumes that "no doctrine is lost" (p. 122), "no doctrinal variations arise" (p. 263), and "differences...never affect doctrine" (p. 247). Schnaiter attempts to assure his readership that although there remains doubt as to the exact wording of 12.5% of the NT, about 7.5% of these differences are insignificant, stating "None of these variants affect meaning much less doctrine" (p. 83). How can he be sure that no doctrine is affected since doctrine is built upon precise Words (e.g., Gal. 3:16). In fact the doctrine of verbal, plenary preservation is lost if the Words are lost (Mt. 24:35; Jn. 12:48). These assumptions must be proved Biblically, and of course, they cannot be.

The authors assume that there is Biblical value in Textual Criticism. They state, "Textual Criticism is the comparison of manuscripts with the goal of eliminating 'typos' and obtaining a copy of the autographs. Textual Criticism seeks to find the true history of God's providence over His Word" (p. 29). This view assumes that Christ did not promise to preserve His Words and man's responsibility is to restore them by applying the axioms of Textual Criticism to the mass of manuscript evidence. The Bible teaches that God has promised to preserve His perfect Words and man's responsibility is to recognize (Jn. 10:27), receive (Jn. 17:8, 20; Acts 2:41, 8:14; 11:1; 17:11; 1 Thess. 2:13), preserve (Mt. 28:20; Rev. 22:7-11), and obey God's Words (Dt. 4:6; 5:1; 7:12; 12:28; 28:1; 29:9; Heb. 5:9). The Apostle Paul believed this Bible teaching since he never instructed Timothy in any principles of Textual Criticism to be passed on to future generations (cf. II Tim. 2:2). Paul was opposed to things such as "manuscript evidence" since it cannot "build up believers" (p. 11) but ministers "questions rather than godly edifying which is in faith" (1 Tim. 1:4).

### Neglected Biblical Means

These authors chant the popular mantra that God did not reveal the "means" or the "how" of Bible preservation (pp. 26-33). And yet the Bible is profoundly clear on the teaching that the Lord used His people, the Jews of the OT (Rom. 3:1-2), and the Baptist churches of the NT, to preserve His Words. The Lord's Great Commission, organized around at least three significant parts of speech (imperative, three participles, and an

infinite), mandated that His disciples "teach" all nations, "go[ing]," "baptizing," and "teaching," with the purpose of these baptized church members "to observe," guard, or preserve Christ's Words (Mt. 28:19-20). Paul confirms this theological interpretation (1 Tim. 3:15) and several other passages give Biblically historical examples (Col.4:16; Rev. 22:16). Failure to receive and believe the integrative role of Ecclesiology in Bibliology severely limits one's understanding of what the Lord Jesus Christ has stated about the preservation of His Words. The Lord's believing churches have recognized, received, and preserved both the NT canonical Books and canonical Words of the Books, while at the same time rejected the false canonical books (II Thess. :2) and false canonical words (II Pet. 3:16; Rev. 1:3-7; 22:7-19).

### Internal Inconsistencies

Several inherent inconsistencies in the book are worth pointing out. The authors seem to approve of the KJV translators who advocated that "All translations (even poor ones) are the Word of God and deserve respect" (p. 319), while condemning the TEV and NWT for their deliberate theological bias (p. 264). Furthermore, they state that the subject of bibliology is "an enormously important matter" (p. 7) while calling the same subject "trivia" (p. 281). Even more egregious is their blatant perverseness in stating, on the one hand, that the Radical Eclecticism theory "cannot identify the autographic text" and "leaves doubt as to whether the true wording can be known at all" (p. 180), and then asserting, across from this page, that "all seven modern theories are orthodox and viable" (p. 181).

### Attitude toward KJV Only

The tenor of this book is both patronizing toward and condemning of the KJV Only advocates. The authors pontificate, stating "the KJV Only position, then, displays serious weaknesses but need not be heretical...Some...remain 'quietly convinced' and do not make it a test of fellowship...While the exact inspired-English wording sounds comforting, God expects study, comparing thought and preaching with Scripture, and even comparing Scripture with Scripture. Such demands ensure that Christians get the tenor of Scripture and will not be ensnared by some copyist's error or translators quirk..." (p 163.) Schnaiter's Critical Text view places him in an awkward position. Dr. Schnaiter,

professor of NT Language and Literature and chair of the Ancient Languages Dept. at BJU, needs to appeal, for students, to fundamental churches that use the KJV, which position his book openly denigrates, because churches which use the other theories' translations (RSV, NEB, NIV, NAS), if available, are either liberal or few and far between. Pastors of KJV Only churches should beware that their pastoral students going to Critical Text Bible colleges and seminaries will undoubtedly be indoctrinated in Custer's conservative eclecticism and Schnaiter's totality of manuscript text criticism.

### CONCLUSION

The Bible explicitly teaches that God has promised to preserve His Words (Ps. 12:6-7; Mt. 4:4; 5:18; 24:35). It teaches Satan's ongoing attack on the Lord's Words (Gen. 3:1 ff.; II Thess. 2:2; II Pet. 3:16), and that local fundamental churches are currently responsible to guard His Words from the demonic attack (Mt. 28:19-20; 1 Tim. 3:15; Col. 4:16; Rev. 22:16). Schnaiter and Tagliapietra reject these Biblical doctrines and are therefore, severely benighted toward and heavily handicapped from producing a book on Bible preservation. They reject these Biblical claims because they do not think history verifies the promises of God. To them historical evidence must have the last word (pp. 25; 28; *et al.*). For the fundamental Christian, one's faith is based on what the Bible teaches, not on what "historical evidence" seems to teach. The Lord Jesus Christ said, "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed" (Jn. 20:29; cf. Heb. 11:1-3). It appears that Prof. Schnaiter and his colleagues would rather reject the blessing of the Lord Jesus Christ and remain under the cloud of the charge of Neo-orthodoxy.

Can the Christian co-exist with those who deny the clear promises of the Bible about verbal, plenary preservation of the Words of God? If the believer will not heed the Pauline warning about withdrawing from Bibliological unbelief (1 Tim. 6:3-5), will he at least learn from history, as Beale observed, and recognize he cannot co-exist with Neo-Orthodoxy? Is this review un-loving? Was Paul un-loving when he rebuked the Apostle Peter (Gal. 2:11-14)? Paul said, "Charity...rejoiceth in the truth" (1 Cor. 13:6).

**Order Phone: 856-854-4452**

## Student's Corner

### Theological Significance in the Text Variance in Acts 9:31

By Jebldlah Porter, M.A.

Student at Heritage Baptist University

In Acts 9:31 there is a textual variance between the TR and WH text. In the TR *ἐκκλησῖαι* occurs but in the WH it is *ἐκκλησία*. In the King James the verse reads, "Then had the churches rest throughout all Judaea and Galilee and Samaria..." This verse has the potential of definitely affecting the doctrine of ecclesiology. The local versus universal question is an aspect of church doctrine that is much debated. If the TR reading is the one accepted then the verse does not decide the question because it is generally accepted that the church does exist in local assemblies. However, if the WH reading is accepted then there is a definite change required in how some view the doctrine of the church.

There is the position that the church is to be organized only in local assemblies. The WH reading makes this position untenable. The WH reading would not necessarily exclude the idea of local assemblies but it definitely allows for the application of the singular *ἐκκλησία* to a group of churches. The reading could even lend itself to the idea of a diocese. One could then legitimately refer to the American church, the French church, the English church, etc. Therefore, those arguing for a local church only organization could not do so in the light of the WH reading. They would have to acknowledge that sometimes it is acceptable to refer to the churches within a given region as a singular church. Charles Ryrie in his *Basic Theology* takes such a position. On page 395 in the section dealing with the concept of the church, he writes, "Yet the singular church is used to designate several churches in a region (Acts 9:31)." Based on this verse, he goes on to outline his concept of the church as being the universal church—all believers, the visible church—local churches within a given area, and the local church—a particular assembly. Regardless of which position is correct concerning the local versus universal question, the WH reading in Acts 9:31 would have to be acknowledged as affecting theology. It is not the purpose of this article to argue for one position or another regarding the local versus universal question but only to point out that in this instance the textual variance can affect theology.

## BOOKS AVAILABLE

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/). Click on the DBS and then press the "DBS Publications" button.

condenses and sums up Dean Burgon's methodology for textual criticism. In it he refutes the false system used 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-

**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 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

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

THE DEAN BURGON SOCIETY NEWS (#70) February—July, 2004

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, Assistant Editor  
Published As The Lord Provides

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

**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. Dean 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. A hardback book, over 300 pages.

**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

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

Texts. Order DBS #1160 for a gift of \$15.00 + \$5.00 S&H. A 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 DEANBURGON 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.

**9. Scrivener's Annotated Greek New Testament** by Dr. Frederick Scrivener. Order DBS #1670 @ \$35 (hardback) \$45 (leather) + \$5.00 S&H.